

## NATIONAL CATHOLIC SAFEGUARDING COMMISSION

**Minutes of the Meeting held on Tuesday 9<sup>th</sup> March 2010 from 11.00 to 16.00**

**At: The Parish of Our Lady of Mount Carmel and St Simon Stock  
41 Kensington Church Street  
London W8 4BB**

**Present:** Bill Kilgallon (Chair)  
Sister Jane Bertelsen  
Roger Bird  
Father Matthew Blake  
Valerie Brasse  
Sister Ann Cunningham  
Bishop Peter Doyle  
Susie Hayward  
Bishop Declan Lang  
Father Kristian Paver  
Bishop John Rawsthorne (until item 7d)

**In attendance:** Adrian Child, Director, CSAS  
Rose Anderson, Secretary, NCSC  
Carol Parry, National Development and Learning Adviser, CSAS (for item 5d)  
Peter Turner, Safeguarding Officer, Archdiocese of Westminster (for item 5d)  
Charles Wookey, Assistant General Secretary, CBCEW (for item 7d)

1 **Apologies for absence were received from:** Kevin Caffrey and Ann Collier

2 **The opening prayer** was led by Bishop Peter Doyle.

3 **Minutes of the meeting held on 8<sup>th</sup> December 2009** were accepted as a correct record.

4 **Matters arising from the minutes of 8<sup>th</sup> December 2009:**

**4a. Action List:** The completed actions were noted

*6b Thematic Reviews.* **It was agreed that** Rose Anderson should contact Eileen Dunn to determine progress with the terms of Reference and Project Plan for Thematic Reviews. **(ACTION: RA)**

**It was also agreed that** the Chair and John Rawsthorne would consider who should represent the Bishops on this group **(ACTION: Chair and JR)**

Members were invited to join this group and give their names to The Chair.

**(ACTION: All)**

*7b Terms of Reference.*

It was noted that the CoR Executive were considering asking the members to approve these at the AGM on 25th March.

*7d Work programme- Recognitio.* There was discussion on the ramifications of applying for and gaining Recognitio, and the need for the policies to be clear and final. **It was agreed that** this should be kept under review, and that a complete package of policies would have to be presented to the Bishops' Conference prior to application for Recognitio. **(ACTION: ALL)**

Members were informed that during the recent Ad Limina visit to the Vatican the Bishops had been congratulated on their work to promote safeguarding in the Church in England and Wales.

**4b Other matters arising, not already on the agenda.** There were no other matters raised.

**CSAS****5a Management group – minutes of meeting held on 8<sup>th</sup> February 2010**

The Chair advised members that he and the vice chairs would be attending a meeting with the General Secretary of CBCEW at 16.30 that day, to discuss outstanding issues regarding the NCSC and CSAS budgets and the IT provision and support.

Referring to *item 3, Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith* Declan Lang advised members that the Vatican was seeking advice on the predictors of future behaviour of people who view abusive images of children. The Vatican had received conflicting advice on the predictors. **It was agreed that** at present the Commission was not in a position to offer this advice.

Referring to *item 4- IT Review Report* Adrian Child advised members that it was his view that there should be an independent IT system for CSAS.

Referring to *item 10 – Regional Religious Commissions* the Chair advised members that there had been a meeting to discuss this issue, earlier in the day and this would be reported under item 7f on the agenda.

**5b Safer Recruitment/ISA/CRB**

Revised Safer Recruitment /Selection Policies, Procedures and Codes of Practice.

Adrian Child advised members that the revised document had been seen by the Policy Subgroup. Members were impressed that the document covered the issues very comprehensively, but were concerned at the size of the document and the lack of definition of which parts were policy/procedure/guideline. Adrian advised that the paper version had been prepared for the purpose of consultation on the contents, but that it would not be published in this way. The contents would appear in the electronic policy manual, where access would be directed to the relevant section for the entered search. Members advised that there should be cross referencing when similar issues were covered in separate policies.

Adrian advised that there were sections currently incomplete as full ISA guidance had not been published on all of the issues.

Regulated Activity Providers (RAPs)

Members discussed the following proposals for the designation of RAPs:

- Bishops/Archbishops: Are designated the RAPs for parish priests and clergy working within the jurisdiction of their Diocese.
- Congregation Leader/Local Superior: Are designated the RAPs for members of Religious Orders.
- Parish Priests: Are designated the RAPs for the activities that involve volunteer groups that are taking place within their parish.
- Activities delivered by Religious: The “local manager” is designated the RAP for activities delivered by Religious for example Care Home Manager; Retreat Centre Manager etc
- Catholic organisations that have their own charitable identity: Where a Catholic organisation has its own charitable status or identity, the organisation is the RAP (although that activity may be operating within parishes). For example it is the responsibility of St Vincent de Paul Society to ensure that those working for that organisation are ISA registered. Additionally in the event that one of their helpers was subsequently barred by the ISA from working with vulnerable groups, SVP would be responsible for removing that person from any regulated activity post they were undertaking on behalf of SVP.
- Catholic schools: The RAP is as designated by the Catholic Education Service (CES) as per usual school directives.

**It was agreed that** the definition for Congregation Leader/Local Superior should have “in the country” added, as the responsibility would lie with the leader resident in England or Wales. **(ACTION: A Child)**

Members also discussed the role of Trustees, with ultimate responsibility for employment contracts, and whether this responsibility could be delegated under the RAP regulations.

