



social care  
institute for excellence

# **Diocese of Galloway independent safeguarding audit (January 2020)**



The Social Care Institute for Excellence (SCIE) improves the lives of people who use care services by sharing knowledge about what works.

We are a leading improvement support agency and an independent charity working with adults', families' and children's care and support services across the UK. We also work closely with related services such as health care and housing.

We improve the quality of care and support services for adults and children by:

- identifying and sharing knowledge about what works and what's new
- supporting people who plan, commission, deliver and use services to put that knowledge into practice
- informing, influencing and inspiring the direction of future practice and policy.

Completed in Great Britain in January 2020  
by the Social Care Institute for Excellence

© Diocese of Galloway

All rights reserved

Written by Jane Bee, Jane Scott with Sheila Fish

**Social Care Institute for Excellence**

Watson House  
54 Baker Street  
London W1U 7EX  
tel 020 7766 7400  
[www.scie.org.uk](http://www.scie.org.uk)



# Contents

<b>1</b>	<b>INTRODUCTION.....</b>	<b>1</b>
1.1	The audit.....	1
1.2	The Diocese .....	1
1.3	Structure of the report .....	2
<b>2</b>	<b>FINDINGS.....</b>	<b>3</b>
2.1	Safeguarding leadership and management.....	3
2.2	Diocesan Safeguarding Advisor .....	9
2.3	Diocesan Safeguarding Advisory Group (DSAG) .....	12
2.4	Diocese Risk Assessment Management team (DRAMT).....	15
2.5	Links with Scottish Catholic Safeguarding Service .....	18
2.6	Guidance, policies and procedures.....	19
2.7	Complaints and whistleblowing.....	20
2.8	Casework.....	21
2.9	Supporting survivors .....	24
2.10	Safe Recruitment of clergy, lay officers and volunteers .....	26
2.11	Training .....	28
2.12	How the Diocese provides safeguarding support to parishes .....	31
2.13	Quality assurance.....	32
2.14	Culture .....	34
<b>3</b>	<b>CONCLUSION .....</b>	<b>37</b>
<b>4</b>	<b>APPENDICES.....</b>	<b>38</b>
4.1	Diocesan timeline of responses from point of initial disclosure .....	38
4.2	Review process .....	39

# 1 INTRODUCTION

## 1.1 THE AUDIT

- 1.1.1 The Social Care Institute for Excellence (SCIE) has been commissioned in partnership with Children in Scotland to undertake an audit of the safeguarding arrangements of the Roman Catholic Diocese of Galloway. The Catholic Church in Scotland has commissioned two audits to be conducted with learning to be disseminated to the other six dioceses when they are completed.
- 1.1.2 The aim of the audit is to work with the Diocese to support safeguarding improvements by identifying how well safeguarding is working, identifying where there might be weaknesses and exploring the rationale for both strengths and weaknesses found.
- 1.1.3 The audit has used SCIE's established methodology *Learning Together* which has been used through a three-year programme of Church of England Diocesan Audits. While some of the areas to be explored differ slightly, the methodology remains the same. The audit was completed by Jane Bee and Jane Scott in February 2019 with quality assurance provided by SCIE through Sheila Fish, Senior Research Analyst.
- 1.1.4 The audit process involved examining various case material, a review of policies and procedures for safeguarding and conversations with key clergy and lay staff involved in safeguarding within the Diocese. This included six individual interviews and one focus group to which all parishes were invited and six attended (referred to collectively as the *participants group*). Details of the process are provided in the Appendix.
- 1.1.5 The auditors also met with a small number of survivors of clergy abuse, all of whom were already known to the Diocese. We also met with some family members, friends and supporters of some of the abuse survivors. Together they are referred to collectively as the survivors' group. All their views and experiences related to the Church's responses in the Paul Moore case.
- 1.1.6 The audit was designed to be proportionate. Auditors aimed to cover enough breadth and depth to gain an insight into safeguarding within the Diocese, recognising that within the timescales available that this was not wholly comprehensive. The fieldwork was carried out over three days on a single site visit. Visits to parishes were not carried out, however several parishes met with the auditors to discuss safeguarding arrangements.
- 1.1.7 There were no other known limitations to this audit.

## 1.2 THE DIOCESE

- 1.2.1 Galloway Diocese covers a large area of over 9,000km<sup>2</sup> in South West Scotland. The Diocese covers the council areas of Dumfries and Galloway, South Ayrshire, most of East Ayrshire and North Ayrshire. It comes within the

Ecclesiastical Province of St Andrews and Edinburgh. The Diocesan Catholic population of Galloway is approximately 43,000 (8.1 per cent of the total population as at 2016) spread across 47 parishes served by 18 priests within four deaneries.

1.2.2 The Archdiocese is led by Metropolitan Archbishop Leo Cushley (Edinburgh) and the Diocese of Galloway is led by Bishop William Nolan.

## 1.3 STRUCTURE OF THE REPORT

1.3.1 This report is divided into:

- Introduction
- The findings that the audit presented – by theme
- Questions for the Diocese to consider, listed where relevant at the end of each Finding.
- Conclusions of the auditors' findings: what is working well and areas where future development might be considered.
- An appendix sets out the audit process and any limitations to this audit.

1.3.2 Each substantive section begins with a generic introduction, this is followed by a description of what the auditors learnt about arrangements and practice in the Diocese, followed by their analysis of the strengths and systemic vulnerabilities identified. The description is value neutral. In the analysis the auditors make assessments of the safeguarding arrangements and practice they learnt about. SCIE methodology does not conclude findings with recommendations. Instead for each theme, the report provides the Diocese with questions to consider in relation to the findings. This approach is part of the SCIE *Learning Together* methodology and requires those with local knowledge and responsibility for progressing improvement work to have a key role in deciding what to do in order to address the findings and to be responsible for their decisions. This methodology also helps to encourage local ownership of the work required in order to improve safeguarding.

## 2 FINDINGS

### 2.1 SAFEGUARDING LEADERSHIP AND MANAGEMENT

2.1.1 Safeguarding Leadership within the Diocese falls ultimately to the Bishop of Galloway who is responsible for leadership on all aspects of life within the Diocese. However, safeguarding leadership takes various forms with different people and/or groups taking different roles. The key areas considered by the audit were on aspects of leadership including spiritual, strategic and operational leadership and how this was defined and understood. How these roles are understood, and how they fit together, can be determinative in how well led the safeguarding function is.

#### **Spiritual / Theological Leadership for safeguarding**

##### *Generic introduction*

2.1.2 It is for senior clergy to help parish priests, congregations and others around the Diocese to understand safeguarding as intrinsic to the Catholic faith and therefore a priority. This aspect of the leadership role is the foundation for the culture of the Church and is critical in terms of making it a safer place for children and vulnerable adults.

##### *Description*

- 2.1.3 The Bishop of Galloway is responsible for the spiritual leadership of the Diocese, which includes a responsibility for safeguarding. Participants described the Bishop as being visible across all local parishes. A consistent message was that the Bishop had worked hard to demonstrate leadership across the Diocese following a period of time where a previous Bishop had been unwell and unable to undertake regular visits. The Parish Focus Group was clear that the personal message issued from the Bishop about the importance of safeguarding ensured that this remained a priority for all.
- 2.1.4 When *In God's Image* was published, the Bishop sent a message to all parishes with the instruction that it was to be read at Mass and displayed within the Churches. Parishes reported that this had given prominence to the messages in the guidance and that safeguarding was more widely recognised as a key priority for the Diocese. This is now promulgated by Decree, which had increased its impact. The parishes commented on a sense of clear authority which was adhered to across parishes regarding safeguarding. Participants felt this was not as evident previously.
- 2.1.5 The Parish Focus Group reflected that while safeguarding has always been important, it had become a higher priority strategically within the Diocese during the past three years. This was partly attributed to wider societal changes and awareness of sexual abuse as well as increasing recognition of the impact on clergy, staff and parishes of cases reported in the media which involved the Catholic Church. The parishes also attributed the changes in emphasis on safeguarding to the leadership of the Bishop and the Diocesan Safeguarding Advisor (DSA), whom they found to be forward thinking and helpful.

- 2.1.6 The current Bishop had personally visited families within the Diocese as well as the children's youth groups and had traveled with pilgrims from the Diocese to Lourdes, providing a feeling of greater contact with people generally and support for their wellbeing.
- 2.1.7 The Bishop has offered to meet with known survivors of abuse by Paul Moore, as a means of demonstrating spiritual leadership on safeguarding and responding openly to survivors. Dealing with the legacy of this high-profile case is discussed further in 2.1.20.

### *Analysis*

- 2.1.8 The Bishop was more visible than the previous incumbent and had taken time to know the issues for deaneries, parishes and, at times, individual parishioners. The auditors see the Bishop as working hard to convey and model the importance of safeguarding by means of publicising guidance and satisfying himself that parishes are aware.
- 2.1.9 What does not yet appear sufficiently active is a leadership role in terms of looking at safeguarding through a theological lens, and overtly articulating safeguarding as an integral part of the Catholic mission. A public, proactive leadership role around the theological centrality of safeguarding needs to be seen in addition to the important work of highlighting the priority being given to safeguarding within the Diocese, and in addition to the strategic and operational work of implementing *In Gods Image*.

#### **Questions for the Diocese to consider**

- Is there more that the Bishop can do to share positive public messages around the integral place of safeguarding in Catholic theology and life?
- Are there ways to strengthen the focus on safeguarding specifically as part of the Bishop's contact with deaneries, parishes and congregations?

### **Strategic leadership for safeguarding**

#### *Generic introduction*

- 2.1.10 The chances of making progress on a safeguarding journey of improvement in a Diocese, increase greatly if there is a strategic plan for safeguarding. This would see a work plan for how the safeguarding service will be developed over time, and who will lead on what aspects of this. Setting out the goals of the service, and tracking progress against them, enhances accountability, helps cohere the various strands of safeguarding work into a whole, and assists the operational leadership (below) including identifying any barriers to development that need addressing.

