Catholic Safeguarding Standards Agency

Building trust, delivering change.

CATHOLIC SAFEGUARDING STANDARDS AGENCY

Baseline Audit Report - Southwark
Pilot audit
May 2022

Completed by Hayley Brooks (QA Manager)
With assistance from Stephen Kimble and Paul Threlfall (QA Analysts)
Report written June 2022
Amended August 2022

Catholic Safeguarding Standards Agency

Building trust, delivering change.

Introduction

This pilot baseline audit was undertaken remotely between 09/05/2022 and 13/05/2022.

An initial meeting was held between CSSA and two representatives from Southwark (Head of Safeguarding and Safeguarding Sub-Committee Chair/Trustee) on 31/03/22 where the audit process was discussed and agreed.

A self-assessment document was shared by CSSA on 31/03/2022 for completion by the Archdiocese, with an agreed return date of 28/04/2022. A list of additional required evidence and supporting documentation was also shared by CSSA.

A final pre pilot audit meeting took place on 05/05/2022 prior to audit commencing on 09/05/2022.

Scope & Methodology

Prior to audit taking place, the Archdiocese was asked to complete the audit self-assessment tool outlining their views on their current adherence to standards and overall progress being made.

Information provided within this self-assessment was analysed by the CSSA alongside key documentation received. In light of the fact that this was the first diocesan pilot audit site, a decision was made that all eight safeguarding standards would be considered within scope of the audit.

The following methods were employed:

Case audit
It was not possible within this pilot audit for CSSA to gain direct access to case recording systems and therefore electronic case records were sent. A list of all safeguarding cases relevant to the previous twelve-month period was provided by the Head of Safeguarding, with fourteen detailed cases sent to the CSSA. Of these fourteen cases, six were chosen to be audited in detail using the approved CSSA case audit tool. The six cases were chosen by the lead auditor, who reviewed the files to ensure sufficient information to carry out an audit. Cases chosen are drawn from a variety of parishes and cover a variety of concerns. Each of the three quality assurance analysts undertook two case audits. Audit tools were completed in a draft form using information provided about individual cases, which was drawn from the case recording system operating within the Archdiocese. Auditors then met with responsible

case workers to discuss cases individually prior to completing their audit tools and finalising their judgements.

Surveys

As part of the pilot audit within the Archdiocese of Southwark, we wanted to capture the views of a wide variety of individuals operating within the Archdiocese. The Archdiocese has 179 Parishes, and due to the nature of the audit it was not possible to reach all Parishes individually. We therefore employed a survey to gain an overview of how key aspects of safeguarding are being embedded within the Archdiocese.

Anonymous surveys were sent to Parish Safeguarding Representatives (PSRs) and Parish Priests across the 179 Parishes. The survey for PSRs ran between 31/03/2022 at 9am until 30/04/2022 at 5pm. The survey for Parish Priests ran between 07/04/2022 at 9am until 30/04/2022 at 5pm.

Responses were received from 90 Parish Priests and Deacons. This return rate therefore accounts for 50% of Parish's within the Archdiocese (It should be noted that a Parish may be represented more than once in responses).

Responses were received from 65 Parish Safeguarding Representatives (PSRs). This return rate therefore accounts for approximately 36% of PSRs within the Archdiocese (It should be noted that Parish's may have more than one PSR, and there are some parishes with no PSR currently in post).

Overview survey reports can be found at ANNEX 1.

Interviews

Interviews took place with several key individuals as follows:

- Archbishop on 26/04/22.
- Chair of Safeguarding Subcommittee (also a trustee) on 09/05/22.
- Safeguarding Subcommittee Members on 09/05/22.
- Head of Safeguarding on 10/05/22.
- Chief Operating Officer on 10/05/22.
- Episcopal Vicar for Safeguarding, Safeguarding Subcommittee Lay Vice Chair & Vice Chair on 12/05/22.

The interview with the Archbishop took place outside of audit week due to shortened audit timescales within the pilot audit, and prior commitments on the part of the Archbishop. For future audits, it is intended that all interviews will take place during audit week.

Focus groups
Two focus groups took place during audit week. One with Parish Priests on 11/05/22 and one with the Safeguarding Team on 12/05/22.