**It was agreed that** Valerie Brasse would seek clarification on this. **(ACTION: V B)**

**5c Workload tracker**

Members noted the contents of the workload Tracker which had been circulated prior to the meeting. There was concern that there was delay in the presentation of the “Information Sharing Policy” to the Commission. Adrian Child explained that this was due to the need to clarify issues about data protection and the sharing of information across the dioceses and religious congregations which had been highlighted during the Reviews

of certain cases. The dioceses and orders, as charities in their own right each have their own data protection controller. He advised that the CCIA had commissioned Hill Dickinson Solicitors to provide a protocol outlining the position of the Church with regard to data protection and any exemptions which may apply in the application of the Review and Investigation protocols.

#### **5d Organisational Structures review –update.**

The Chair welcomed Carol Parry and Peter Turner who were present for this item.

The paper – “A Review of (Diocesan) Safeguarding Organisational Structures in the Catholic Dioceses of England and Wales” had been circulated prior to the meeting.

Peter Turner explained that the working group had initially been tasked with reviewing both diocesan and religious safeguarding structures. However this had not been possible and the first review looked at diocesan structures.

The members of the working group were:

Peter Turner: Chair of Working Group & Safeguarding Adviser, Westminster  
Carol Parry: National Training & Development Adviser, CSAS  
Jane Jones: Safeguarding Coordinator, Birmingham  
Fr Kieron O'Brien: Safeguarding Coordinator, Arundel & Brighton  
Sr Darryl Candy: Religious Safeguarding Coordinator  
Fr Ray Collier: Religious Safeguarding Representative

And the Terms of reference were:

- To consider needs and draw conclusions about appropriate levels of safeguarding resources to ensure that Dioceses fulfil their safeguarding responsibilities to children, young people and vulnerable adults;
- To identify current levels of resources allocated to safeguarding in Dioceses and Congregations;
- To identify how current systems and lines of accountability are working;
- To identify strengths and limitations in the way that resources are allocated and systems are working;
- To report on findings and make recommendations about what constitutes an appropriate structure and level of safeguarding resource for Dioceses and Congregations.

The review commenced with a focus group from the Safeguarding Coordinators and Officers meeting and was followed with four separate questionnaires which had been sent to:

- All Bishops
- All Safeguarding Coordinators
- All Safeguarding Officers/Advisers
- All Diocesan Financial Secretaries.

All of the returns were anonymised before being seen by the working group.

Carl Parry informed the members that a thematic analysis of the returns was carried out before making the ten recommendations in the report. The recommendations were then discussed in turn.

It was agreed that there should be an implementation plan. Valerie Brasse and Susie Hayward agreed to join the working group to develop the plan.

**(ACTION: P Turner, C Parry, V B and S H)**

The Chair thanked Carol and Peter for their work and for the helpful contribution to the debate.

## **6 Sub Groups**

### **6a Non aligned Religious- progress report**

Jane Bertelsen reported that Sr Helen had now contacted all religious orders in England and Wales. She had found that 189 orders were not aligned to a safeguarding commission, and of these 85 were not members of CoR. 145 orders were aligned to a safeguarding commission.

Sr Helen is now collecting all of the contact details for the aligned orders. She will then collect the contact details of the non aligned orders.

There was discussion on the next phase of the project and the need to identify priorities for work within the group of non aligned orders.  
Members also discussed the relationship between the Religious Safeguarding Commissions and the CoR, and were informed by the Chair of the meeting which had taken place earlier that morning.  
It was agreed that the NCSC should request a meeting with the CoR Executive concerning the responsibility for Safeguarding within the Religious Orders and Restructuring of the Religious Safeguarding Commissions. **(ACTION: Chair)**

## **6b Policy**

### **i Thematic Reviews**

This item was discussed under 4a 6b earlier in the meeting.

### **ii Review Protocol**

Members noted the proposed changes to the Review Protocol, circulated prior to the meeting and which had been considered by the Policy subgroup. .  
Members noted that legal advice concerning third party disclosure was the responsibility of the Safeguarding Coordinator. Adrian Child advised that the protocol was working, but there were problems with the timescale for the reviews.  
Review Panel members with expertise in Safeguarding Vulnerable Adults had not yet been required to attend a review panel. It was agreed that Adrian Child would contact them. **(ACTION: A Child)**

### **iii Domestic Abuse**

Adrian Child referred to the papers which had been circulated prior to the meeting and reminded members that this had been a three way project between the Department for Family Life (CBCEW), CARITAS Social Action and CSAS.  
The documents would be incorporated in the e-policy as guidance. He advised that there is a wider project which will include training material, with a CD, for parish and other church groups.

### **iv Independent Investigation**

Adrian Child referred to the report on the pilot study, which had been circulated prior to the meeting.  
He reminded members that initially the pilot was to have been carried out in the Northern Province, but as this had not been practicable the pilot was extended across England and Wales. Problems identified were:

#### *General Protocol Issues:*

- Definitions required for "independent" and "investigation." Neither term appear appropriate.
- Clarification of status of and support for investigators whilst undertaking this work if they are employed within another Diocese.
- Clarification around the panel hearing in terms of support for any victims/witnesses.
- Within current arrangements for the religious, how would a panel hearing be set up?
- Clarification regarding data protection issues

#### *Servicing issues*

- Who provides administrative support?
- Who provides legal or canonical advice and support?
- Who supervises or supports the investigator?