#### *Description*

- 2.1.11 The Bishop considered that a key part of his strategic responsibility to safeguarding was to ensure that key staff have the skills and knowledge to enable safeguarding to run effectively. The Bishop also felt it important to ensure the visibility of the Bishop, input into the Diocese Safeguarding



Advisory Group (DSAG), and that messages regarding new legislation and guidance are clearly disseminated through diocesan office to all parishes. This was evidenced through the regular contact and communication between the Bishop and the Diocesan Safeguarding Advisor (DSA) although the DSA is not line managed directly by the Bishop.

### *Analysis*

2.1.12 In terms of strategic leadership of safeguarding, the auditors noted some of the right kind of activity on the part of the Bishop – as described above.

2.1.13 What seems missing is a strong sense of the strategic leadership. This would see for example the development of a strategic management group made up of the Bishop, Vicar General and Chancellor, with clear responsibility for the direction and oversight of safeguarding within the Diocese, supported by a mechanism for gaining professional safeguarding input.

#### **Questions for the Diocese to consider**

- Is there enough input to and oversight of safeguarding at strategic level, as critical context to the DSA role?
- What is required to create something akin to a functioning senior leadership team for safeguarding in the Diocese?

### **Operational leadership of safeguarding**

#### *Generic introduction*

2.1.14 Senior clergy leadership and management of the operational work of safeguarding is needed to provide oversight of safeguarding in the Diocese, including identifying any barriers to implementation that need tackling. It is also needed for accountability purposes, particularly when the safeguarding service is delivered primarily by people in volunteer roles. Operational leadership and management via clergy can be seen as providing a strong link to the strategic leadership of senior clergy and ultimately the Bishop.

#### *Description*

2.1.15 Within Galloway, responsibility for safeguarding is delegated to the Vicar General. The Vicar General exercises the Bishop's ordinary executive power over the Diocese and is the highest official within Galloway Diocese after the Bishop. As part of his role, the Vicar General is the operational lead within the Diocese for safeguarding as delegated to him by the Bishop. The Vicar General line manages and oversees the work of the DSA. He also advised that the National Catholic Safeguarding Office (Scotland) were particularly helpful in providing advice and support.

2.1.16 Both the Bishop and the Vicar General commented that the appointment of the current DSA in 2016 had allowed them to take a 'step back' from the hands-on work surrounding safeguarding and would appropriately seek advice from DSA about individual cases. Both commented that the current

DSA was exceptionally competent and had improved all aspects of safeguarding strategically and operationally through implementation of *In God's Image*.

### *Analysis*

2.1.17 The auditors are extremely positive about the work that the DSA has initiated and completed since coming into post – as described in later sections. The high respect in which the DSA's professional knowledge is held by the Bishop and Vicar General is positive and important to effective safeguarding. The auditors are however concerned that in stepping back from leadership of the hands-on safeguarding work, inadvertently operational leadership and oversight of safeguarding by the Bishop and Vicar General has also disappeared. A distinction between the operational delivery role and the leadership and management of that operational role has been lost. What seems to be missing is any leadership and oversight of that very critical work of the DSA. The evident competence and dedication of the current DSA have allowed this set up to work without problems. Systemically, however, a part-time volunteer needs to have strategic and operational leadership and oversight from the Diocese to create a safe system.

2.1.18 The auditors saw no examples of disagreement between the DSA and Vicar General, so no opportunity to test in practice who has ultimate responsibility for making safeguarding decisions around referrals to statutory agencies, or how potential conflicts of interest relating to allegations of church officers are handled in practice.

#### **Questions for the Diocese to consider**

- Is there enough input to and oversight of safeguarding at operational level, as critical context to the DSA role?
- Is there more that the Bishop and Vicar General could do to ensure that safeguarding is led by them alongside the DSA rather than only the DSA?
- Has any stress-testing of the current division of roles and responsibilities been conducted? Imagine a scenario where performance issues are emerging in delivery of the DSA function.

### **Dealing with the legacy of a high-profile conviction**

#### *Generic introduction*

2.1.19 Across all settings, dealing with the legacy of a high-profile case of abuse presents opportunities and challenges. Assuming leadership of a diocese with a high-profile case of clergy abuse is no different. A change of leadership creates the possibility to focus on restorative practice: to help all affected parties come to terms with the facts, the betrayal and the possibility of their own, albeit unwitting, part in allowing abusers to go unchecked; to identify and right any wrongs of the past, working closely and compassionately with survivors to hear and respond to what they need. Equally, it is not

straightforward, particularly when it is a longstanding and/or prominent member of diocesan clergy to whom others in the Diocese have been close for many years, when perceptions of survivors and others that past efforts to bring the abuse to light have not been responded to in an appropriate way. As all bishops know, their responses to these are key to setting the tone of their leadership and the tenor of the safeguarding culture they are trying to propagate.

### *Description*

- 2.1.20 The case of Paul Moore has been high profile and difficult for all involved. Amongst the Church communities, it had separated those who supported Paul Moore and disbelieved the allegations made against him with those who are extremely supportive of the survivors as those who brought the case to light. All those spoken to (aside from those he abused) were united in their shock regarding the allegations and later conviction of Paul Moore and felt communication surrounding this case between the Diocese and parishes and between the Diocese and survivors could have been better.
- 2.1.21 Following the conviction of Paul Moore, the Diocese made several attempts to reach out and contact parishes and individual survivors. A public apology was made through the media and a pastoral letter sent to all parishes outlining the Bishop's deep and sincere sorrow that a member of diocesan clergy had betrayed the trust placed in him. The Bishop continues to reinforce the need for healing through his pastoral engagement across parish communities. This was described to the auditors as a continuing priority.
- 2.1.22 The auditors saw evidence of the Bishop's willingness to be available to meet face-to-face and have ongoing engagement with survivors of Paul Moore. Direct contact has been possible with some survivors. Others had not wanted this or wished to retain their anonymity. For the latter, the auditors were informed that options for contact had been explored by the Diocese through legal representatives or Police Scotland acting as a conduit to ensure that, where possible, the apology of the Bishop and Church was offered.
- 2.1.23 A continued offer of support is being made to known survivors of Paul Moore's abuse. On this there was some positive feedback to the auditors. This was tempered by a strong view that waiting until the conviction for contact or apology was wrong and that survivors needed to have been believed at the time.
- 2.1.24 Despite the obvious positive efforts, from a discrete group of survivors, family members, friends and supporters of some of the abuse survivors, there remains staunch criticism of the Diocese in terms of how the Paul Moore case has been handled. There are three key points of contention. Within each issue there are aspects of the view held people in the survivors' group that the Diocese does not accept.
- A) The initial response 1996
- 2.1.25 There is a view within the survivors' group that the Diocese's failure

immediately to report to the police played a part in the significant time (over 20 years) that it took for Paul Moore to be prosecuted and convicted, and further that following the initial disclosure, the Diocese did not restrict Paul Moore's activities so as to minimise the risks he posed.

2.1.26 The Diocese does not accept this view. The Diocese acknowledges the inappropriate delay of seven months before it was reported to the statutory authority but stressed to the auditors that in 1996, following the initial disclosure, Paul Moore was removed from ministry, before being sent for treatment in Canada. After he returned and through all the years before his trial in 2018 he was never returned to ministry and was subject to serious restrictions which continued up to the point of conviction and custody.

B) The laicisation process

2.1.27 There is a view within the survivors' group that the laicisation of Paul Moore is not being enforced and this is evidenced in the fact that he has been asked to resign voluntarily, indicating a lack of commitment to his laicisation. This is reinforced by the fact that his name still appears in the directory of clergy despite his conviction.

2.1.28 The Diocese does not accept this view. In adherence to canonical procedure, the Diocese advises that the use of the voluntary route to laicisation does not reflect any lack of commitment or priority being given to this process. Instead, the rationale is that this is by far the quickest route to laicisation. It also gives the opportunity for Paul Moore in person to recognise publicly his own guilt which, to date he has not, rather than opting to fight the process all the way. So from this perspective, the diocesan position is that there is a positive side to the approach, including for survivors.

2.1.29 On the issue of Paul Moore's name remaining in the directory, the Diocese has explained that the directory production is contracted out with the Diocese, and there is no intentionality on the part of the Diocese to maintaining Paul Moore in the directory.

C) The treatment of clergy making allegations

2.1.30 There is a view within the survivor group that the member of clergy who first disclosed abuse by Paul Moore has been scapegoated for his role in bringing the abuse to light.

2.1.31 The Diocese does not accept this view and does not feel that this member of the clergy was treated differently because he had brought the abuse to light.

*Analysis*

2.1.32 The description above makes clear the ongoing priority that the Bishop continues to give to attempting to support healing within communities, in the wake of the conviction of Paul Moore in 2018 for non-recent cases of child abuse. This runs to ongoing, proactive and determined efforts to reach out to his abuse victims and survivors.

2.1.33 What is also clear is that there remains a discrete group of survivors, their friends, family and supporters who have lost trust in the Diocese in regard to

safeguarding, and who still hold serious concerns about due process in relation to the Paul Moore case.

2.1.34 This raises real challenges that it is vital for the Diocese to engage determinedly and constructively with, as the ongoing, contemporary legacy of the Paul Moore case: how to start to build relations with people who have lost trust in you and do not believe what you say. It indicates the pressing need for the Diocese to find ways of providing the right information to people in accessible ways, and of demonstrating transparency and accountability in all its work in dealing with the legacy of Paul Moore's case.

#### **Questions for the Diocese to consider**

- How does the Diocese plan to continue to provide self and wider parish reflection following the Paul Moore case?
- What will help the Diocese routinely think through how processes following a clergy conviction, such as laicisation, will be experienced and provide clear and accessible information about what is happening and why?
- How can the Diocese ensure that there is learning regarding the possibility of manipulation by those who may wish to abuse?
- What is the role of the Diocese in effecting change to the directory production process so that convicted clergy are removed, and later reinstated, if successful on appeal?
- What more can the Diocese do to help heal the damage caused to survivors and those in parishes following the Paul Moore case?
- How will independent scrutiny be made a part of routine quality assurance activity of the Diocese?
- How can reassurance be provided to parishioners and the wider public about the fair treatment of those who bring forward allegations of abuse?.