Document review
Review of the following key documents additionally took place:

- Audit Self-Assessment.
- Archdiocese of Southwark Safeguarding Communications Strategy
- Archdiocese of Southwark Safeguarding Guidance
- Archdiocese of Southwark Safeguarding Service Complaints Policy and Procedure
- Archdiocese of Southwark Safeguarding Policy & Procedures: Children & Adults at Risk, Archdiocese of Southwark Whistleblowing Policy
- Clergy DBS Tracker
- Safeguarding Subcommittee Action Log (22/03/22)
- Safeguarding Subcommittee Minutes (22/03/22)
- Safeguarding Subcommittee Work Plan 2021
- Safeguarding Team Report for Safeguarding Subcommittee (09/21 and 03/22)
- Safeguarding Training Strategy (27/07/21)
- Archdiocese of Southwark Clergy Safeguarding Training
- Record of Completion of Educare Training Modules
- Safeguarding Report for Trustees (01/21, 06/21, 10/21, 12/21, 02/22)
- Archdiocese of Southwark Volunteer Safeguarding Training.

Catholic Safeguarding Standards Agency

Building trust, delivering change.

Executive Summary

OVERALL GRADING FOR SOUTHWARK ARCHDIOCESE (Pilot audit)	Results being achieved
Standard 1 - Safeguarding is embedded in the Church body's leadership, governance, ministry and culture	Results being achieved
Standard 2 - Communicating the Church's Safeguarding Message	Firm progress
Standard 3 - Engaging with and Caring for those who report having been harmed	Firm progress
Standard 4 - Effective Management of Allegations and Concerns	Firm progress
Standard 5 - Management and Support of Subjects of Allegations and Concerns (respondents)	Results being achieved
Standard 6 - Robust Human Resource Management	Results being achieved
Standard 7 - Training and Support for Safeguarding	Results being achieved
Standard 8 - Quality Assurance and Continuous Improvement	Firm progress

This report outlines the findings of the pilot audit undertaken within the Archdiocese of Southwark for the purposes of identifying progress made in implementation and embedding of national safeguarding standards. It draws on evidence taken from self-assessment, supporting documentation, interviews and focus groups, surveys and case work analysed by the CSSA.

The conclusion reached is that the Archdiocese is at the overall grading of *results being achieved* at this time, with four standards at a *firm progress* grading and four at a *results being achieved* grading. Many key areas of the safeguarding standards are being addressed, and there are plans in place to develop other areas further. Auditors found elements of comprehensive assurance particularly in relation to firm governance arrangements and the overall plans in place relating to safeguarding in the Archdiocese.

An area identified for development is quality assurance (standard 8). This relates to the Archdiocese having measures in place to measure their own performance, impact and effectiveness of their work. Additional requirements within this standard relate to working alongside the CSSA and implementing recommendations, and it is accepted that the Archdiocese cannot implement recommendations until they are made.

It is noted that the Archdiocese of Southwark volunteered to be the pilot audit site, highlighting their commitment to safeguarding and improvement within the Archdiocese.

Auditors found no areas of significant concern, and there was no requirement for escalation of case related matters during audit week. Recommendations for further development are outlined within the conclusion of this report.

We thank the Archdiocese of Southwark for their support in facilitating this pilot.

Findings

Standard 1 - Safeguarding is embedded in the Church body's leadership, governance, ministry and culture

Strengths

- The overall culture within the Archdiocese promotes the message that safeguarding is everyone's responsibility.
- The leadership team are committed to taking a zero-tolerance approach to abuse, and this is evidenced through all areas of leadership.

Safeguarding policies and procedures, interviews with key staff, a focus group with parish priests and safeguarding training for clergy demonstrate a zero tolerance approach and a culture where safeguarding is seen as everyone's responsibility (LG1).

Interviews with the safeguarding team and Archbishop demonstrated a commitment to support survivors or those have been harmed. There is a fund in place for counselling to be offered where appropriate, and the Chief Operating Officer (COO) for the Archdiocese is on the board of Safe Spaces[1]. Survey responses from both PSRs and Parish priests show that

[1] Safe Spaces is a free, national support service independently run by Victim Support. It provides a confidential, personal and safe space for anyone who has been abused through their relationship with either the Church of England or the Catholic Church of England and Wales.

safeguarding messages are disseminated in a variety of ways including via physical posters, verbal communication and online.