Following discussion **it was agreed that** the original working group should draw up a revised protocol. The revised protocol would be presented at a future meeting of the NCSC. **(ACTION: A Child and R B)**

## **7 NCSC Organisational issues**

### **7a Terms of Reference CoR approval**

This item was discussed under item 4a 7b above

### **7b NCSC Strategic Business Plan**

The revised paper had been circulated prior to the meeting and was accepted by the Members

### **7c Work Programme and review of Cumberlege recommendations**

The updated paper had been circulated prior to the meeting.  
It was noted that:

- under Administration, item 2, the support for the CSAS management Committee should be recorded as **CSAS**.
- under Administration item 6, Attendance at Diocesan and Religious Commission meetings- it should be recorded that the Religious Safeguarding Coordinators and Officers meetings are attended by members of the NCSC every quarter.
- under Cumberlege Recommendations to be addressed- no 44 should show that that recommendation is included in the Independent Risk Assessment Protocol.

**(ACTION: R A)**

#### **7d Budget report 2009 and Budget allocation for 2010**

Members noted the content of the draft budget report for 2009 which had been circulated prior to the meeting.

The Chair advised members that the NCSC had not yet received its budget allocation for 2010 and that CSAS had received its budget allocation in February. There had been a number of items removed from the previously agreed CSAS budget.

Charles Wookey joined the meeting and was welcomed by the Chair. He apologised for the delays in advising CSAS of their budget for 2010 and agreed that the terms of reference for agreeing the budget should have been followed and there should have been an explanation concerning the items deleted from the budget. He agreed that the budget should be reinstated for TriX, and advised that he was seeking a one off grant for the remaining IT items relating to the National Data Base and the key fobs. He advised, and Adrian Child confirmed, that there had been an agreement to defer the EBulk project to 2011.

Charles went on to suggest that the draft budget plan for 2011 should be developed and discussion commence during the summer, in order to meet the budgeting timetable. He also advised that the CSAS proposals should be presented with a supporting statement from the NCSC, confirming that the budget is appropriate for the work to be carried out.

Members expressed their concern that outside funding was being sought for what is a statutory requirement and also questioned the removal of the Training budget for CSAS staff. Charles explained that this may be due to the centralization of the training budget within CBCEW, where training could be provided more efficiently for greater numbers of staff, but agreed that it was unsatisfactory to have it removed without explanation.

Members also expressed their concern about problems with the management of the IT servers and the National Data Base. Charles advised that the Assistant General Secretary for operations had written to Bishop Lang with proposals to improve this and that work would start immediately. Declan Lang confirmed that he had received the letter and would now reply to the AGS (operations).

The Chair thanked Charles for attending the meeting.

**It was agreed that** the budget timetable should be obtained from CBCEW and made available to members for the June meeting, **(ACTION: RA)**

#### **7e Membership of NCSC**

The Chair advised members that Steve Landy (representing Chairs of Religious Commissions) had retired from his post with the NSPCC and therefore resigned his membership of the NCSC and Ann Collier (Lay representative) and John Rawsthorne (CBCEW Representative) had decided not to seek a further term of office. Ann Cunningham (CoR Representative) was prepared to serve a second term of office and this had been supported by CoR.

The CBCEW will nominate the replacement for John Rawsthorne at their Low Week meeting.

It was agreed that

- the Chair should approach the chairs of Religious Safeguarding Commissions for a nomination to replace Steve Landy **(ACTION: Chair)**
- an advert be placed for a new lay member **(ACTION: Chair and RA)**

Members asked whether the advert could be for more than one lay member, but were advised that a change to the membership would have to be approved by the CBCEW and the CoR.

**7f Diocesan and Religious Commission**

**i attendance at meetings**

Members were referred to the addition of some dates for the programme of Diocesan and Religious Commission meetings and asked to inform Rose Anderson if they were able to attend any of the meetings. **(ACTION: R A)**

**ii Succession Planning for Regional Religious Commissions**

This item was discussed under item 6a above

**7g NCSC website - Update and activity report**

Rose Anderson reported that there had been no "contacts" via the website and that the weekly access to the site was between 70 and 100 hits. Members' passwords for the members' page of the site were circulated to those present.

**8 Annual Report**

**2009/2010- Costings**

Adrian Child referred to the paper which had been circulated prior to the meeting.

He proposed, and **it was agreed that** the design and printing should be carried out by Sarah Moss Designs.

**It was also agreed that** the number of leaflets be reduced for the 2009/2010 report.

**(ACTION A Child)**

**9 Anglophone conference 2010(31<sup>st</sup> May – 4<sup>th</sup> June) Dublin**

Members were advised that Peter Doyle would attend the conference in addition to the Chair, Rose Anderson and Mike Denton.

**Anglophone Conference 2011 – Rome**

Members were advised of the dates for the 2011 conference -30<sup>th</sup> May – 3<sup>rd</sup> June, and were reminded that it was the responsibility of England and Wales to organise this conference.

**10 Any other business**

There were no items of other business.

**11 Date and time of next meeting: 8th June 2010 commencing at 11.00**

Future meetings: 14<sup>th</sup> September, 14<sup>th</sup> December.