## **2.2 DIOCESAN SAFEGUARDING ADVISOR**

### *Generic introduction*

2.2.1 The Diocesan Safeguarding Advisor, along with the DSAG and DRAMT, are key to the infrastructure set out in *In God's Image*, to advise and assist the Bishop to fulfill safeguarding responsibilities. The role is summarised in the Glossary (p76) Structures and roles – Section 2 as follows:

*'The role of the DSA is to assist the Bishop with the development and management of Diocesan Safeguarding approaches. Has a central role in providing support and may also chair the DSAG meetings (and any subgroups thereof).'*

2.2.2 Elsewhere the guidance specifies that the DSA roles as to:

- coordinate efforts to raise awareness of safeguarding within parish communities, including the recruiting and training of parish safeguarding coordinators

- recruit diocesan safeguarding trainers and the training of diocesan clergy
- advise the Bishop on good practice in responding to allegations of abuse.

2.2.3 The DSA is described as providing a conduit between concerns/allegations and experts appointed to sit on the DRAMT, assess risk and make recommendations to the Bishop for how concerns or risks might be addressed.

2.2.4 Paragraph 4.6 of the Glossary Structures and Roles states that:

*'While investigation is not part of the role, Diocesan Safeguarding Advisors may agree to additional, mutually acceptable functions consistent with the position. Caution should, however, be exercised in extending the activities beyond what is reasonable and practical.'*

2.2.5 The guidance recommends that the role is undertaken by a layperson. It makes no specification about the professional expertise required.

### *Description*

#### **Resourcing and relative roles**

2.2.6 The Diocese Safeguarding Advisor (DSA) in the Diocese of Galloway has been in post for 2½ years. He is a part-time volunteer and does not have an agreed number of working hours for the role. There is no job description for the role of the DSA and instead the Diocese uses the generic role descriptors within *In God's Image* to reference the role of the DSA. These can be found under the Glossary (p76) Structures and roles – Section 2.

2.2.7 The DSA spends one day a week at the Diocesan Office and is provided with a diocesan laptop to support this work. In addition to this weekly commitment, the DSA covers: eight Deanery/Parish Safeguarding meetings per year; four Diocesan Safeguarding Advisory Group meetings; four Diocesan Safeguarding Advisers' meetings per year and a minimum of two Diocesan Risk Assessment Management Team meetings per year. He is available to meet with those raising concerns at any time should an allegation be made or a Registered Sex Offender (RSO) contract requirement arise.

2.2.8 The interviews and discussion group reflected that the DSA works well beyond what is expected in order to achieve the outcomes currently seen, for example: leaving a contact number when on holiday; sharing personal landline and mobile numbers with the diocesan office, parish priests and parish safeguarding coordinators should an urgent matter arise which requires advice and guidance; and when unavailable asking a DSA from another diocese to act as the contact point for parishes and the Bishop should a matter arise that requires an immediate response.

2.2.9 The DSA works alongside the Diocesan Chancellor, who is a paid employee of the Diocese, works 40 hours per week and is chief record keeper. The Diocesan Chancellor has been in post for 30 years. This role did not initially have a remit for safeguarding, but safeguarding became part of the role around 2000 due to an increase in Protection of Vulnerable Groups (PVGs) being required.

## **Resources**

2.2.10 As the DSA role is voluntary, the Diocese does not provide resources other than expenses, a laptop and office space.

## **Qualifications**

2.2.11 The DSA is a qualified social worker and has worked extensively in adult safeguarding.

## **Conflicts of interest**

2.2.12 There are no known conflicts of interest for the DSA in his role.

## **Line management and supervision arrangements**

2.2.13 Both the DSA and the Diocesan Chancellor are line managed by the Vicar General. No formal supervision is in place. The DSA can refer to the National Office should he require specific advice, guidance, information or to debrief.

## *Analysis*

2.2.14 The expertise of a social worker is an excellent fit for the role of DSA. This and the DSA's past experience in safeguarding has allowed him to look at systems and casework, offer an overview of safeguarding in the Diocese as a whole and implement new systems where there are gaps.

2.2.15 The team-working between the DSA and Diocesan Chancellor linking with the parishes and, in particular, with the Parish Safeguarding Coordinators (PSCs) and the trainers was clearly evident. There appeared good lines of communication, mutual respect and a sense of shared purpose.

2.2.16 The DSA's commitment is exemplary and his warmth, visibility and support across such a wide geographical area is evident from the Bishop and Vicar General, records, parish feedback, parish safeguarding coordinators, trainers and from those attending groups such as the Diocese Safeguarding Advisory Group (DSAG) and the Diocese Risk Assessment Management Team (DRAMT).

2.2.17 However, the role of the DSA is vastly expanded beyond the description of the role within *In God's Image*. The DSA is a part-time volunteer and the nature of the role raises serious questions about whether this is appropriate or sustainable. The role to date is akin to a consultancy role, focused on the set up of safeguarding, setting up developing and implementing policies and procedures, systems and processes. The DSA has dealt with the key priorities and is now developing operational and organisational protocols which, in time, should allow less engagement by the DSA as they embed. However, without a specific job description or formal line management, and the lack of strategic and operational support (as discussed in the leadership section), this does not represent clear commissioning on the part of the Diocese. It has also left governance and accountability extremely weak – which is not to discredit or question the professionalism and dedication of the DSA.

2.2.18 In the transition from set-up consultancy role to DSA business-as-usual, a more reliable set up will need to see:

- clarity of realistic and sustainable role and remit, including clear interfaces and fit with roles of DSAG, DRAMT
- arrangements for cover
- line management including personal objectives fitting with a broader diocesan strategic plan, and operational leadership support
- professional supervision with formal arrangements to link in to line management
- provision of business phone if one is not already provided.

2.2.19 This would create a more reliable set-up for the Diocese, and be less dependent on fortuitousness of recruiting someone with exemplary skills, knowledge, experience and personal attributes, availability and commitment, on a voluntary basis. As things stand, the auditors have serious concerns that the chances of safeguarding being maintained to such a high standard were the current DSA to cease volunteering, are not high.

#### **Questions for the Diocese to consider**

- Is it helpful to distinguish between set-up and business-as-usual role of the DSA?
- Is there as yet adequate clarity about the role and remit of the DSA, including clear links with the functions of the DSAG and DRAMT?
- Whose role should it be to draw up a job description and review the post, its remit and resourcing on an ongoing basis?
- Is serious consideration needed about the viability of the DSA role being fulfilled on a voluntary basis and whether the role should attract a salary?
- Linked to questions in sections on strategic and operational leadership, how can the DSA be better supported by the Bishop and Vicar General
- How can the Diocese provide appropriate and more formal professional supervision and line management for the DSA so that concerns can be addressed, CPD monitored and support provided?

## **2.3 DIOCESAN SAFEGUARDING ADVISORY GROUP (DSAG)**

### *Generic introduction*

2.3.1 In *In Gods Image*, the DSAG along with the DRAMT and the DSA is a core part of the safeguarding infrastructure, whose function it is to support the Bishop in his responsibilities for safeguarding.

2.3.2 Responsibilities are listed in *In God's Image* (para 6.1.3) as including:

- Advising the Bishop on Safeguarding matters within the Diocese
- Ensuring compliance with national safeguarding standards within all diocesan groups



- Responding to issues emerging from the safeguarding audit
- Organising training for parish clergy, safeguarding volunteers and parish safeguarding coordinators
- Liaising with the Scottish Catholic Safeguarding Service on national developments, resources, legislative change etc.

2.3.3 Drawing on our understanding of equivalent groups in the Catholic Church in England and the Church of England, we think it is helpful to try to clarify the different functions this list entails. If the DSA plays a vital operational role, the role of the DSAG can be seen as three-fold. Firstly, it is described as having an operational function around the organisation of PVG applications and monitoring of ongoing membership of the scheme across the dioceses (p12, para 6.4) and organising training for parish clergy, safeguarding volunteers and parish safeguarding coordinators (para 6.1.3).

2.3.4 Secondly, it should play an oversight, scrutiny and challenge role in order to ensure compliance with national safeguarding standards across the Diocese and discuss ongoing issues related to safeguarding arrangements in the Diocese:

*'8.3.1 In each Diocese, the Diocesan Safeguarding Advisory Group (DSAG) must meet at least four times per year to discuss ongoing issues relating to safeguarding arrangements in the Diocese. These discussions should consider compliance with safeguarding training and PVG checks across the Diocese. The Bishop must be kept informed of the outcomes of DSAG meetings.'*

2.3.5 Thirdly, it has something of a strategic leadership role, in the responsibilities for:

- responding to issues emerging from the safeguarding audit
- liaising with the Scottish Catholic Safeguarding Service on national developments, resources, legislative change etc.

2.3.6 Membership is prescribed as follows:

*6.1.3 Membership of DSAG must include the Diocesan Safeguarding Adviser and any key individuals charged with Diocesan Safeguarding responsibilities, as well as representatives of relevant Diocesan groups: Pilgrimage leaders, SPRED, Youth Office etc. The National Safeguarding Co-ordinator may be invited to these meetings to share information about national developments and to discuss resource needs and training development.*

#### *Description*

2.3.7 In line with *In God's Image*, the Diocese of Galloway has a Diocesan Safeguarding Advisory Group (DSAG) which is chaired by the Diocese Safeguarding Advisor (DSA). It is attended by the Bishop, Vicar General, National Safeguarding Coordinator and representatives of the deaneries and parishes, some of whom are also parish safeguarding coordinators or

diocesan safeguarding trainers. Representatives come from a wide range of professional backgrounds including clergy, health, and youth work and safeguarding.

