

# NATIONAL CATHOLIC SAFEGUARDING COMMISSION

## Minutes

Monday 14 July 2008  
Masterson Room of St Chad's Cathedral, Birmingham

**Present:** Bill Kilgallon (Chair), Bishop Peter Doyle, Bishop Declan Lang, Sr Jane Bertelsen, Roger Bird, Fr Matthew Blake, Kevin Caffrey, Sr Ann Cunningham, Steve Landy, Fr Kristian Paver, Valerie Brasse, Ann Collier, Eileen Dunn, Susie Hayward, Adrian Child, Liz Taite.

**Apologies:** Apologies had been received from Bishop John Rawsthorne, who would be at the World Youth Day in Sydney.

### 1. Welcome and Introductions

The Chairman invited each member of the Commission to introduce themselves and say something about their background.

Before proceeding further, Bill Kilgallon proposed that the 'House Rules' used for the Cumberlege Commission should also apply to the NCSC: that what is said in the group is confidential, with how much to be made public to be decided at each stage; that for the sake of simplicity, the group could address one another using first names.

### 2. Membership of the Commission

It was explained that the differing periods of office for membership of the NCSC was to ensure continuity, so that not everyone would be changing at the same time.

### 3. The role of the National Catholic Safeguarding Commission (NCSC) and the role of the Catholic Safeguarding Advisory Service (CSAS) and arrangements for managing the relationship between them

- i. Bill Kilgallon outlined the reasons for changing the national structure. With reference to Chapter 3 of the Cumberlege Report, he spoke of the distinct and different roles that the NCSC and CSAS would have; the Commission would set standards and ensure compliance and consistency in the Church's safeguarding of children and vulnerable adults, whilst the Advisory Service would advise, provide training and link with national stakeholders. Bill pointed out that, inevitably, the success of the new organisations would depend on how the Commission works.
- ii. Referring to the diagram on page 53 of the Report, Valerie Brasse emphasised the evolutionary nature of the new bodies, saying that much would be worked out as the work progressed. The role of the Commission would focus on the strategic level and compliance.
- iii. Bishop Declan Lang noted that it had been unfortunate that – for reasons beyond their control – the work of COPCA had become associated with policing and CRB checks; it was important the two bodies should have separate roles.

- iv. There was a lengthy discussion on the culture change needed in moving from a negative, threatening understanding of 'protection' to one of 'safeguarding', which flows out and sits within the theology and spirituality of the Church; the Church has something to *offer* safeguarding. The language in making the cultural shift would need to be rooted in the gospel language understood by parishioners. It was agreed that trust would grow inasmuch as there was continuous dialogue on all sides.
- v. Explaining in more detail how the two bodies would be managed, Bill reiterated that the NCSC would oversee the policy work of CSAS, whereas the Catholic Trust for England and Wales (CaTEW), represented by Charles Wookey, Secretary to the Department for Christian Responsibility and Citizenship, would oversee the day to day employment matters of CSAS. To make sure that these functions operate smoothly a small management group, comprising Bishop Declan Lang, Sr Jane Bertelson, Bill Kilgallon, Adrian Child and Charles Wookey had been convened and would be meeting on a regular basis. Valerie Brasse underlined the importance of the regular meetings of this management group and suggested that it would be good for the Commission members to meet Charles Wookey. Liz Taite to liaise and arrange for CW to attend a meeting of NCSC.
- vi. Sr Jane Bertelson noted that the Marriage and Family Life Project Team and the Caritas Social Action Network also reside within the Department for Christian Responsibility and Citizenship and that each had welcomed the future presence of CSAS, seeing the natural links in their areas of work.
- vii. Fr Kristian Paver highlighted not just his concern but the concern of many clergy that CSAS would simply be COPCA with another name; Sr Jane Bertelson reported that there was a different perception amongst the religious.
- viii. The value of having a member of the Conference of Religious within the new membership of the Department for Christian Responsibility and Citizenship was acknowledged.
- ix. The complexity in maintaining a united vision was also acknowledged. The Trustees of CaTEW would be coming from one perspective, clergy would have another and the religious congregations yet another. The Chairman stressed that the NCSC would be independent.

#### **4. Report of the Safeguarding with Confidence Implementation Group**

The report of the interim Implementation Group had been circulated with the agenda and papers for the meeting. Item 8, relating to numbers of meetings and year and the costs involved was queried; Bill Kilgallon responded by saying that this had been an attempt to guess accurately, as it was not clear exactly what the needs would be.

**5. Report by the Director of CSAS – Adrian Child**

- i. Adrian Child circulated a paper on the COPCA/CSAS work programme (see Appendix A). He suggested that the major shift in the work would be about tone and delivery (80% of the work remaining the same). He noted that it was cost efficient to have a national office for working on the CRB checks and ISA implementation; without a national office the costs to the Church would be £ \_ million, whereas the CSAS budget is £330,000.
- ii. Adrian outlined the in-built review procedures that were scheduled for the following 12 months. There are a number of smaller Catholic organisations which do not have safeguarding procedures in place and one focus would be to work with such organisations.
- iii. As far as advice and guidance are concerned, Adrian reported that rather than being about cases, phone calls now tend to be about general enquiries and CRB checks, i.e. dissemination of good practice.
- iv. COPCA has produced an annual report: Adrian asked members to consider what a future report might look like, perhaps produced under the banner of the NCSC.
- v. The ‘cementing’ of CSAS within the Department for Christian Responsibility and Citizenship was mentioned in very positive terms. The structural shift would facilitate the generic and bespoke training offered by CSAS.
- vi. Under the heading ‘Communication and awareness-raising’, Adrian’s paper referred to newsheets. It was requested that Commission members should be on the mailing list for these. Liz Taite to pass on email address of NCSC members to CSAS.