All meetings will be held at The Parish of Our Lady of Mount Carmel and St Simon Stock  
41 Kensington Church Street London W8 4BB

**NATIONAL CATHOLIC SAFEGUARDING COMMISSION**

**Minutes of the Meeting held on Tuesday 9<sup>th</sup> March 2010 from 11.00 to 16.00**

**At: The Parish of Our Lady of Mount Carmel and St Simon Stock  
41 Kensington Church Street  
London W8 4BB**

**Present:** Bill Kilgallon (Chair)  
Sister Jane Bertelsen  
Roger Bird  
Father Matthew Blake  
Valerie Brasse  
Sister Ann Cunningham  
Bishop Peter Doyle  
Susie Hayward  
Bishop Declan Lang  
Father Kristian Paver  
Bishop John Rawsthorne (until item 7d)

**In attendance:** Adrian Child, Director, CSAS  
Rose Anderson, Secretary, NCSC  
Carol Parry, National Development and Learning Adviser, CSAS (for item 5d)  
Peter Turner, Safeguarding Officer, Archdiocese of Westminster (for item 5d)  
Charles Wookey, Assistant General Secretary, CBCEW (for item 7d)

1 **Apologies for absence were received from:** Kevin Caffrey and Ann Collier

2 **The opening prayer** was led by Bishop Peter Doyle.

3 **Minutes of the meeting held on 8<sup>th</sup> December 2009** were accepted as a correct record.

4 **Matters arising from the minutes of 8<sup>th</sup> December 2009:**

**4a. Action List:** The completed actions were noted

*6b Thematic Reviews.* **It was agreed that** Rose Anderson should contact Eileen Dunn to determine progress with the terms of Reference and Project Plan for Thematic Reviews. **(ACTION: RA)**

**It was also agreed that** the Chair and John Rawsthorne would consider who should represent the Bishops on this group **(ACTION: Chair and JR)**

Members were invited to join this group and give their names to The Chair.

**(ACTION: All)**

*7b Terms of Reference.*

It was noted that the CoR Executive were considering asking the members to approve these at the AGM on 25th March.

*7d Work programme- Recognitio.* There was discussion on the ramifications of applying for and gaining Recognitio, and the need for the policies to be clear and final. **It was agreed that** this should be kept under review, and that a complete package of policies would have to be presented to the Bishops' Conference prior to application for Recognitio. **(ACTION: ALL)**

Members were informed that during the recent Ad Limina visit to the Vatican the Bishops had been congratulated on their work to promote safeguarding in the Church in England and Wales.

**4b Other matters arising, not already on the agenda.** There were no other matters raised.

**CSAS****5a Management group – minutes of meeting held on 8<sup>th</sup> February 2010**

The Chair advised members that he and the vice chairs would be attending a meeting with the General Secretary of CBCEW at 16.30 that day, to discuss outstanding issues regarding the NCSC and CSAS budgets and the IT provision and support.

Referring to *item 3, Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith* Declan Lang advised members that the Vatican was seeking advice on the predictors of future behaviour of people who view abusive images of children. The Vatican had received conflicting advice on the predictors. **It was agreed that** at present the Commission was not in a position to offer this advice.

Referring to *item 4- IT Review Report* Adrian Child advised members that it was his view that there should be an independent IT system for CSAS.

Referring to *item 10 – Regional Religious Commissions* the Chair advised members that there had been a meeting to discuss this issue, earlier in the day and this would be reported under item 7f on the agenda.

**5b Safer Recruitment/ISA/CRB**

Revised Safer Recruitment /Selection Policies, Procedures and Codes of Practice.

Adrian Child advised members that the revised document had been seen by the Policy Subgroup. Members were impressed that the document covered the issues very comprehensively, but were concerned at the size of the document and the lack of definition of which parts were policy/procedure/guideline. Adrian advised that the paper version had been prepared for the purpose of consultation on the contents, but that it would not be published in this way. The contents would appear in the electronic policy manual, where access would be directed to the relevant section for the entered search. Members advised that there should be cross referencing when similar issues were covered in separate policies.

Adrian advised that there were sections currently incomplete as full ISA guidance had not been published on all of the issues.

Regulated Activity Providers (RAPs)

Members discussed the following proposals for the designation of RAPs:

- Bishops/Archbishops: Are designated the RAPs for parish priests and clergy working within the jurisdiction of their Diocese.
- Congregation Leader/Local Superior: Are designated the RAPs for members of Religious Orders.
- Parish Priests: Are designated the RAPs for the activities that involve volunteer groups that are taking place within their parish.
- Activities delivered by Religious: The “local manager” is designated the RAP for activities delivered by Religious for example Care Home Manager; Retreat Centre Manager etc
- Catholic organisations that have their own charitable identity: Where a Catholic organisation has its own charitable status or identity, the organisation is the RAP (although that activity may be operating within parishes). For example it is the responsibility of St Vincent de Paul Society to ensure that those working for that organisation are ISA registered. Additionally in the event that one of their helpers was subsequently barred by the ISA from working with vulnerable groups, SVP would be responsible for removing that person from any regulated activity post they were undertaking on behalf of SVP.
- Catholic schools: The RAP is as designated by the Catholic Education Service (CES) as per usual school directives.

**It was agreed that** the definition for Congregation Leader/Local Superior should have “in the country” added, as the responsibility would lie with the leader resident in England or Wales. **(ACTION: A Child)**

Members also discussed the role of Trustees, with ultimate responsibility for employment contracts, and whether this responsibility could be delegated under the RAP regulations.