- 2.3.8 While there are no written terms of reference for the group, its purpose is laid down in *In God's Image*.
- 2.3.9 Minutes from the DSAG were provided and showed a range of subjects discussed including safer recruitment, Protection of Vulnerable Groups (PVG), national updates, training updates and support for survivors. The Diocese has not completed a diocesan self-audit recently or undertaken any case reviews to report to the DSAG.
- 2.3.10 The auditors met with a member of the DSAG who advised that the national safeguarding coordinator attends most DSAG meetings, which are held quarterly, and provides a national update. The group then consider how national issues might affect Galloway. An example provided was that the uptake for the Raphael Counselling service provided to survivors is not high and DSAG is looking at how this service might be made more accessible. As a first step, the DSAG has developed a leaflet to be placed in libraries and leisure centres in the hope that this will reach survivors who no longer attend church. Auditors felt that this was proactive and a positive outcome of the group. The DSAG member also reported that the DSA is keen to have links with the four deaneries and had invited representatives from each onto the DSAG.
- 2.3.11 The DSAG has also discussed how parishes affected by the recent conviction of Paul Moore can best be supported. The DSAG member reflected on a sense of immense change of culture and that safeguarding is moving into a more structured and professional realm. All were becoming more aware and knew where to go with concerns, however, the Diocese still has pockets of volunteers who feel that 'this is the way it's always been done' and are resistant to change. An example being someone who has undertaken home visits for a number of years and now finds that they must undertake safeguarding training before being allowed to continue to do this.

### *Analysis*

- 2.3.12 In certain ways, auditors felt that the DSAG was a viable and effective group, meeting regularly and discussing some difficult issues. There is good representation from Parish, Deanery and Diocese which is effective in the communication of safeguarding information. It is being used to link Diocese, deaneries and parishes to good effect. This means people feel very connected and involved in safeguarding which is improving confidence and transparency.
- 2.3.13 The effectiveness of any group's functioning, with appropriate governance and accountability, can only be ascertained, and improved, against its claimed purpose. Therefore, the auditors hold that terms of reference for the DSAG are therefore essential.
- 2.3.14 The wide range and different kinds of function, with what we have described as incorporating operational, strategic and oversight roles, increases the value

that a written terms of reference would bring. It could also serve to distinguish different aspects of work conducted by the group, and different 'hats' assumed in different parts of meetings. Currently, the group seems to cover some of its designated roles and not others. What is more difficult to ascertain is whether this is by design, or by default. It would also help to clarify the extent to which the DSAG is accountable to the Bishop, for fulfilling its functions and therefore the role of the Bishop, if he attends meetings.

2.3.15 Further, as there is no independent representative on DSAG the actual and perceived scrutiny and challenge role could be usefully strengthened.

#### **Questions for the Diocese to consider**

- Whose role should it be to draw up the terms of reference of the DSAG tailored to Galloway but in line with *In God's Image*?
- Is there as yet adequate clarity about what the aspiration for the DSAG is, both what it is and what it isn't?
- Should the DSAG's function be strengthened to lead the strategic direction of safeguarding and, with that, be responsible for developing a strategic plan?
- What governance arrangements are needed?
- Is there an appetite for increasing the scrutiny and challenge role of the DSAG? Would this extend to having an independent representative as a member, perhaps Chair?
- How can the DSAG best hear the views of abuse victims and survivors and reflect abuse survivors' perspectives adequately in their work?

## **2.4 DIOCESE RISK ASSESSMENT MANAGEMENT TEAM (DRAMT)**

### *Generic introduction*

2.4.1 In *In Gods Image*, the DRAMT along with the DSAG and the DSA is a core part of the safeguarding infrastructure, whose function it is to support the Bishop in his responsibilities for safeguarding.

2.4.2 The DRAMT is described as follows:

*6.1.4 The main function of the DRAMT is to offer recommendations to the Bishop in relation to situations of risk, convictions on PVGs, allegations or cases in relation to anyone involved in the life and work of the Diocese who has contact with children and vulnerable adults. The DRAMT must comprise a small number of individuals with relevant expertise, including those with experience of working in the legal profession, healthcare, social work and the Police. Its composition should be balanced, in numbers of both ordained and lay members, and in their gender.*

*6.1.5 It is for each Bishop to decide if he wishes to preside at meetings of the DRAMT, or if he wishes to receive its*

*recommendations in writing. The group must discuss each case, agree the recommendations that it has made to the Bishop and record these in writing. It is the ultimate responsibility of the Bishop to decide the action he will take in each case. The Bishop must communicate his decision in writing to the individual concerned.*

*6.1.6 The DRAMT must meet as often as is required, as cases are brought to its attention.*

2.4.3 The guidance is very clear that a key part of the DSA's role is as a conduit for safeguarding concerns to the DRAMT. It is the DRAMT rather than the DSA that is ascribed responsibility for differentiating between concerns and allegations and deciding when referrals to statutory agencies need to be made:

*'Appropriate safeguarding training must ensure that everyone remains vigilant and is able to identify safeguarding concerns. These should be referred to the Diocesan Safeguarding Adviser so that the DRAMT can address how they might be addressed.*

*While it is important to differentiate between allegations and concerns<sup>28</sup>, both must be referred to the Diocesan Safeguarding Adviser. If concerns are shared sufficiently early, then it is possible that behaviours or attitudes can be addressed without significant harm developing. The DRAMT may advise that particular concerns need to be reported to statutory services who will consider whether to explore these. Once those concerns are explored further, there might well be evidence of harm. In that case, a concern may lead to an allegation.'*

#### *Description*

2.4.4 In the Diocese of Galloway, the DRAMT group has existed for around 20 years, however, for about 18 months in its present form. It was reorganised by the DSA to ensure its activities were in line with guidance and the group was effective in dealing with concerns.

2.4.5 Meetings are held when required and chaired by the DSA. The group is small, but members are selected for their expertise and include a retired police officer, a Sheriff, a social worker (who is also a Church of Scotland member), the DSA and the Vicar General.

2.4.6 There are no terms of reference for the group other than those cited in *In God's Image* guidance, which states that the DRAMT should include decisions such as:

- where, how and when a registered sex offender should worship
- recommendations to the Bishop regarding situations of risk
- convictions on PVGs
- allegations or cases in relation to anyone involved in the life and the work of the Diocese who has contact with children or vulnerable adults.

2.4.7 The DRAMT representative was not clear to whom that DRAMT reported but ultimately felt that this should be the Bishop. There have not been cases in the last 18 months requiring the DRAMT's involvement, which has made the process of risk assessment difficult to monitor.

#### *Analysis*

2.4.8 Along the same lines as the auditors' evaluation of the DSAG above, if the DRAMT is to be an effective, core part of the safeguarding infrastructure, it needs clear terms of reference that articulate its functions and how they relate to those of other roles and groups. Auditors felt that the remit of the DRAMT group was not completely clear to its members and as yet has had little input into diocesan decision-making. For a group with such a vital function, more urgency is needed to creating the DRAMT into a reliable mechanism for responding in a timely and effective way to situations of risk, convictions on PVGs, allegations or cases in relation to anyone involved in the life and work of the Diocese who has contact with children and vulnerable adults. This is also vital in order to make the role of the DSA viable over the longer term. Currently, the DSA appears in more of a senior and leadership role in connection with his work with the DRAMT, in contrast to requirements of *In Gods Image*, where the DSA services the functioning of the DRAMT.

2.4.9 Auditors were interested in how a DRAMT risk assessment for a Registered Sex Offender was completed, how this might be fed back to the Parish and how this would be managed if the Parish did not agree with the DRAMT assessment. Without cases going through the DRAMT, it is difficult to be clear on process or whether this would be effective and therefore assist in a safer culture. Similarly, without allegations or concerns or cases going to the DRAMT to make recommendations to the Bishop, the auditors had no evidence of the quality of decision-making, or governance and accountability. How is conflict to be handled whether between the DRAMT members and the DSA, or the DRAMT and the Bishop?

2.4.10 However, the group is in place, meets at least every four months and has good representation from relevant professional backgrounds. This is a good basis on which to build.

### Questions for the Diocese to consider

- Whose role should it be to draw up the terms of reference of the DRAMT tailored to Galloway but in line with *In God's Image*, including reporting structure (both up and down)?
- Is there adequate clarity about the interface and relationship expected between the DSA and the DRAMT?
- Could aspects of the English Local Authority Designated Officer (LADO) role be explored for possible incorporation into diocesan casework to assist in cases which do not meet the criminal threshold?
- Has there been planning for potential disagreement between the DRAMT and the Bishop? What is the justification for not delegating responsibility to the DRAMT for decision-making?
- How can the Diocese best keep the skills of each member of DRAMT up to date, particularly for those in the role having retired?
- How might the Diocese best prepare the DRAMT for live cases? Should the Diocese consider the use of case scenarios to run through the DRAMT process?
- What is the appropriate timescale for seeing an active, functioning DRAMT?

## 2.5 LINKS WITH SCOTTISH CATHOLIC SAFEGUARDING SERVICE

### *Generic introduction*

2.5.1 The role of the Scottish Catholic Safeguarding Service, led by the National Safeguarding Coordinator, is limited in *In Gods Image* to the provision of advice on good practice in safeguarding and provision of training materials, as well as being the point of contact for external bodies and agencies. It has no case work role ascribed to it for a diocese:

*'The NCSS offers support through the collation of PVG applications, the design and provision of training, the development of guidance and the facilitation of an annual audit to check compliance with national safeguarding standards. The National Safeguarding Coordinator is also expected to offer advice and counsel to safeguarding staff in dioceses and Religious Institutes as required by the Bishops' Conference of Scotland.'* (para 6.4.2)

2.5.2 It is not given any authority in terms of quality assurance or deemed a point of escalation if conflict or disagreement arises within or between dioceses.

### *Description*

2.5.3 The DSA and Vicar General both reported good links with the National Safeguarding Coordinator of the Bishops' Conference Scotland. Parishes and trainers also felt well versed with national issues because they are briefed either via an annual meeting for the trainers, or via DSAG which is attended

by the National Safeguarding Coordinator.

2.5.4 The DSA felt able to contact the National Coordinator for advice or assistance with any query coming into the diocesan office and he is well supported in this.

#### *Analysis*

2.5.5 The Diocese has good links with the National Safeguarding Coordinator and therefore is very aware of the direction of travel for national safeguarding in Scotland. This is evident from discussion with both the DSA and the parishes, members of DRAMT, trainers and the DSAG.