**6. Work programme of the Commission**

The Commission considered the priorities for its work programme taking into account the recommended timetable set by the Implementation Group.

**i. The review process (see Appendices B and C)**

- a. Recommendations 47-51 of Safeguarding with Confidence refer to the introduction of a review process of the recommendation made by a diocesan or regional religious commission before a decision is made by a bishop or congregation leader. The Implementation Group recommended that this be available from 1<sup>st</sup> September 2008. The Commission agreed to work to this time and noted that one request for such a review had been received.
- b. It was agreed that Valerie Brasse, Kristian Paver, Susie Hayward and Adrian Child should take this forward on behalf of the Commission. This group was asked to set the procedures for reviews and to appoint the first members of a panel from which review panels could be chosen.

- c. It was agreed that in the first instance these should be drawn from people already involved in for example existing commissions but that a wider and open recruitment exercise should be carried out later.
- d. It was agreed that members of the NCSC should not take part in reviews.
- e. It was agreed that the CSAS should hold the information on the panel of people suitable to undertake reviews and that a bishop or congregation leader should select the members to carry out a review from that panel with advice from CSAS.

**ii. Independent Investigation**

Recommendation 45 introduces the concept of an independent investigation and the Implementation Group recommended that a pilot scheme be established in one province. At the CBCEW/CoR Spring Meeting the Archbishop of Liverpool had offered the Northern Province as an appropriate place for such a pilot. It was agreed that Roger Bird, Ann Collier, Eileen Dunn, Steve Landy and Adrian Child would take this forward on behalf of the NCSC.

**iii. Training Day**

Recommendation 39 referred to a day of training on safeguarding for all bishops and congregation leaders. This had been agreed by CBCEW and CoR.

It was agreed that two dates should be offered one in the north and one in the south and that these should be referred to as study days. The Chair, the Vice-Chairs and Adrian Child agreed to consider the content for such a day and to begin to make the arrangements.

**iv. Responding to those alleging abuse**

The Insurance Committee for the Catholic Church in England, Wales & Scotland has produced draft protocols for responding to allegations of abuse. It was agreed that Bill Kilgallon, Roger Bird, Valerie Brasse and Matthew Blake would meet with representatives of the insurers to discuss these.

**v. Work Programme**

It was agreed that a work programme for the coming year would be drawn up. Adrian Child offered to circulate the CSAS programme to assist in this process.

**7. Working arrangements for the NSCS**

- i. A schedule of meetings was agreed for the full meetings of the NCSC which would allow for reporting to the meetings of CBCEW and CoR. The dates agreed were:
  - o Monday 29 September: 11.00 am – 4.00pm: St Philomena's Convent, 70 - 71 Euston Square, London NW1 1DJ
  - o Wednesday 14 January 2009
  - o Monday 2 March 2009
  - o Tuesday 7 July 2009
- ii. It was agreed that at the next meeting the location of future meetings would be considered and whether meetings should include an opportunity to meet people involved in safeguarding in the Church.

- iii. It was noted that the administration of the NCSC would be handled by staff at the CBCEW.
- iv. It was agreed that the NCSC should have access to its own media advice – separate from the Catholic Communications Network.
- v. It was agreed that a website for the NCSC should be set up and that this should be part of the administrative support provided by the CBCEW. As a minimum this should include the membership of the NCSC and key documents. At a future meeting the NCSC should discuss putting the agenda and minutes of the meetings on the website. It was suggested that a photographs of the NCSC be taken at the next meeting for use on the site.
- vi. It was agreed that the NCSC should have its own logo – distinct from CSAS but perhaps with some visual similarity and a letter head which identified the NCSC but also reflected its position in respect of CBCEW and CoR.
- vii. It was agreed that a standing committee of the NCSC should be established to look at all proposed safeguarding policies and procedures for recommendation to the NCSC and subsequently to CBCEW and CoR.

#### **8. Any other business**

- i. Recommendation 2 of Safeguarding with Confidence said that CBCEW and CoR should develop Codes of Conduct for all clergy, religious, those who work in the church and volunteers. These should be separate from the clergy handbook. The Australian document 'Integrity in Ministry' had been suggested as a possible model. The Implementation Group considered that this was a very important development but that it should be very much rooted in a pastoral and theological statement of ministry not a safeguarding approach. Safeguarding should flow from that understanding. It was agreed that the Chair and vice-chairs give further consideration to how this could be taken forward. It was agreed to circulate the web link for 'Integrity in Ministry' to all members.
- ii. Recommendation 70 asked that 'safeguarding' terminology be used from 1 July in all Church settings. This had implications for the job descriptions and duties of employed staff in some areas. It was agreed that the Chair would consider with CSAS whether it would be useful to write to all dioceses offering advice on this matter.
- iii. The Chair reported that a bishop had written to the NCSC asking that we consider the issue of whether it was ever appropriate for a priest who had been subject of an allegation and therefore left his presbytery could be allowed to live in another presbytery with safeguards. Members considered that the present guidelines were clear and workable and that a bishop in this situation should take advice from his diocesan commission.

Closing the meeting, the Chairman thanked everyone for their time and contribution.