**It was agreed that** Valerie Brasse would seek clarification on this. **(ACTION: V B)**

**5c Workload tracker**

Members noted the contents of the workload Tracker which had been circulated prior to the meeting. There was concern that there was delay in the presentation of the “Information Sharing Policy” to the Commission. Adrian Child explained that this was due to the need to clarify issues about data protection and the sharing of information across the dioceses and religious congregations which had been highlighted during the Reviews

of certain cases. The dioceses and orders, as charities in their own right each have their own data protection controller. He advised that the CCIA had commissioned Hill Dickinson Solicitors to provide a protocol outlining the position of the Church with regard to data protection and any exemptions which may apply in the application of the Review and Investigation protocols.

#### **5d Organisational Structures review –update.**

The Chair welcomed Carol Parry and Peter Turner who were present for this item.

The paper – “A Review of (Diocesan) Safeguarding Organisational Structures in the Catholic Dioceses of England and Wales” had been circulated prior to the meeting.

Peter Turner explained that the working group had initially been tasked with reviewing both diocesan and religious safeguarding structures. However this had not been possible and the first review looked at diocesan structures.

The members of the working group were:

Peter Turner: Chair of Working Group & Safeguarding Adviser, Westminster  
Carol Parry: National Training & Development Adviser, CSAS  
Jane Jones: Safeguarding Coordinator, Birmingham  
Fr Kieron O'Brien: Safeguarding Coordinator, Arundel & Brighton  
Sr Darryl Candy: Religious Safeguarding Coordinator  
Fr Ray Collier: Religious Safeguarding Representative

And the Terms of reference were:

- To consider needs and draw conclusions about appropriate levels of safeguarding resources to ensure that Dioceses fulfil their safeguarding responsibilities to children, young people and vulnerable adults;
- To identify current levels of resources allocated to safeguarding in Dioceses and Congregations;
- To identify how current systems and lines of accountability are working;
- To identify strengths and limitations in the way that resources are allocated and systems are working;
- To report on findings and make recommendations about what constitutes an appropriate structure and level of safeguarding resource for Dioceses and Congregations.

The review commenced with a focus group from the Safeguarding Coordinators and Officers meeting and was followed with four separate questionnaires which had been sent to:

- All Bishops
- All Safeguarding Coordinators
- All Safeguarding Officers/Advisers
- All Diocesan Financial Secretaries.

All of the returns were anonymised before being seen by the working group.

Carl Parry informed the members that a thematic analysis of the returns was carried out before making the ten recommendations in the report. The recommendations were then discussed in turn.

It was agreed that there should be an implementation plan. Valerie Brasse and Susie Hayward agreed to join the working group to develop the plan.

**(ACTION: P Turner, C Parry, V B and S H)**

The Chair thanked Carol and Peter for their work and for the helpful contribution to the debate.

## **6 Sub Groups**

### **6a Non aligned Religious- progress report**

Jane Bertelsen reported that Sr Helen had now contacted all religious orders in England and Wales. She had found that 189 orders were not aligned to a safeguarding commission, and of these 85 were not members of CoR. 145 orders were aligned to a safeguarding commission.

Sr Helen is now collecting all of the contact details for the aligned orders. She will then collect the contact details of the non aligned orders.

There was discussion on the next phase of the project and the need to identify priorities for work within the group of non aligned orders.  
Members also discussed the relationship between the Religious Safeguarding Commissions and the CoR, and were informed by the Chair of the meeting which had taken place earlier that morning.  
It was agreed that the NCSC should request a meeting with the CoR Executive concerning the responsibility for Safeguarding within the Religious Orders and Restructuring of the Religious Safeguarding Commissions. **(ACTION: Chair)**

## **6b Policy**

### **i Thematic Reviews**

This item was discussed under 4a 6b earlier in the meeting.

### **ii Review Protocol**

Members noted the proposed changes to the Review Protocol, circulated prior to the meeting and which had been considered by the Policy subgroup. .

Members noted that legal advice concerning third party disclosure was the responsibility of the Safeguarding Coordinator. Adrian Child advised that the protocol was working, but there were problems with the timescale for the reviews.

Review Panel members with expertise in Safeguarding Vulnerable Adults had not yet been required to attend a review panel. It was agreed that Adrian Child would contact them. **(ACTION: A Child)**

### **iii Domestic Abuse**

Adrian Child referred to the papers which had been circulated prior to the meeting and reminded members that this had been a three way project between the Department for Family Life (CBCEW), CARITAS Social Action and CSAS.

The documents would be incorporated in the e-policy as guidance. He advised that there is a wider project which will include training material, with a CD, for parish and other church groups.

### **iv Independent Investigation**

Adrian Child referred to the report on the pilot study, which had been circulated prior to the meeting.

He reminded members that initially the pilot was to have been carried out in the Northern Province, but as this had not been practicable the pilot was extended across England and Wales. Problems identified were:

#### *General Protocol Issues:*

- Definitions required for "independent" and "investigation." Neither term appear appropriate.
- Clarification of status of and support for investigators whilst undertaking this work if they are employed within another Diocese.
- Clarification around the panel hearing in terms of support for any victims/witnesses.
- Within current arrangements for the religious, how would a panel hearing be set up?
- Clarification regarding data protection issues

#### *Servicing issues*

- Who provides administrative support?
- Who provides legal or canonical advice and support?
- Who supervises or supports the investigator?