2.5.6 The audit suggested good links and use of the Scottish Catholic Safeguarding Service as currently exists. We think therefore that the Diocese can now usefully focus attention on whether the service that exists is the right service. Such decisions rest with the Bishops Conference of Scotland (BCOS), of which the Bishop of Galloway is a member.

#### **Questions for the Diocese to consider**

- How does the Diocese know if it is seeking advice and counsel appropriately?
- Are there any other functions currently missing in the Diocese that the Scottish Catholic Safeguarding Service might usefully provide e.g. professional supervision of DSA?
- Is the Diocese satisfied that the National Safeguarding Coordinator is adequately and appropriately supported and supervised in their role?

## **2.6 GUIDANCE, POLICIES AND PROCEDURES**

### *Generic introduction*

2.6.1 The Scottish Catholic Safeguarding Service provides support and advice to the Catholic Church including the Diocese of Galloway. The service is developing an online manual of procedures and policy/process exemplars, templates, forms and information sheets which are currently available on request by creating a login account.

### *Description*

2.6.2 The Diocese of Galloway has a website which includes information on safeguarding and events, support for survivors and a policy statement by the Bishops' Conference Scotland. However, the Diocese does not have policies and procedures for safeguarding which are separate to the standards set out in *In God's Image* supported by the additional elements in the resources section which they use in toto.

## Analysis

- 2.6.3 The standards within *In God's Image* are comprehensive and clear, however, some policies identified by *In God's Image* were not available or did not exist; for example, Standard 1.4 which talks about promoting the use of information technology by Church personnel and refers the reader to the Diocesan Policy or policies for promoting the safe use of CCTV and webcams on Church premises. *In God's Image* also refers to a Diocesan Social Media Policy which does exist but is dated 2013.
- 2.6.4 The auditors also identified some policies and procedures based on the guidance that would need to be personalised to the Diocese of Galloway, particularly in order to clarify processes for risk assessment and management of allegations.

### Questions for the Diocese to consider

- What role does the Diocese have, as a member of the Bishops' Conference of Scotland (BCOS), to influence the substance and timescales of the work of the national office, such as the online manual on which it depends for core building blocks of a reliable safeguarding service?
- What is the right priority for the creation of localised policies in the context of other demands related to implementing *In Gods Image*?
- Where does the responsibility lie for oversight of whether the Diocese has the mandatory policies in place as cited in *In God's image*?

## 2.7 COMPLAINTS AND WHISTLEBLOWING

### Generic introduction

- 2.7.1 A complaints process is required so that anyone who has contact with the Diocese about safeguarding knows how to complain should they feel they need to. A strong policy is clear about who complaints should be made to, and how they can be escalated if necessary. Positive features include an independent element, and clarity that raising a safeguarding concern, and making a complaint about a safeguarding service, are two distinct things. The outcome of complaints enables an organisation to learn from those who have had to use their service, enabling them to make any necessary changes or improvements.
- 2.7.2 For safeguarding in a diocese, it does not matter if the policy and process is part of a general complaints procedure as long as it's clear that you can make a complaint about the safeguarding response/service and that it makes clear this is different from sharing safeguarding concerns or allegations.

### Description

- 2.7.3 A search on 'complaints' or 'whistleblowing' in *In God's Image* however does not elicit any results. The index likewise, does not contain either term.



2.7.4 Galloway has no general policies outside *In God's Image* supported by the additional elements in the resources section, therefore the Diocese has no separate complaints or whistleblowing policy.

### *Analysis*

2.7.5 The good work in establishing processes and confidence in safeguarding in the Diocese will be strengthened by demonstrating a willingness to seek feedback both positive and negative, including complaints. It is a crucial aspect of demonstrating a commitment to responding appropriately to concerns and allegations, and being compassionate and just to abuse survivors.

#### **Questions for the Diocese to consider**

- Does the Diocese have a generic complaints and whistleblowing policy that can be used for complaints about safeguarding practice? If not, what help can the Diocese draw on both within the Catholic, ecumenical or secular communities, to develop and make readily accessible an appropriate and transparent policy and process?
- What are the best means of demonstrating that:
  - the Diocese encourages people to flag up if /where there are problems with the safeguarding service / responses through feedback, complaints and whistleblowing
  - a zero-tolerance policy of any penalisation of a person because they have shared concerns about how safeguarding issues have been handled in the Diocese?

## **2.8 CASEWORK**

### *Generic introduction*

2.8.1 In order to manage concerns well, and respond to allegations there must be a system in place which clearly defines escalation for seeking advice regarding concerns and reports of abuse. There should be effective and clear recording of issues and incidents which are kept securely and are compliant with General Data Protection Regulations (GDPR) 2018. Integral to managing concerns well is the requirement to work jointly with statutory agencies and to debrief and reflect on any areas of weakness in order to improve practice.

2.8.2 The auditors looked at a range of casework material that was identified by the Diocese as related to safeguarding. These included general enquiries dealt with by the DSA.

2.8.3 The auditors focused on recording systems, quality of response to allegations, information sharing, risk assessments and safeguarding agreements. For this section description and analysis are presented together for each sub-section.

## Recording systems

### *Description and analysis*

- 2.8.4 All files are in paper form and some were split into timescale for ease of reference. All were in chronological order but contained many of the same document and so were repetitive. The DSA advised that they had been quite poorly organised historically. The DSA is working through the files to ensure that they are complete and are in an order that makes sense.
- 2.8.5 The files are kept locked away in line with GDPR.
- 2.8.6 The auditors felt that they had received the widest possible range of information from the Diocese. However, the current paper file system is inadequate without the ability to track information over time and across different locations or cross-referring abusers and victims. There is no way of linking contacts, particularly for enquiries which may come back at a later date. The risks of a system that relies on the knowledge of staff to make connections on the basis of recall are clear.
- 2.8.7 This was identified, however, within the Diocese's self-assessment as needing to be addressed and steps had been taken to put this into action. The Diocese is introducing a new database to assist in the management of Safer Recruitment (see section 2.10 below) and it is hoped in the future to build on this for case management purposes.

#### **Questions for the Diocese to consider**

- What assistance can the Diocese draw on to identify a case management system to best suit their needs and possibilities of building this into the newly introduced database?
- Has the appropriate urgency been given to this task?
- Should the Diocese retrospectively add case summary sheets to historical files to assist with tracking and cross referring?

## Quality of response to concerns and allegations and information sharing

### *Description and analysis*

- 2.8.8 There was evidence of a better and more transparent approach to members of the community when allegations had been disclosed more recently. Responses from the Diocesan Office as seen in case files were timely and supportive. There were clear referrals to statutory agencies recorded in some circumstances and the cases showed that the DSA understands when this is required and understands the need to preserve evidence, while offering individuals appropriate further support.
- 2.8.9 It was of particular note that the tone of letters and emails over time has changed considerably for the better within the paperwork. Contact with those raising concerns is timelier, more positive with sensitive language and offers of assistance from the DSA are forthcoming and well accepted.

2.8.10 The auditors saw evidence of good multi-agency working. The DSA has, in some cases, arranged for a multi-agency meeting to look at risk involved with individuals which included police and children's social work. Social workers did not always attend meetings, but were always invited. There was evidence of a good working relationship between the DSA and the Police Public Protection Unit (PPU).

2.8.11 Auditors explored whether the DSA would also refer to adult mental health in appropriate cases. The DSA advised that this caused a dilemma because without the person's permission to do this, he would not be able to. He would always ask for permission though and support the individual in contacting mental health services.

2.8.12 The key omission in all of the case work viewed by the auditors, was any use of the DRAMT for decisions about the risk assessments and management of Registered Sex Offenders, and allegations or concerns or cases in relation to anyone involved in the life and the work of the Diocese who has contact with children or vulnerable adults, as required in *In God's Image* – see DRAMT section for further explanation. In a safeguarding system structured predominantly around volunteers and with no requirement for safeguarding expertise in the DSA role, clarity about how responsibilities across DSA and DRAMT members are shared, is an important element of building in sustainability.

#### **Questions for the Diocese to consider**

- Is the Diocese adequately assured that the DSA, a part-time volunteer, has had and continues to have adequate capacity to review all past enquires and casework to ascertain which cases/enquiries are satisfactorily concluded, and in which cases follow-up work still needs to be done? How might additional capacity best be arranged?
- Are plans for co-working between DSA and DRAMT appropriate? Are they being actively prepared and promoted in a timely fashion?

### **Risk assessments and safeguarding agreements**

#### *Description and analysis*

2.8.13 Safeguarding Agreements (also sometimes called Agreements Concerning Worship or Registered Sex Offender Contracts), are a key mechanism to support offenders who wish to attend church, to do so safely. They should be underpinned by a risk assessment that details the risks posed by a worshipper, the measures in place to manage those risks, and therefore the reasons for the Safeguarding Agreement. Having a clear rationale for any restrictions helps people enforce the agreements with the level of diligence appropriate. Clarity about the risks that a Safeguarding Agreement is intended to address, also allows for a robust reviewing process, which allows Safeguarding Agreements to be strengthened where needed, or indeed terminated if appropriate.

2.8.14 The auditors were not presented with any risk assessments or Safeguarding Agreements concerning worship. There have not been cases in the last 18 months requiring the DRAMT's involvement or risk assessment. We are not therefore able to comment on the quality.

#### **Questions for the Diocese to consider**

- Can the Diocese be satisfied currently that the right safeguards are in place for worshippers who pose a risk?
- Is a review needed of all Safeguarding Agreements/Contracts to ascertain which are linked to good quality and up-to-date risk assessments, and in which cases a new risk assessment needs to be undertaken? Should this be the responsibility of the DRAMT?
- Is there an effective system for monitoring and reviewing Safeguarding Agreements/Contracts, possibly as part of the wider case-management system?

## **2.9 SUPPORTING SURVIVORS**

2.9.1 The emotional impact when allegations are made was clear in the Diocese of Galloway. Greater acknowledgment by the Church of the impact of sexual abuse and damage to communities, public apologies to survivors and clearer assurances of a fair and transparent process in responding to allegations of abuse (for both those who disclose and against whom the allegation is made) will help progress the required healing process.