There are clear governance arrangements in place. Two trustees are also members of the safeguarding subcommittee. If a trustee is not present at the meeting then it is not quorate. Expertise within the sub-committee includes a former director of local authority social services, and an international member of the clergy with a PHD in safeguarding who is a special advisor to the sub-committee. The overall safeguarding plan has been ratified by the trustees with annual review planned. Current safeguarding staff hold professional backgrounds in safeguarding. There is information from multiple sources indicating that the Archbishop takes a strong line on safeguarding and will withhold or withdraw authority to celebrate mass from clergy who are not appropriately trained or vetted (LG2).

'Caring Safely for Others' is referenced in clergy safeguarding training and evidence was seen within one case example of this being used as benchmark for clergy behaviour (case 185). Safeguarding training is mandatory for all clergy, religious and PSRs. A training record is kept and monitored, with the Archbishop promoting completion via individual letters to clergy. In survey, 93% of Parish Priests and 86% of PSRs had completed some form of safeguarding training during the last three years.

A historic case review (HCR) is currently being undertaken within the Archdiocese. There is evidence that learning from this review has influenced policy development and practice, for example action has been taken to remove clergy where unsuitable for their post and new policy has been introduced relating to overseas or visiting clergy (LG3).

The CSSA hold evidence of enquiries from Southwark in 2021 and 2022. For purposes of this pilot audit, a CSSA National Practice Advisor confirmed recent liaison with Southwark regarding a safeguarding matter (LG4).

<u>Areas for development</u>

- Plans to more formally seek the voice and views and support the engagement of those who report having been harmed require further consideration.
- Further work is needed to fully embed the 'caring safely for others' standards. Leadership have ideas in place regarding how this can be further addressed.

Multiple individuals were able to provide clear examples of how they are supporting those who have been harmed, and there is information on the archdiocesan website outlining the approach taken and support available to those who have been harmed. There is however currently no operational guidance stating how those who have been harmed are supported

in the Archdiocese and by whom (LGC1). Introduction of guidance would be beneficial in formalising the approach taken, ensuring clarity and consistency in approach.

Information was shared with auditors about the challenges that can exist between pastoral and safeguarding matters, whereby clergy may be in situations where there is a heightened risk of allegations due to the nature of their pastoral work. On-going training and individualised support where required may improve understanding of the 'caring safely for others' standards and their interaction with safeguarding matters. We were able to evidence that this is discussed within training, and we have seen evidence that matters of concern are addressed on a one to one basis as they arise. This is an area for continued development, and plans have been discussed to address this, for example through increased and enhanced training (LGC3).

There is a recent communication strategy in place, developed by the safeguarding team and covering communication relating to the work of the safeguarding team. There is no overall communication strategy in place for the Archdiocese and sub-committee members identify this as a priority area for development. When completed, the overall communication strategy will subsume the safeguarding team communication strategy (LGC4).

Standard 2 - Communicating the Church's Safeguarding Message

Strengths

- There is evidence of how those in the Archdiocese work with other bodies and organisations to promote a safer environment.
- Survey results from PSRs and Parish Priests tell us that leaders communicate a clear message regarding safeguarding within the Archdiocese.

There is evidence of links with Safe Spaces (via the COO) and through the Hurt by Abuse leaflet available on the Archdiocesan website. Due to the geographical scale of the diocese, there is a need to liaise with multiple different statutory organisations. Links are in place with police (Kent and Met) and there is evidence in case reviews of liaison with Local Authority Designated Officers (LADO) and Children's Services. The Head of Safeguarding has established links with coordinators in other Catholic dioceses. Personnel work across other charities such as CAFOD (The Catholic International Development Charity in England and Wales) and Safe Spaces and the team work frequently with the Church of England (CMS1).

In survey, 83% of PSRs and Parish Priests agreed or strongly agreed that there is a clear message in place from leadership about the management of safeguarding matters. This

indicates that overall communication relating to safeguarding matters is reaching those at a parish level.

Evidence of feedback from clergy safeguarding training was reviewed, with the majority of participants grading the trainer, content and individual learning as either 'good' or 'excellent' overall. Evidence of impact could be further developed through introducing an assessment at the end of training in order to measure understanding, or through completing 'check ins' at an agreed interval following training to determine how individuals are using the training within their day to day practice.

Areas for development

- Continued development of links with external agencies.
- Involvement of volunteers/parents/adults/children and young people to be developed to ensure that they are part of creating and communicating the safeguarding message to a variety of audiences.