Following discussion **it was agreed that** the original working group should draw up a revised protocol. The revised protocol would be presented at a future meeting of the NCSC. **(ACTION: A Child and R B)**

## **7 NCSC Organisational issues**

### **7a Terms of Reference CoR approval**

This item was discussed under item 4a 7b above

### **7b NCSC Strategic Business Plan**

The revised paper had been circulated prior to the meeting and was accepted by the Members

### **7c Work Programme and review of Cumberlege recommendations**

The updated paper had been circulated prior to the meeting.

It was noted that:

- under Administration, item 2, the support for the CSAS management Committee should be recorded as **CSAS**.
- under Administration item 6, Attendance at Diocesan and Religious Commission meetings- it should be recorded that the Religious Safeguarding Coordinators and Officers meetings are attended by members of the NCSC every quarter.
- under Cumberlege Recommendations to be addressed- no 44 should show that that recommendation is included in the Independent Risk Assessment Protocol.

**(ACTION: R A)**

#### **7d Budget report 2009 and Budget allocation for 2010**

Members noted the content of the draft budget report for 2009 which had been circulated prior to the meeting.

The Chair advised members that the NCSC had not yet received its budget allocation for 2010 and that CSAS had received its budget allocation in February. There had been a number of items removed from the previously agreed CSAS budget.

Charles Wookey joined the meeting and was welcomed by the Chair. He apologised for the delays in advising CSAS of their budget for 2010 and agreed that the terms of reference for agreeing the budget should have been followed and there should have been an explanation concerning the items deleted from the budget. He agreed that the budget should be reinstated for TriX, and advised that he was seeking a one off grant for the remaining IT items relating to the National Data Base and the key fobs. He advised, and Adrian Child confirmed, that there had been an agreement to defer the EBulk project to 2011.

Charles went on to suggest that the draft budget plan for 2011 should be developed and discussion commence during the summer, in order to meet the budgeting timetable. He also advised that the CSAS proposals should be presented with a supporting statement from the NCSC, confirming that the budget is appropriate for the work to be carried out.

Members expressed their concern that outside funding was being sought for what is a statutory requirement and also questioned the removal of the Training budget for CSAS staff. Charles explained that this may be due to the centralization of the training budget within CBCEW, where training could be provided more efficiently for greater numbers of staff, but agreed that it was unsatisfactory to have it removed without explanation.

Members also expressed their concern about problems with the management of the IT servers and the National Data Base. Charles advised that the Assistant General Secretary for operations had written to Bishop Lang with proposals to improve this and that work would start immediately. Declan Lang confirmed that he had received the letter and would now reply to the AGS (operations).

The Chair thanked Charles for attending the meeting.

**It was agreed that** the budget timetable should be obtained from CBCEW and made available to members for the June meeting, **(ACTION: RA)**

#### **7e Membership of NCSC**

The Chair advised members that Steve Landy (representing Chairs of Religious Commissions) had retired from his post with the NSPCC and therefore resigned his membership of the NCSC and Ann Collier (Lay representative) and John Rawsthorne (CBCEW Representative) had decided not to seek a further term of office. Ann Cunningham (CoR Representative) was prepared to serve a second term of office and this had been supported by CoR.

The CBCEW will nominate the replacement for John Rawsthorne at their Low Week meeting.

It was agreed that

- the Chair should approach the chairs of Religious Safeguarding Commissions for a nomination to replace Steve Landy **(ACTION: Chair)**
- an advert be placed for a new lay member **(ACTION: Chair and RA)**

Members asked whether the advert could be for more than one lay member, but were advised that a change to the membership would have to be approved by the CBCEW and the CoR.

**7f Diocesan and Religious Commission**

**i attendance at meetings**

Members were referred to the addition of some dates for the programme of Diocesan and Religious Commission meetings and asked to inform Rose Anderson if they were able to attend any of the meetings. **(ACTION: R A)**

**ii Succession Planning for Regional Religious Commissions**

This item was discussed under item 6a above

**7g NCSC website - Update and activity report**

Rose Anderson reported that there had been no "contacts" via the website and that the weekly access to the site was between 70 and 100 hits. Members' passwords for the members' page of the site were circulated to those present.

**8 Annual Report**

**2009/2010- Costings**

Adrian Child referred to the paper which had been circulated prior to the meeting.

He proposed, and **it was agreed that** the design and printing should be carried out by Sarah Moss Designs.

**It was also agreed that** the number of leaflets be reduced for the 2009/2010 report.

**(ACTION A Child)**

**9 Anglophone conference 2010(31<sup>st</sup> May – 4<sup>th</sup> June) Dublin**

Members were advised that Peter Doyle would attend the conference in addition to the Chair, Rose Anderson and Mike Denton.

**Anglophone Conference 2011 – Rome**

Members were advised of the dates for the 2011 conference -30<sup>th</sup> May – 3<sup>rd</sup> June, and were reminded that it was the responsibility of England and Wales to organise this conference.

**10 Any other business**

There were no items of other business.

**11 Date and time of next meeting: 8th June 2010 commencing at 11.00**

Future meetings: 14<sup>th</sup> September, 14<sup>th</sup> December.

