# Appendix B – Template Terms of Reference

SAFEGUARDING PRACTICE REVIEW

TERMS OF REFERENCE CHECKLIST

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Section** | **Considerations** | **Action/Notes** |
| Key Lines of Enquiry (KLOE)[[1]](#footnote-1) | * What are the key issues that the SPR needs to focus on? What will happen if further KLOE emerge during the process? |  |
| Timescales | The Good Practice Advice advises six months from the resolution of GDPR and planning, up to the point of sign-off   * Can the Review be done in these timescales? If not, what are the reasons and what is a reasonable timescale? * What currently known external processes/staff absences/ other factors might put the timescale at risk? * How will delays be communicated and by whom? |  |
| Resources | * What funding has been identified for the Review? * What staffing resources, eg administrative support is needed? * What support is required for victim(s)/survivor(s), respondents and where appropriate their families, to actively participate? * What other resources are needed, e.g. translators, office space, |  |
| Governance | * How often will the Reviewer meet with or report to the Review Group? * Is a written update required or will verbal suffice? * Are there key milestones which must be met dictated by other processes/needs? * What are the mediation/escalation processes for the Reviewer and the Review Group to follow in case of disagreement? * What governance processes (meetings) need to be scheduled? |  |
| Role of the Reviewer | Are there specific instructions for the Reviewer before they commence. This might be:   * Will they contact victim(s)/survivor(s) directly? * Will they be the data controller? * Are they responsible for the representation process?   Are there particular individuals that need to be spoken to, specific things they need to observe, for example team meetings, services, robing procedures, governance groups?   * Any specific documents they need to read and referenced, including past reviews and relevant research [[2]](#footnote-2)? |  |
| Outcome based recommendations | The recommendations must be SMART, based on the National Safeguarding Standards and between 6 and 10. |  |
| Proposed Methodology |  |  |
| Pastoral Support | * Who will be offering this and to whom? For example, will the Support Person continue to provide support to victim/survivor, will the Link Person provide support to the respondent, what about other Church officers who might be involved? * Will more than one person be required? |  |
| Data protection arrangements | * Who will be responsible for these?[[3]](#footnote-3) * Who is the data controller? |  |
| Publication of report | * Who will be advising on publication from a data protection/legal perspective? * How will viewing the report (by victims, survivors, respondents, Church officers who are criticised) be managed? * What sensitivities are there around the timing of the publication? * Is it clear to everyone involved exactly what will be published, for example, the full report, a summary, redacted versions, recommendations only? |  |
| Views of victim(s)/survivors(s) on ToRs | * Who will carry this out and how? * What is the timescale? * How will disagreements be recorded? |  |
| Views of respondents | * Who will carry this out and how? * What is the timescale? * How will disagreements be recorded? |  |
| Views of statutory partners (where this is deemed necessary) | * Who will carry this out and how? * What is the timescale? * How will disagreements be recorded? |  |

# 

1. [Key lines of enquiry for healthcare services - Care Quality Commission (cqc.org.uk)](https://www.cqc.org.uk/guidance-providers/healthcare/key-lines-enquiry-healthcare-services); [Disclosure Manual: Chapter 5 - Reasonable Lines of Enquiry and Third Parties | The Crown Prosecution Service (cps.gov.uk)](https://www.cps.gov.uk/legal-guidance/disclosure-manual-chapter-5-reasonable-lines-enquiry-and-third-parties) [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. This is particular important where there have been previous similar Lessons Learned Reviews, but the learning has not been implemented [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. These **must** be drawn up with input from data protection/legal colleagues, or specialist contractors where these roles do not exist [↑](#footnote-ref-3)