Engagement and mutual learning with external agencies is an area for continued development. Safeguarding staff shared with auditors that there are occasions when their role is overlooked or their involvement missed. It appears on the whole that these matters are resolved on a case by case basis as necessary, and we heard accounts of the way in which such matters have been resolved through communication between the Archdiocesan safeguarding team and multi-agency partners. It is important that positive working relationships continue with the opportunity for diocese staff to challenge safeguarding decisions made by statutory bodies where necessary, and for external agencies to be supported to fully understand the role and remit of the safeguarding team (CMS1).

Leaders recognise that the current involvement of parishioners in developing and communicating their safeguarding message is limited. There are plans to engage these groups, however these are not yet established. The Head of Safeguarding was able to discuss intentions and what these groups may look like. There was a clear recognition of the importance of inclusivity and the seeking of views in this area. It is acknowledged by the audit team that the global pandemic has presented difficulties in arranging for organised groups to meet (CMS2).

Standard 3 - Engaging with and Caring for those who report having been harmed

Strengths

- There is clear and relevant guidance in place regarding training.

- Survey results from PSRs and Parish Priests indicate that they are confident in knowing what action to take when receiving a disclosure.
- The historic case review provides a good example of learning from those who have been harmed.
- The overall response to those who have been harmed is one of compassion.

There is evidence of guidance and training being available to those who may receive a disclosure, for example within safeguarding training for volunteers and guidance for Priests in the event that they receive a disclosure of abuse from a child in the Sacrament of Reconciliation (Safeguarding Policy p.17).

Survey results from both Parish Priests and PSRs indicate that they are confident in responding to any disclosure. 94.5% of Priests and 93.9% of PSRs agreed or strongly agreed that they know the actions to take if abuse is disclosed.

Case Management files demonstrate contact with statutory agencies at expected points. Staff were able to offer a clear understanding of the role of external agencies. This is evidenced within case recordings in addition to verbal discussions regarding case work. There is evidence that relevant sign posting in in place, and an understanding evident of the key agencies to involve at various points within investigation (EC1).

There are plans in place for members of the leadership team to engage with those who have been harmed, and discussions with various individuals confirm that the overall approach taken to survivors and those who report having been harmed is one of compassion. The clergy training package references 'Caring Safely for Others' to promote compassionate and caring leadership, and the Archbishop recounted individuals to whom he has personally provided support in line with the wishes of the individual involved. There are numerous examples shared from the safeguarding team around how they support individuals who have been harmed, for example through supporting them in attendance at appointments, or through signposting. There are additionally plans in place to train a number of clergy specifically to be key respondents when receiving concerns of abuse or harm (EC2).

During the week following audit, the Archdiocese was due to hold their first event recognising those who had suffered harm. This was not planned to be a religious service, but rather an apology relating to historical matters and a commitment to create a safer environment.

Subsequent to audit week, the head of safeguarding shared that the team have responded to lessons learned and emerging themes, for example when experiencing increased referrals regarding mental health and domestic abuse, training videos were created and shared with Clergy and PSRs to assist them.

Areas for development

- Consideration around having clear and evidence-based mechanisms in place to gain feedback from those who have been harmed.

While evidence from interviews and questionnaires supports that the Archdiocese respond with compassion to those have been harmed, there is currently no formal means of recording and learning from the experiences of those who have been harmed (EC2). Feedback can be gained in a variety of forms, including written recording of support offered, and/or verbal feedback from those who have been harmed about their experience of seeking support. A visible formal offer outlining what support might be available both through signposting and from a variety of individuals within the diocese may encourage those who have been harmed to engage in a way most suitable to them.

Leaders shared during audit their commitment to ensuring that the voice and views of survivors and those who report having been harmed are gathered in the way most appropriate to the individual. They are aware of the sensitivities associated with gaining feedback, and wish to take a considered approach when developing evidence in this area. They recognise this as an area for further development.

Standard 4 - Effective Management of Allegations and Concerns

Strengths

- Procedures for ensuring that allegations are received and responded to are embedded and widely understood.
- Senior leadership are routinely made aware of significant cases of concern.

There are clear procedures in place regarding response to allegations. These outline in depth and detail actions to be taken when an allegation is received. It is clear that the safeguarding team will report all allegations of abuse to statutory authorities, regardless of whether the abuse occurred recently or in the past, or whether the accused person is living or deceased. Safeguarding policy and procedures additionally outline that an internal enquiry or assessment may take place to establish any risk and to ascertain the Archdiocesan response where matters do not reach a statutory threshold (EF1).