All meetings will be held at The Parish of Our Lady of Mount Carmel and St Simon Stock  
41 Kensington Church Street London W8 4BB

## NATIONAL CATHOLIC SAFEGUARDING COMMISSION

**Minutes of the Meeting held on Tuesday 9<sup>th</sup> March 2010 from 11.00 to 16.00**

**At: The Parish of Our Lady of Mount Carmel and St Simon Stock  
41 Kensington Church Street  
London W8 4BB**

**Present:** Bill Kilgallon (Chair)  
Sister Jane Bertelsen  
Roger Bird  
Father Matthew Blake  
Valerie Brasse  
Sister Ann Cunningham  
Bishop Peter Doyle  
Susie Hayward  
Bishop Declan Lang  
Father Kristian Paver  
Bishop John Rawsthorne (until item 7d)

**In attendance:** Adrian Child, Director, CSAS  
Rose Anderson, Secretary, NCSC  
Carol Parry, National Development and Learning Adviser, CSAS (for item 5d)  
Peter Turner, Safeguarding Officer, Archdiocese of Westminster (for item 5d)  
Charles Wookey, Assistant General Secretary, CBCEW (for item 7d)

1 **Apologies for absence were received from:** Kevin Caffrey and Ann Collier

2 **The opening prayer** was led by Bishop Peter Doyle.

3 **Minutes of the meeting held on 8<sup>th</sup> December 2009** were accepted as a correct record.

4 **Matters arising from the minutes of 8<sup>th</sup> December 2009:**

**4a. Action List:** The completed actions were noted

*6b Thematic Reviews.* **It was agreed that** Rose Anderson should contact Eileen Dunn to determine progress with the terms of Reference and Project Plan for Thematic Reviews. **(ACTION: RA)**

**It was also agreed that** the Chair and John Rawsthorne would consider who should represent the Bishops on this group **(ACTION: Chair and JR)**

Members were invited to join this group and give their names to The Chair.

**(ACTION: All)**

*7b Terms of Reference.*

It was noted that the CoR Executive were considering asking the members to approve these at the AGM on 25th March.

*7d Work programme- Recognitio.* There was discussion on the ramifications of applying for and gaining Recognitio, and the need for the policies to be clear and final. **It was agreed that** this should be kept under review, and that a complete package of policies would have to be presented to the Bishops' Conference prior to application for Recognitio. **(ACTION: ALL)**

Members were informed that during the recent Ad Limina visit to the Vatican the Bishops had been congratulated on their work to promote safeguarding in the Church in England and Wales.

**4b Other matters arising, not already on the agenda.** There were no other matters raised.

**CSAS****5a Management group – minutes of meeting held on 8<sup>th</sup> February 2010**

The Chair advised members that he and the vice chairs would be attending a meeting with the General Secretary of CBCEW at 16.30 that day, to discuss outstanding issues regarding the NCSC and CSAS budgets and the IT provision and support.

Referring to *item 3, Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith* Declan Lang advised members that the Vatican was seeking advice on the predictors of future behaviour of people who view abusive images of children. The Vatican had received conflicting advice on the predictors. **It was agreed that** at present the Commission was not in a position to offer this advice.

Referring to *item 4- IT Review Report* Adrian Child advised members that it was his view that there should be an independent IT system for CSAS.

Referring to *item 10 – Regional Religious Commissions* the Chair advised members that there had been a meeting to discuss this issue, earlier in the day and this would be reported under item 7f on the agenda.

**5b Safer Recruitment/ISA/CRB**

Revised Safer Recruitment /Selection Policies, Procedures and Codes of Practice.

Adrian Child advised members that the revised document had been seen by the Policy Subgroup. Members were impressed that the document covered the issues very comprehensively, but were concerned at the size of the document and the lack of definition of which parts were policy/procedure/guideline. Adrian advised that the paper version had been prepared for the purpose of consultation on the contents, but that it would not be published in this way. The contents would appear in the electronic policy manual, where access would be directed to the relevant section for the entered search. Members advised that there should be cross referencing when similar issues were covered in separate policies.

Adrian advised that there were sections currently incomplete as full ISA guidance had not been published on all of the issues.

Regulated Activity Providers (RAPs)

Members discussed the following proposals for the designation of RAPs:

- Bishops/Archbishops: Are designated the RAPs for parish priests and clergy working within the jurisdiction of their Diocese.
- Congregation Leader/Local Superior: Are designated the RAPs for members of Religious Orders.
- Parish Priests: Are designated the RAPs for the activities that involve volunteer groups that are taking place within their parish.
- Activities delivered by Religious: The “local manager” is designated the RAP for activities delivered by Religious for example Care Home Manager; Retreat Centre Manager etc
- Catholic organisations that have their own charitable identity: Where a Catholic organisation has its own charitable status or identity, the organisation is the RAP (although that activity may be operating within parishes). For example it is the responsibility of St Vincent de Paul Society to ensure that those working for that organisation are ISA registered. Additionally in the event that one of their helpers was subsequently barred by the ISA from working with vulnerable groups, SVP would be responsible for removing that person from any regulated activity post they were undertaking on behalf of SVP.
- Catholic schools: The RAP is as designated by the Catholic Education Service (CES) as per usual school directives.

**It was agreed that** the definition for Congregation Leader/Local Superior should have “in the country” added, as the responsibility would lie with the leader resident in England or Wales. **(ACTION: A Child)**

Members also discussed the role of Trustees, with ultimate responsibility for employment contracts, and whether this responsibility could be delegated under the RAP regulations.