### *Generic introduction*

2.9.2 Standard 4 of *In God's Image* relates to providing care and support for survivors:

*'We provide a compassionate response to survivors of abuse when they disclose their experiences and we offer them support, advice, care and compassion.'*

An important part of the audit was to seek the views of survivors, as well as those working in the Diocese.

### *Description and analysis*

2.9.3 Input to the audit revealed a striking divide in thinking regarding views on the support for survivors between non-recent and potential future allegations.

2.9.4 Parishes, trainers, DSAG, DRAMT, DSA, the Bishop and the Vicar General are all clear that survivors will be listened to and the response will be in line with the McLelland report and *In God's Image*. The Parish Focus Group was clear that things have changed, procedures are clear if there is an allegation or disclosure of abuse and that there is no longer a desire to protect the Catholic Church at the expense of individuals.

2.9.5 The DSA was also very clear in how the processes reflect the priority that survivors come first and that support would be offered immediately and counselling arranged, if required. The Bishop also told auditors that the Church is keen to support those who have been victims of abuse and that the Diocese would do so in line with *In Gods Image*.

2.9.6 As noted in the section on DSAG above, the DSAG and the parishes recognise that the take-up of the Raphael Counselling service is low. The DSAG is looking at how this service might be made more accessible. As a first step, the DSAG has developed a leaflet to be placed in libraries and leisure centres in the hope that this will reach survivors who no longer attend Church. It has also tried to understand other obstacles. One possible block to receiving the offered Health in Mind counselling identified was that, in some cases, the Diocese requests permission from the victim to approach the group or order in which the victim's abuser was linked or based for funding. This has caused distress to some victims who then refused counselling.

2.9.7 In contrast to any positive and confident view of what would happen, there were the perspectives of some abuse survivors as previously highlighted in the leadership section on dealing with the legacy of a high-profile conviction. All of these points are important for any future disclosures suggesting the need for more transparency about:

- the facts of the diocesan response in relation to the Paul Moore case including commitment to laicisation
- the commitment to providing support to survivors regardless of the existence or outcome of legal processes
- the need for public acknowledgement and thanks to victims of abuse for the valuable service they provide when they come forward and allow abusers and their abuse to be brought to light.

2.9.8 Several ideas for how survivors should be treated in the future were put forward and include:

- putting victims first
- using processes that are orientated to the victim and not the Church system
- to support victims from the very beginning and keep this support separate from any process of litigation
- to guarantee anonymity for the victim
- not to push the victim towards a solicitor for support
- to do everything possible to provide 'closure' for the victim
- to make counselling available without having to go to the Church for it
- not to use the term 'historical abuse'. For the victims it is not historic, it is current and valid. For this reason, statutory agencies now use the term 'non-recent' abuse
- be clear that friends within the Church cannot be supported and that the victim comes first

- train priests in supporting those who have suffered trauma
- keep everything transparent
- work to remove the idea that the biggest sin in the Catholic Church is to cause a scandal and recognise that victims are preventing further abuse by coming forward.

#### **Questions for the Diocese to consider**

- How can the Diocese better implement the counselling service without adding further trauma re links with the Church for the survivor?
- Would an independent advocacy model to support individuals' aid understanding on both sides, allow for expertise and provide a resource which gives a consistent response in cases of abuse?
- How can the Church better support survivors so that they feel able to come forward at the earliest possible time?
- How can the Diocese work with survivors to refine understanding about how certain processes will be experienced by survivors, their friends and family? E.g. voluntary laicisation, names of convicted abusers remaining in the directory during appeal processes?
- Is there parity between the support provided to the survivor and the support provided to the accused clergy? If not, how can this best be implemented?

## **2.10 SAFE RECRUITMENT OF CLERGY, LAY OFFICERS AND VOLUNTEERS**

### *Generic introduction*

2.10.1 The mandatory Safe Recruitment process in the Catholic Church in Scotland is central to ensuring that everyone, including volunteers, is safe to work with children and vulnerable adults. *In God's Image* specifies the DSAG as having an operational function around the organisation of PVG applications and monitoring of ongoing membership of the scheme across the dioceses.

### *Description*

2.10.2 Safe Recruitment within the Diocese is managed by the Diocesan Chancellor. The process is in place to ensure that those working or volunteering with children are fit and proper to do so, have two referees willing to support their character and experience, have no criminal convictions relating to children and have completed the necessary safeguarding training.

2.10.3 All staff and volunteers complete an application form which is provided to the Diocesan Chancellor or the parish safeguarding coordinators. Details from the application forms are recorded on the diocesan database. Once selected for the post, references are sought from two referees which are checked, details recorded, and the database updated. At the same time, a Protection of Vulnerable Groups (PVG) application is made to check criminal history and the individual is asked to complete a self-disclosure form.

- 2.10.4 The Diocesan Chancellor receives this information and, once in place, the individual is invited to attend training at level 1. Only when these elements have been received and the training is complete, is the individual provided with a written confirmation from the DSA advising that they have been approved to start in their role.
- 2.10.5 The Diocesan Chancellor was able to provide details of application forms, reference forms and self-declaration forms used as part of this process.
- 2.10.6 The Diocesan Chancellor, over time, has built up a word-based database of her work on recruitment and PVGs (see paragraph 2.3 above). However, this could not be interrogated easily. In preparation for the audit, the Diocese of Galloway asked its IT lead to use the existing database to make an improved version which could provide a better basis for information storage and from which they could extract data, cross cut in various ways. Having developed a database in Access that works for the Diocese, the Bishops' Conference has now asked that it be rolled out across all dioceses in Scotland. The auditors also saw the new database in which the details of the completed process are recorded.
- 2.10.7 The Diocesan Chancellor observed that it is difficult to determine whether all volunteers within each parish have completed the Safe Recruitment process prior to volunteering or starting in their intended role. To reassure themselves, the DSA attends regular parish safeguarding meetings across the Diocese and reminds parish priests of the requirement for Safe Recruitment and that this is a requirement within *In God's Image*.

### *Analysis*

- 2.10.8 The auditors were impressed with how the policies for Safe Recruitment are being applied in practice within the Diocese of Galloway. The recording of Safe Recruitment is comprehensive and the database itself is intuitive to use providing several reports to support the work of the Chancellor and the Diocese. Approval letters remain pending for those who have not provided any one component of the Safe Recruitment process including completion of training.
- 2.10.9 The auditors were impressed with the new database and the benefits it will have when fully implemented. The Diocesan Chancellor advised that it would be of great assistance to record keeping in the types of data searches it will be able to perform and standard reports available.
- 2.10.10 The auditors had no concerns about the management of the Safe Recruitment process. What was less clear was the extent to which the PVG or any aspect was seen as part of the work of the DSAG, as per *In God's Image*.
- 2.10.11 There also remains a concern that some volunteers, who started in their post prior to training becoming mandatory, had still not completed Level 1 training. This is addressed in section 2.11 on training below.

2.10.12 Attention is now needed on the process when a blemished PVG is returned and the interface with the DRAMT. How exactly will it work when disclosed convictions are returned and need to be referred to the DRAMT for decision-making? As discussed in the section on DRAMT, the auditors were informed that in the past 18 months there has not yet been a case to test this process.

2.10.13 The auditors did not have the opportunity to see evidence of Safer Recruitment for visiting priests either a 'celebret' letter and, when needed, additional PVG application (see 2.5 of *In God's Image*). The auditors have no concerns about the understanding of requirements. A reliable Safer Recruitment system anywhere needs to see them routinely put into practice, so adequate assurance here is important.

2.10.14 More attention is needed to link the work of the DSAG, Diocese, deaneries and parishes, and support the flow of information (as discussed in the DSAG section). This will aid the building of transparency and confidence and provide a conducive context for the prioritisation, across the board, of compliance with Safer Recruitment requirements.

#### **Questions for the Diocese to consider**

- Is greater clarity needed about the link/role of the DSAG in the operation and oversight of Safer Recruitment?
- Does the interface of Safer Recruitment and the DRAMT need clarifying for both parties?
- Should the Diocese look to support parishes in Safer Recruitment by setting a deadline by which all volunteers already in post should have completed their training?
- To future-proof arrangements, is there clarity about whether there are to be any consequences imposed by clergy leadership, where parishes are found to be consistently not implementing Safer Recruitment processes? Is there any need for further assurance that Safer Recruitment practices for visiting priests are being reliably operationalised across the Diocese?



## TRAINING

### *Generic introduction*

- 2.10.15 Safeguarding training is important within the Diocese in order to establish a baseline of safeguarding awareness; signs and symptoms, reporting etc. and to instill confidence in recognising and passing on safeguarding issues in those working and volunteering in the Diocese.
- 2.10.16 Prior to the introduction of *In God's Image*, training was not mandatory before volunteering or taking up a role within the parish. *In God's Image* has clarified the importance of training. The DSAG is ascribed the key role of organising training for parish clergy, safeguarding volunteers and parish safeguarding coordinators (para 6.1.3)

### *Description*

- 2.10.17 The Diocesan Chancellor holds records of all training delivered within the Diocese. Until 2017, there was only one trainer within the Diocese, however, there are now 12 volunteer trainers delivering training across all parishes. The trainers come together annually and are updated on national developments by the DSA, which assists them in keeping their skills and knowledge up to date.
- 2.10.18 There are currently 700 volunteers working across the Diocese. The Diocesan Chancellor holds records for all new volunteers' training and while clear that the training is mandatory, was aware of approximately 100 volunteers who had started their roles and had not yet completed the training. Trainers are targeting these volunteers first to ensure compliance. Both trainers and the Diocesan Chancellor understood that should these volunteers not undertake training, they would be asked to step down, but there is no formal timescale for this.
- 2.10.19 All parish priests receive Level 1 safeguarding training. The Vicar General attends this training as part of ensuring consistency and quality. The current training provided is at Level 1 (basic safeguarding training), but there are plans for the Diocese to begin the roll-out of Level 2 later this year. The trainers will be first to undertake Level 2 training which will then be rolled out to specific groups which have not yet been identified.
- 2.10.20 Trainers advised that the training material created by the National Safeguarding Office is much improved and provides case scenarios regarding allegations, disclosures and other 'real life' issues which is creating good detailed discussion in training. Both the Bishop and the Parish Focus Group spoke of a significant culture change in attitudes towards abuse, which the training has assisted with. It was recognised, however, that more is needed specifically to address the impact of trauma of individuals and parishes where abuse has taken place.