There is policy in place relating to confidentiality, stating that records of all children and adult at risk must be securely maintained in accordance with GDPR (EF1).

Trustees are made aware of allegations and responses through trustee attendance at the safeguarding subcommittee and issues of concern regarding clergy are raised to the Archbishop's Council to ensure they are managed according to the canonical process. The Head of Safeguarding serves as link between the subcommittee and Archbishop's Council and reports on key matters as required (EF2).

Areas for development

- Current case recording systems do not allow for evidenced recording of management oversight and reflective discussion. This leads to difficulty in evidencing the impact of management oversight on case work and learning from case work.
- Requirement for written principles regarding when to inform CSSA of matters for support or development/learning.

Members of the safeguarding team explained that regular reflective supervision is held, and there was one case example where a reflective and learning log had been completed regarding the individual case. Team members were clear that management support is readily available and shared examples of this in day to day practice. While auditors accept that management oversight is in place, it is not possible to evidence fully due to absence of written evidence held within case recording systems. The safeguarding team shared with auditors that the current case management system does not allow for recording of management oversight and reflective discussion, and as this audit was undertaken on a fully remote basis auditors did not access hand written records. Development of case recording systems is an area identified for suggested development (EF1). This would support the safeguarding team in more fully evidencing case work practice and ensure completeness in recording within a centralised system.

There is evidence of communication taking place with CSSA, and safeguarding staff were able to outline instances in which they would contact the CSSA, for example in relation to complex cases or cross boundary issues. It is positive that links are established, however to achieve consistency it is advised that written guidance be drafted regarding the circumstances in which those within the Archdiocese would contact the CSSA (EF2).

Standard 5 - Management and Support of Subjects of Allegations and Concerns (respondents)

Strengths

- Risk assessment and safety planning is carried out by competent and suitably qualified staff.
- Informing and supporting respondents is well established.
- Planning around support for those alleged to have caused harm is clear.

Risk assessments and safety plans are implemented by safeguarding team staff who are all suitably trained, with a professional history of undertaking investigations and experience in safeguarding practice.

The Safeguarding policy states:

> In responding to safeguarding concerns or allegations of abuse, the Archdiocese safeguarding team will endeavour to respect the rights under criminal and civil law of any accused person. In addition, the Archdiocese safeguarding team recognises people who are subject to safeguarding concerns are vulnerable during any internal or statutory agency process. The Archdiocese will take all reasonable steps to offer a support person through this process. (pp 9-10).

There is a policy in place entitled 'Supporting an individual who has volunteered or has been withdrawn from Ministry'. This document outlines the right of respondents to choose a supportive individual who will provide direct support to the individual for as long as is judged to be appropriate by the Archbishop (SMR2).

In practice, cases 126/170 (merged case) and 185 demonstrated that clergy had access to a support person throughout the investigation. The Archbishop additionally shared plans for a property to be made available for Priests who are subject of an allegation to reside in to prevent them from becoming homeless when withdrawn from ministry. This property would have a resident member of clergy to support the respondent/s (SMR2).

A number of policies (whistleblowing, complaints policy, safeguarding policy) viewed by auditors have been adapted from CSSA national policies. These policies adhere to national requirements while outlining in specific detail steps to be taken on a practical basis within the Archdiocese.

There are mechanisms in place to review safeguarding plans. During audit week, auditors saw evidence of this in case reviews. Subsequent to audit week, a document was shared evidencing that requirements for each review are tracked and diarised. This document also contains key information such as reasoning for the plan and contact details of key involved

professionals. To develop this further, auditors recommend an overall review of this document at regular intervals to ensure that any gaps or outstanding tasks are addressed (SMR1).

Auditors saw evidence of the management of canonical investigations, which were undertaken in line with required canon law and advice sought appropriately from the Holy See.

Areas for development

- Consideration around how the Archdiocese quality assures their policies and tests the effectiveness of these.
- Requirement for written guidance around seeking support from CSSA relating to safeguarding plans.

Development in this area will largely involve further practice based experience and reviewing the effectiveness of already established practice. Some localised processes are newly implemented and therefore it has not yet been possible to review their use and effectiveness, for example the safeguarding communication strategy.

At the current time, there is no established guidance on when the Archdiocese would seek CSSA advice or support. It is important that this is formalised to ensure that this is available to staff when the Head of Safeguarding is absent, or for new employees. This will support in bringing required consistency, and allow the Archdiocese to more fully evidence links with CSSA (SMR1).

Standard 6 - Robust Human Resource Management

Strengths

- Clear policies in place regarding DBS and safer recruitment, recently expanded to include international clergy.
- Necessary selection and screening procedures in place.
- Timely completion of checks is underway. The safeguarding team have evidenced how they have gone 'over and above' to achieve in this area.

The Safeguarding policy outlines expectations of vetting and training in recruitment. It is the policy of the Archdiocese that all individuals undertaking regulated activity must have a disclosure check appropriate to their role. They also outline that an individual must not undertake a role until they have successfully completed relevant recruitment checks and completed the required training for the role (HRM1).

Prior to undertaking roles within a parish, volunteers are required to complete a registration form. Volunteers are asked whether they have the right to work in the UK and are advised of requirements to disclose criminal convictions or cautions. Two personal references are also requested. There is an interview process for those applying for PSR roles (HRM1).

Compliance with vetting is monitored through, for example, a clergy DBS tracker. Training compliance is monitored via the Record of Completion of Educare Training Modules. Training and vetting progress, including a DBS re-check for all volunteers, are reported to the Safeguarding Subcommittee at every meeting via a report from the Head of Safeguarding. The expectation extends to overseas clergy before they are allowed to celebrate mass in the Archdiocese and a bespoke training package for overseas priests in safeguarding is in development (HRM1).

A complaints policy is available from the Archdiocesan website. There is also a whistleblowing policy for staff to raise concerns (HRM2).

Auditors were informed during the audit that a staff member had left the safeguarding team at the beginning of the year and had left a number of outstanding DBS checks (something which was not communicated to the Head of Safeguarding while the staff member was in post). Due to the backlog, it was necessary for the team to prioritise DBS checks, with team members travelling directly to various parishes and even homes of individuals to ensure that checks were completed as required. Measures have subsequently been introduced to prevent future backlogs, and resources are moved in to this area as and when required.

<u>Areas for development</u>

- Consider developing bespoke training regarding management of offenders.

Bespoke training in the management of known or suspected offenders is not currently available. There is a section within clergy training highlighting steps to offending, however no specific training offer relating to day to day management of known or suspected offenders and the specific requirements relating to individual safeguarding plans. It is clear that such cases are discussed with responsible clergy on a day to day basis, with the safeguarding team visiting the relevant parish to explain the process and provide support, however all clergy may

benefit from access to more specific training to ensure that they hold a clear awareness of potential risks and associated actions to reduce these (HRM2).

Standard 7 - Training and Support for Safeguarding

Strengths

- A programme of online and face to face training is offered and generally well attended.
- Mechanisms are in place to track attendance at training.
- Leaders promote prioritisation of safeguarding training.
- Action is taken by senior leadership where attendance falls below expected standards.
- Feedback from training is generally positive.

There is a Safeguarding Training Plan for 21/22 with specific plans for Clergy, Overseas Clergy, PSRs, Seminarians, Parish Employees and Volunteers. Clergy training explores the definition of safeguarding, legal responsibilities, IICSA and the impact of sexual abuse, safer recruitment, risk assessments, audit, embedding a safeguarding culture, safeguarding plans, grooming, effective management of low-level concerns, and caring safely for others.

Training for Clergy and PSRs led by the safeguarding team has been delivered in various locations across the Archdiocese (London and Kent), and it is important to note the investment of the Archdiocese in offering face to face training. It is positive that the safeguarding team has led on developing and delivering this training, which has been well received by clergy and PSRs. Future audit activity will provide a comparison around in-house training and the training and learning programme currently in development by CSSA.

Completion of Educare and face to face training is encouraged by senior leaders and attendance/completion is recorded and brought to the attention of the Safeguarding subcommittee/Trustees via reports from the Head of Safeguarding. 93% of Parish Priests who responded to the survey reported completing some form of safeguarding training in the last three years. For PSRs 86% reported completing safeguarding training in the same time period (TS1).

All leaders interviewed stressed the importance of safeguarding training across the Archdiocese. Within their focus group, Parish Priests were positive about the online learning available through Educare. Auditors saw evidence of feedback being sought from 'in house' training, with the majority of responses being positive in nature. The development of training in line with feedback is an area for further consideration in evidencing learning and increasing effectiveness of training.

There is a mechanism by which failures in training reach senior leaders and are addressed, for example, through letters encouraging completion from the Archbishop. These are brought to subcommittee and trustees within the subcommittee in the form of regular updates by the Head of Safeguarding (TS2).