## Analysis

- 2.10.21 The Diocese, trainers and the parishes were clear that volunteers are not now allowed to start in post without training. Training records are available and information can be easily extracted. The records show those who have undertaken training, the date, their role and who trained them. It is therefore possible to see who has not yet undertaken training and who is already in post. These are the volunteers being targeted by trainers. The new database will be able to track volunteers yet to undertake training and volunteers whose training requires updating.
- 2.10.22 The auditors were impressed with training records but felt that these could be strengthened further by identifying a date by which all volunteers in post, who have not undertaken the required training, will be asked to step down. There is a danger that this will drift if a date is not identified.
- 2.10.23 Achievements to date will be further strengthened if, in preparations for Level 2 safeguarding training, the Diocese could comprise a strategic training plan, that identifies priority groups for training, details the training needs of people in different roles, and an implementation plan for rolling the training out over time, including refresher and update sessions.
- 2.10.24 The DSA spoke of the positive team work between himself, the Diocesan Chancellor, Trainers, DRAMT and DSAG and commented that information is better disseminated via improved training leading to greater confidence in safeguarding. The auditors also observed this teamwork with regards to training. This could be further strengthened with, for example, annual training sessions for clergy, parish safeguarding representatives and church volunteers.
- 2.10.25 Future training needs were explored through all interviews and discussions and a clear need identified was working with trauma. Individuals commented on positive changes for the future, but all felt that parish priests needed more support and training to assist helping those who have already suffered trauma.
- 2.10.26 Lastly, further clarity is needed about the extent to which organising training is seen as part of the work of the DSAG, as per *In God's Image*.

### Questions for the Diocese to consider

- Are there any barriers to setting a date by which all current volunteers in post without training step down from their role? How is it best to disseminate and enforce this?
- To future-proof arrangements, is there clarity about how any potential reluctance and/or refusal on the part of clergy to safeguarding training is to be handled, and does it give the right message about the centrality of safeguarding?
- Where does responsibility for requiring and overseeing a strategic training

plan lie? Is adequate priority being given to the role out of Level 2 training to those who are in posts with the most contact with children and vulnerable adults? Can there be greater clarity about relative roles of different players at different times to avoid the DSA inadvertently playing all parts?

- How is the Diocese going to support parish priests working with trauma in individuals and parishes, which is beyond the current remit of the safeguarding training?
- Is greater clarity needed about the link/role of the DSAG in the operation and oversight of training?

## **2.11 HOW THE DIOCESE PROVIDES SAFEGUARDING SUPPORT TO PARISHES**

### *Generic introduction*

2.11.1 In a centralised diocesan structure of safeguarding, support from the Diocese to parishes is key to safe and reliable safeguarding. Diocesan safeguarding is, in significant ways, only as good as its weakest parish.

### *Description*

2.11.2 As well as individualised on-call support from the DSA, there are two key meetings through which parishes are provided safeguarding support. First, the DSAG. There is a better communication from the national office of Scottish Catholic Safeguarding Service (SCSS) to local parishes through the Diocese Safeguarding Advisory Group (DSAG). In addition to the Bishop, Vicar General and DSA, each of the four deaneries in the Diocese of Galloway are represented and the National Safeguarding Advisor also attends. Four meetings per year are held to discuss how the strategic objectives for safeguarding are translated into practice locally and the plan is to feedback information from the annual audits. The Bishop and Vicar General provide the links between the clergy and laity.

2.11.3 Secondly, each deanery meets regularly – usually four times per year – to which all parish safeguarding coordinators (PSC) are invited. The DSA attends and this allows a forum for PSCs to share and discuss concerns. Auditors were advised by deanery representatives that these meetings had also become more purposeful and there was a greater sense of trust amongst members allowing for more meaningful discussions in relation to safeguarding.

2.11.4 In addition to this the PSCs were also required to attend training on an annual basis.

2.11.5 A third development had been to increase the extent and approaches to communication with all parishes. The number of trainers has increased from one to 12 in recent years and issues arising in training are now fed back more widely through notes from the Diocese. There are news articles in the quarterly *Diocese Parish Newsletter* and the annual statement by the parish

priest or PSC to highlight the work being done and to alert the community to the need for continuing watchfulness is being increased to twice a year. The DSA produces a framework that can help local PSCs pull together their script which provides some consistency, but allows local parishes to own the messages. More often it is the PSC delivering the messages at Mass rather than the parish priest which the focus group thought was an illustration of how the wider responsibility for safeguarding is being understood.

### *Analysis*

2.11.6 As noted in the DSA section, the team-working between the DSA and Diocesan Chancellor linking with the parishes and, in particular, with the PSCs and the trainers was clearly evident. There appeared good lines of communication, mutual respect and a sense of shared purpose.

2.11.7 The DSA's commitment is exemplary and his warmth, visibility and support across such a wide geographical area is evident from all sources, including parish feedback, PSCs, and from those attending groups such as the Diocese Safeguarding Advisory Group (DSAG).

2.11.8 The range of meetings and communications with parishes is very positive and illustrates a proactive and planned approach. Recent changes such as to the structure and meetings of the DSAG have brought a clarity to its purpose. This has improved its effectiveness as a mechanism for providing safeguarding support to parishes.

#### **Questions for the Diocese to consider**

- No questions raised.

## **2.12 QUALITY ASSURANCE**

### *Generic introduction*

2.12.1 A safe organisation needs constant feedback loops about what is going well and where there are difficulties in relation to safeguarding, and this should drive ongoing cycles of learning and improvement. Robust quality assurance enables an organisation to understand its strengths and weaknesses. Potential sources of data are numerous, including independent scrutiny. Quality assurance needs to be strategic and systematic to support accountability and shed light on how well things are working and where there are gaps or concerns.

2.12.2 Standard 8 of *In God's Image* sets out an expectation that each diocese will oversee effective planning processes to monitor, review, self-evaluate and report on local safeguarding practices. Compliance with these safeguarding standards is to be monitored externally by the Independent Review Group (IRG). In particular, there are expectations that:

- parishes monitor and review their safeguarding arrangements and to self-evaluate their safeguarding practice by completing an annual audit and devise a safeguarding action plan

- dioceses regularly monitor and review their safeguarding arrangements and to self-evaluate their safeguarding practice by completing an annual audit and devising a safeguarding action plan.

### *Description*

- 2.12.3 It was clear from the participants group that there has been considerable activity to improve both the processes to monitor safeguarding in parishes and the information requested and shared about how this is being done.
- 2.12.4 A recent development has been the changes to the self-evaluation audit process for parishes. The audit requirements have changed and are now asking for both qualitative and quantitative data. The audit still asks for information on numbers of volunteers PVG checked and trained, but also for information about how parishes are working with local groups to ensure each adheres to parish safeguarding policies.
- 2.12.5 A further change to the audit is that it asks for greater reflection on how parishes can evidence improvements in areas, for example, training and quality assurance. Following this, each parish now has to produce a parish safeguarding plan based on the self-assessment which reflects the audit. The Parish Focus Group fed back that in some parishes this had led to useful discussions about how to evidence change and to reflect on the impact of change.
- 2.12.6 Despite proactive encouragement to local parishes, a few failed to return the self-evaluation audit in 2018. It was hoped that the changes to the information asked for by the audit in 2018 would be viewed as more meaningful for local parishes and encourage better responses. The DSA also reported that he would actively visit each parish that did not complete the audit and also feed any themes from the audits back to parishes through the DSAG. The DSA hoped that these approaches would ensure better compliance and recognition of the audit's usefulness.
- 2.12.7 The DSA recognised that more information from the parishes was required to ensure a meaningful diocesan audit response. The Diocese has not completed an audit of its own routinely.

### *Analysis*

- 2.12.8 To date quality assurance processes have focused on the parish and diocesan audits. Efforts to make the parish audit meaningful for all concerned, and as such, part of driving cultural change, is positive. Bringing in independence through this audit is a positive development. Formalising how the returns are analysed and fed into strategic plans at diocesan level, is also needed so as to feed cycles of learning and improvement and allow benefits to be demonstrated.
- 2.12.9 The auditors would like to see quality assurance now progress and set up mechanisms to include a wider range of feedback data, including:

- professional supervision of the DSA (see DSA section)
- scrutiny by the DSAG (see DSAG section)
- external scrutiny of case work
- routine benchmarking the diocese against other dioceses within and out with Scotland
- identifying lessons learnt from other dioceses and feeding these into planning the work of the Diocese
- abuse survivor 'customer' feedback
- routine PSC 'customer' feedback
- complaints procedure about the safeguarding service (see Complaints section)

#### **Questions for the Diocese to consider**

- Is there appetite for developing a broader quality assurance framework for the Diocese?
- Where might the Diocese usefully turn for support and about standards and options for quality assurance?
- Who could support with routine feedback from survivors?
- How will external scrutiny be made a part of routine quality assurance activity of the Diocese?
- See questions related to leadership and strategic plans, DSA and the DSAG
- Is there more the National Scottish Safeguarding Service could do to support analysis of parish and diocesan audit data, including trends over time?

## **2.13 CULTURE**

### *Generic introduction*

2.13.1 The most critical aspect of safeguarding relates to the culture within any organisation. In a diocesan context, that can mean, for example, the extent to which priority is placed on safeguarding individuals as opposed to the reputation of the Church, or the ability of all members of the Church to think the unthinkable about friends and colleagues. Any diocese should strive for an open, learning culture where safeguarding is 'everybody's business' and a shared responsibility, albeit supported by experts, and which encourages people to highlight any concerns about how things are working in order that they can be addressed.

2.13.2 An open learning culture starts from the assumption that maintaining adequate vigilance is difficult and proactively seeks feedback on how safeguarding is operating and encourages people to highlight any concerns about how things are working in order that they can be addressed.