Areas for development

- Consider offering bespoke/specialised training for those in leadership roles.
- Continue to develop training offer for safeguarding team.

Development in this area will largely build upon practice already in place.

Specific training for those in leadership roles (senior clergy/staff) is a suggested area for further development (TS1). The safeguarding team are aware of the need to consider the way in which the training requirements of those in leadership can be met, and such training is under development within CSSA and accessible to all diocese as part of the overall learning programme.

In achieving continuous development, it is important that staff within the safeguarding team continue to access and attend opportunities for training to support them at being at the forefront of practice developments and in a position to provide the most up to date oversight and support. Information has been received subsequent to audit week stating that the team have attended numerous training events, predominately online, with the last two years.

There is a mechanism in place to address failure to attend or complete training, however this is not currently contained within the training strategy (TS2).

Standard 8 - Quality Assurance and Continuous Improvement

Strengths

- Southwark volunteered to be the first pilot audit site for CSSA.
- Evidence of internal audit being undertaken (Parish audit).
- Historic case review shows willingness to reflect on and learn from past practice.

The safeguarding subcommittee were involved in the self-assessment against the eight safeguarding standards in preparation for the pilot audit. All staff interviewed recognised the importance of engaging with victims and improving outcomes for them and this is the next area for significant development. The subcommittee has recently developed an action

tracker. An internal parish audit has recently been undertaken in order to learn more about practice and it is planned that similar audit activity will continue (QA1).

A Safeguarding Plan has been implemented. The Chair of the safeguarding subcommittee has shared that this will be reviewed annually with recommendations from the subcommittee for any changes or improvements. The subcommittee have an action tracker currently in place to ensure that actions are monitored and complete as required (QA2).

Two years ago, the Archdiocese invested resources to create a specific post to undertake Quality Assurance work. In the first instance the post has been focused on the Historic Case Review and thereafter will be available for providing a case audit/QA function. Bi-annually Southwark reports to the Charity Commission on the position of their HCR. Plans are in place upon completion of the HCR for learning and actions arising to be drawn in to a single document. Subsequent to audit, evidence of the on-going HCR, including an action tracker and learning was shared with the audit team. This review currently remains in progress.

Areas for development

- Further mechanisms to be developed for checks and balances around effectiveness of service provided.
- Further embedding and review needed of various plans/strategies (to be achieved over time).

There is a limit to the evidence gathered in this area as the nature of the standard relies in some areas on established relationships between the CSSA and Archdiocese, which at this point are unlikely to be embedded due to the comparatively recent formation of the CSSA. Through no fault of the Archdiocese, it is not possible to evidence that a contractual agreement has been entered in to with the CSSA, or to evidence that the Archdiocese has embedded recommendations made by the CSSA (QA3).

This standard additionally references areas such as implementation and review of a three-year rolling plan, however again due to the audit programme being in early stages, sufficient time has not elapsed to allow for this to be evidenced. There are however possibilities for further measures to be introduced to ensure that the Archdiocese is able to monitor the effectiveness and impact of their work, for example through introducing a programme of learning and thematic responses to case work and sharing the learning widely throughout the Archdiocese, supported by tracking, implementation and review of recommendations made.

Many of the policies and plans shared will require further time to embed within the Archdiocese, and it is important that mechanisms are in place to review these at regular

intervals to better understand the impact of services provided and achieve continual improvement. To evidence robust oversight, it is recommended that a programme of SMART planning and review be introduced for current trackers (HCR, safeguarding plans) to ensure that clarity is provided around responsibility for actions, alongside specific deadlines for completion and/or review.

Summary of overall findings

It is clear that safeguarding is prioritised within the Archdiocese. This commitment was illustrated by all leaders who auditors spoke with. There is clear dedication from the Head of Safeguarding and her team, who show knowledge and commitment to achieving high standards in supporting others and achieving safety.

A clear strength within the Archdiocese is the way in which the leadership team has developed and are delivering their overall safeguarding message. There was evidenced consistency in the message that safeguarding is the responsibility of all operating with the Archdiocese, whether this be the Archbishop, PSRs, Clergy, Trustees etc. Indications from parish level are that there is good support from the safeguarding team and religious leadership, and safeguarding messages are being communicated clearly to them.