### *Description*

2.13.3 Auditors heard from the Parish Focus Group about the shock experienced by the allegations and convictions of sexual abuse across the Catholic Church

and recently within the Diocese of Galloway. The group reported frustrations with media headlines which had criticised the Church and not acknowledged recent developments. It advised that previously the Church had not responded robustly to allegations of child abuse and had not shown enough care and compassion to survivors. Moving forward, however, the focus group was sure there would be a different response to an allegation made now. It reported a significant change in thinking and that the alleged perpetrator of abuse would no longer be protected. The group suggested: *'gone are the days when people said: "we can't report the priest"'*.

- 2.13.4 All were clear on the procedures within *In God's Image* for safeguarding and welcomed the clarity of 'Listen, Respond, Repeat, Refer' which was thought to be a simple statement for everyone to remember. The Parish Focus Group advised that the Church should immediately pass on any concerns to the police and children's social work for safeguarding decisions to be made.
- 2.13.5 The visibility of the DSA around the parishes has assisted with a consistent message and the Parish Focus Group felt this was filtering down to those 'in the pews', helped also by the roll-out of training to all volunteers. It reported that while safeguarding was discussed more in parishes, change was a culmination of the preceding 20 years.
- 2.13.6 Similarly, the Vicar General was also confident that if an individual disclosed abuse to their parish priests, the priests would know to refer the individual to the DSA without delay. The Bishop, Vicar General, DSAG and the Parish Focus Group all spoke of a significant culture change in attitudes towards abuse.
- 2.13.7 It is not unexpected that survivors were sceptical about changes more broadly, but were cautiously optimistic about changes being made locally within parishes due to training and reporting procedures brought in by the DSA. Nonetheless, there remained perceptions that friendships made and strengthened over years among the clergy will continue to create challenges for those who speak out, and in the promptness of responses. In contrast, however, the Parish Focus Group was very clear that the response to allegations today is about protecting and supporting the victim, not the organisation.

### *Analysis*

- 2.13.8 There is clear commitment from across the individuals who spoke with the auditors to safeguarding. PSCs, trainers and others involved in this work reported an improved clarity about roles, and importantly, the limitations. There was a notable sense of team-working, good lines of communication, mutual respect and a sense of shared purpose. This had helped increase confidence in taking action in relation to safeguarding, and there was strong support that the process of change was gaining momentum locally.
- 2.13.9 Auditors were struck by the confidence and understanding of parish representatives and their enthusiasm for safeguarding. Auditors felt that parish representatives were passionate and clear in their view that there has

been an enormous shift in understanding of safeguarding and the role of the Church. They understood the main forms of abuse due to much improved safeguarding training, could identify the groups which *In God's Image* intends to protect and were very clear in their understanding of where to go with concerns received.

2.13.10 All this does seem to be fostering a culture in which 'the way we do things round here' takes the need for safeguarding as a given and takes the responsibility to be prepared and ready to play your part in safeguarding, seriously. A number of challenges emerge:

- How to sustain this momentum of cultural change in the longer term, when in common with any locality, concerns or allegations of abuse are, as far as any individual is concerned, an extremely rare thing? (see Munro & Fish 2015: Hear no evil, see no evil: Understanding failure to identify and report child sexual abuse in institutional contexts. Australian Royal Commission report).
- How to be more inclusive and enable survivors themselves, the opportunity to be part of efforts to cultivate a safe culture throughout the Diocese.

2.13.11 While improvements in the processes are clear, the Diocese is at an early stage of assessing the effectiveness of the process, and understanding the impact of change identified through *In God's Image* in parishes and the Diocese. There has not been another allegation against clergy to test the response. The new requirement within the parish audit to gather both quantitative and qualitative information was welcomed and should help inform the next steps for the Diocese.

#### **Questions for the Diocese to consider**

- How can the Diocese help sustain the process of changes and the improvements to parish and diocesan processes?
- How best to welcome dissenting voices and use the challenge provided constructively?
- What are the options for inviting abuse survivors to support the development of safeguarding in the Diocese?



## 3 CONCLUSION

- 3.1.1 The work of the Diocese Safeguarding Advisor in conjunction with the publication of *In God's Image* appears to have been a turning point in the Diocese. Improvements in relation to safeguarding include clearer and more transparent structures and processes, good working relationships with external agencies, new training, better record keeping and better links between the Diocese, deaneries and the parishes. The DSA has been forward thinking and stoic in his desire to raise standards and has taken people with him and helped in their understanding. These improvements and the work of the DSA need to be owned by the Diocese to ensure that the changes continue to be embedded, and that safeguarding remains a priority for the Diocese. This can include supervision for the DSA, a job description, agreed hours and continuity planning and for greater clarity of the individual role and contribution of the senior management team.
- 3.1.2 Those parishioners who have volunteered for DRAMT, for DSAG, to be trainers and to assist in the parishes in various roles are to be strongly commended for their very positive input and the importance they give to safeguarding. The Diocese relies heavily on volunteers and this means that processes such as Safe Recruitment, PVGs and safeguarding training take on a new importance. This has been embraced and is already in place.
- 3.1.3 The case of Paul Moore was mentioned by everyone who participated which illustrates the divisions and strong emotions within the Diocese for the clergy, communities and, most importantly, those he abused. Open reflection by many participants was that previous responses by the Church had not been professional or positive compounded by weak leadership and poor contact with survivors. Scepticism from some and strong feelings remain, and this needs to be acknowledged to allow a genuine process of healing. This brings with it a need to tackle the contradictory narratives regarding this case and the handling of it by the Diocese which continue to challenge and act as a barrier to healing. It is positive that the Diocese has begun to work with survivor organisations as this creates an opportunity for real change and for abuse to be managed differently. Working in partnership with survivors and survivor organisations to improve outcomes should be something that the Diocese continues, in order to help address the findings in this report.
- 3.1.4 A focus is now needed on sustaining current improvements through strengthened strategic and operational leadership for safeguarding. The knowledge and understanding of good safeguarding systems and process is growing and owned more widely across parishes. This needs the continuing support of senior leadership to build on the momentum of change.

## 4 APPENDICES

### 4.1 DIOCESAN TIMELINE OF RESPONSES FROM POINT OF INITIAL DISCLOSURE

- 22 April 1996 PM meets with his Bishop
- PM continues in his parish whilst arrangements for his admission to Southdown treatment Centre Ontario Canada are established
- The record does not indicate whether there were any limitations placed on PM's pastoral activities during this period or the date he left the parish.
- 21 June 1996 PM admitted to Southdown treatment Centre Ontario Canada
- Bishop seeks advice from both within the Catholic Church and from the Diocese's legal representatives on the action he should take in relation to the disclosure. The Bishop received conflicting advice on action he should pursue.
- 06 November 1996 Bishop, along with his Diocesan Safeguarding Adviser meet with Procurator Fiscal to alert disclosure
- 03 January 1997 PM returned to Galloway Diocese, Scotland.
- January 1997 (exact date not shown on the record) PM interviewed by police Scotland
- 12 February 1997 PM moves to Fort Augustus Abbey, Aberdeenshire, Scotland the record does not indicate his status or what restrictions were in place at the Abbey other than he was resident in the setting
- PM continues in Fort Augustus Abbey until the end of 1998 when the Abbey closes
- PM's residence moves to St Mary's presbytery Saltcoats Ayrshire. He has no pastoral responsibility.
- 01 April 1999 the Procurator Fiscal's office alert PM's solicitor that it was not intended to commence proceedings against PM but that the Crown was not abandoning its right to take proceedings should circumstances dictate.
- 05 May 1999 the Bishop alerts PM that he will not return to pastoral ministry
- July 1999 PM moves to the Benedictine Convent, Largs before transferring to a community address in Woodcroft Ave, Largs where he resided until his conviction and sentence
- PM has never returned to pastoral/public ministry since and has been subject to restrictions as part of the ongoing risk management protocols. The record does not show when said restrictions were initially imposed, however from the most recent copy of the Covenant of Care dated 2015, which details imposition of, and management of, restrictions in relation to regulated work, it would appear that this was most recent document of a mechanism that had been in place for a sustained period.

## 4.2 APPENDIX: REVIEW PROCESS

### DATA COLLECTION

#### *Information provided to auditors*

In advance of and during the site visit, the Diocese of Galloway provided auditors with the following:

- In God's Image
- The McLellan Report
- A self-assessment of Safeguarding
- DRAMT minutes
- DSAG minutes
- Parish newsletters
- PVG database information
- Safe recruitment forms
- Guidance notes for parish audit completion
- 2019 Parish safeguarding audit
- Safeguarding report form
- Counselling support information leaflet
- Bishop's conference Safeguarding in the Catholic Church
- Diocesan context
- Access to the website
- Invitation to survivors
- Social Media Policy 2013

#### *Participation of members of the Diocese*

On 19 February to 21 February 2019 the auditors visited the Diocese and had conversation with:

- The Bishop of Galloway
- The Vicar General of Galloway
- The Designated Safeguarding Advisor
- The Diocesan Chancellor
- The Data Protection Officer for Galloway Diocese
- A member of DSAG
- A member of DRAMT
- Representatives from the parishes
- Trainer representatives
- Survivors of abuse and their representatives either in person, over the phone or by video call.

### *The audit: records / files*

Auditors looked at:

- A number of randomly selected case files
- A past safeguarding agreement
- Examples of enquiries handled within the Diocese from 2014

### *Limitations of audit*

It is possible that some survivors of abuse who have no further contact with the Church and who have not approached survivor support organisations would not have been made aware of the audit. We also recognise that those with strongly negative or positive views are more likely to come forward than those with broadly neutral views.

### *References*

Bishop's Conference of Scotland (2018) *In God's Image. Safeguarding in the Catholic Church in Scotland*. Airdrie: Bishops' Conference of Scotland.

The McLellan Commission (2015) *A review of the current safeguarding policies, procedures and practice within the Catholic Church in Scotland*. Edinburgh: APS Group. [[www.mclellancommission.co.uk](http://www.mclellancommission.co.uk)]

Munro, E. and Fish, S. (2015) *Hear no evil, see no evil: understanding failure to identify and report child sexual abuse in institutional contexts*. Royal Commission into Institutional Responses to Child Sexual Abuse, Sydney. London: SCIE.