Governance structures are in place and embedded. The Head of Safeguarding works effectively in providing a link between the trustees, safeguarding sub-Committee and Archbishop's Council through providing regular update reports regarding safeguarding activity and cases of concern. The safeguarding team is made up of dedicated individuals and it should be noted that multiple individuals praised the work and dedication of the team and the strength in management.

Mechanisms for tracking the offer of and attendance at training are in place. There is a training plan in place and intention for this to be developed further to offer more bespoke training, including specific training for those in a variety of leadership roles. The Archbishop becomes directly involved around issues of non-compliance with training, and the safeguarding team are active in supporting all to access training either online or in person. Training has recently been developed for overseas and visiting clergy.

Requirements around safer recruitment are in place. DBS compliance is tracked to ensure that all those working in relevant roles are appropriately checked and vetted prior to carrying out their role. This again has been extended to overseas and visiting clergy. There is training in place for volunteers and parish safeguarding representatives.

There is further work to be undertaken in relation to formalising the way in which those who report to have been harmed are supported in practical terms within the Archdiocese. All audit activity supported a view that those who come forward receive a compassionate response. Formalising practice in this area will allow the Archdiocese to provide evidence of the work that is being undertaken in supporting survivors, capturing their views, and shaping practice based upon their feedback.

Case work audits evidenced that safeguarding matters are addressed in a timely way, and involve key multi agency partners as required. The safeguarding team are clear that there is a high level of day to day support in place, and supervision including reflective discussion is happening regularly however audit of case work within the case management system was not always reflective of this. In order to more fully evidence practice in this area, there is a need for clear recording mechanisms and capturing of key practice within a central recording system.

It was noted by auditors that some areas of practice, for example communication with the CSSA, addressing of concerns with statutory bodies, and response to survivors have developed organically within the Archdiocese, and there is some reservation around how these aspects of practice would be continued and embedded if for any reason there was a change within management. We have therefore made recommendations in relation to formalising practice responses in such areas.

Engagement and consultation with parishioners in developing and communicating the safeguarding strategy appropriately at parish level is an area for development as there are currently no means of formal consultation in place.

There are continuing matters relating to the challenge of balancing pastoral support and safeguarding. Work is being completed both on a one to one basis and through training, and this is an area for on-going development in ensuring that safeguarding matters are recognised and responded to appropriately, and in ensuring that the risk of allegations is reduced.

Many areas for development build upon already established best practice or plans in place, and this is reflected in the overall grading of *results being achieved*.

Areas for development

- Continued consideration of formally capturing the voice, views, support for and learning from those who report having been harmed.
- Increased involvement of volunteers/parishioners/vulnerable adults/children and young people in development and communication of safeguarding messages.

- Improvement in case management system to allow for managers and practitioners to evidence practice in decision making, analysis and reflection.
- Quality assurance systems to be further developed to consider effectiveness of practice and the way in which planning, policy and procedures will be developed or adapted in response to feedback received.
- Continue to develop positive links with multi agency partners.
- Continue to embed 'caring safely for others' guidance at a parish level.

To support improvement in these areas, the following recommendations are made:

- Create a written policy regarding response to those who have been harmed, to include practical support, how learning from survivors will be captured and how this will impact upon service development.
- Develop a mechanism for consulting with parishioners to ensure their influence in development and communication of safeguarding messages.
- Develop a mechanism for the capture of case supervision, decision making, analysis and reflection, on the case management system.
- Further develop quality assurance mechanisms to determine how quality and effectiveness of practice will be monitored and reviewed.
- Further develop training offer with consideration for bespoke training regarding management of offenders, specialised training for those in leadership roles, and a formalised training and development offer for the safeguarding team.
- Create written guidance around consultation with CSSA.
- Should an archdiocese wide communication strategy be developed, it is recommended that the safeguarding communication strategy be included.

Recommendations for follow up:

- CCSA re-audit to be undertaken in three years.
- Two targeted audits to be undertaken by CSSA prior to full re-audit. Suggested topics are case work and response to survivors.

Report prepared by:
Hayley Brooks (Safeguarding Quality Assurance Manager)

With assistance from:
Stephen Kimble (Safeguarding Quality Assurance Analyst)
Paul Threlfall (Safeguarding Quality Assurance Analyst)

Catholic Safeguarding Standards Agency

Building trust, delivering change.

Catholic Safeguarding Standards Agency

Building trust, delivering change.

Annex 1

Survey reports (PSR and Parish Priests)

Survey overview report PSRs Southwar

Survey overview report Parish Priests S