**It was agreed that** Valerie Brasse would seek clarification on this. **(ACTION: V B)**

**5c Workload tracker**

Members noted the contents of the workload Tracker which had been circulated prior to the meeting. There was concern that there was delay in the presentation of the “Information Sharing Policy” to the Commission. Adrian Child explained that this was due to the need to clarify issues about data protection and the sharing of information across the dioceses and religious congregations which had been highlighted during the Reviews

of certain cases. The dioceses and orders, as charities in their own right each have their own data protection controller. He advised that the CCIA had commissioned Hill Dickinson Solicitors to provide a protocol outlining the position of the Church with regard to data protection and any exemptions which may apply in the application of the Review and Investigation protocols.

#### **5d Organisational Structures review –update.**

The Chair welcomed Carol Parry and Peter Turner who were present for this item.

The paper – “A Review of (Diocesan) Safeguarding Organisational Structures in the Catholic Dioceses of England and Wales” had been circulated prior to the meeting.

Peter Turner explained that the working group had initially been tasked with reviewing both diocesan and religious safeguarding structures. However this had not been possible and the first review looked at diocesan structures.

The members of the working group were:

Peter Turner: Chair of Working Group & Safeguarding Adviser, Westminster

Carol Parry: National Training & Development Adviser, CSAS

Jane Jones: Safeguarding Coordinator, Birmingham

Fr Kieron O'Brien: Safeguarding Coordinator, Arundel & Brighton

Sr Darryl Candy: Religious Safeguarding Coordinator

Fr Ray Collier: Religious Safeguarding Representative

And the Terms of reference were:

- To consider needs and draw conclusions about appropriate levels of safeguarding resources to ensure that Dioceses fulfil their safeguarding responsibilities to children, young people and vulnerable adults;
- To identify current levels of resources allocated to safeguarding in Dioceses and Congregations;
- To identify how current systems and lines of accountability are working;
- To identify strengths and limitations in the way that resources are allocated and systems are working;
- To report on findings and make recommendations about what constitutes an appropriate structure and level of safeguarding resource for Dioceses and Congregations.

The review commenced with a focus group from the Safeguarding Coordinators and Officers meeting and was followed with four separate questionnaires which had been sent to:

- All Bishops
- All Safeguarding Coordinators
- All Safeguarding Officers/Advisers
- All Diocesan Financial Secretaries.

All of the returns were anonymised before being seen by the working group.

Carl Parry informed the members that a thematic analysis of the returns was carried out before making the ten recommendations in the report. The recommendations were then discussed in turn.

It was agreed that there should be an implementation plan. Valerie Brasse and Susie Hayward agreed to join the working group to develop the plan.

**(ACTION: P Turner, C Parry, V B and S H)**

The Chair thanked Carol and Peter for their work and for the helpful contribution to the debate.

## **6 Sub Groups**

### **6a Non aligned Religious- progress report**

Jane Bertelsen reported that Sr Helen had now contacted all religious orders in England and Wales. She had found that 189 orders were not aligned to a safeguarding commission, and of these 85 were not members of CoR. 145 orders were aligned to a safeguarding commission.

Sr Helen is now collecting all of the contact details for the aligned orders. She will then collect the contact details of the non aligned orders.

There was discussion on the next phase of the project and the need to identify priorities for work within the group of non aligned orders.  
Members also discussed the relationship between the Religious Safeguarding Commissions and the CoR, and were informed by the Chair of the meeting which had taken place earlier that morning.  
It was agreed that the NCSC should request a meeting with the CoR Executive concerning the responsibility for Safeguarding within the Religious Orders and Restructuring of the Religious Safeguarding Commissions. **(ACTION: Chair)**

## **6b Policy**

### **i Thematic Reviews**

This item was discussed under 4a 6b earlier in the meeting.

### **ii Review Protocol**

Members noted the proposed changes to the Review Protocol, circulated prior to the meeting and which had been considered by the Policy subgroup. .

Members noted that legal advice concerning third party disclosure was the responsibility of the Safeguarding Coordinator. Adrian Child advised that the protocol was working, but there were problems with the timescale for the reviews.

Review Panel members with expertise in Safeguarding Vulnerable Adults had not yet been required to attend a review panel. It was agreed that Adrian Child would contact them. **(ACTION: A Child)**

### **iii Domestic Abuse**

Adrian Child referred to the papers which had been circulated prior to the meeting and reminded members that this had been a three way project between the Department for Family Life (CBCEW), CARITAS Social Action and CSAS.

The documents would be incorporated in the e-policy as guidance. He advised that there is a wider project which will include training material, with a CD, for parish and other church groups.

### **iv Independent Investigation**

Adrian Child referred to the report on the pilot study, which had been circulated prior to the meeting.

He reminded members that initially the pilot was to have been carried out in the Northern Province, but as this had not been practicable the pilot was extended across England and Wales. Problems identified were:

#### *General Protocol Issues:*

- Definitions required for "independent" and "investigation." Neither term appear appropriate.
- Clarification of status of and support for investigators whilst undertaking this work if they are employed within another Diocese.
- Clarification around the panel hearing in terms of support for any victims/witnesses.
- Within current arrangements for the religious, how would a panel hearing be set up?
- Clarification regarding data protection issues

#### *Servicing issues*

- Who provides administrative support?
- Who provides legal or canonical advice and support?
- Who supervises or supports the investigator?

Following discussion **it was agreed that** the original working group should draw up a revised protocol. The revised protocol would be presented at a future meeting of the NCSC. **(ACTION: A Child and R B)**

## **7 NCSC Organisational issues**

### **7a Terms of Reference CoR approval**

This item was discussed under item 4a 7b above

### **7b NCSC Strategic Business Plan**

The revised paper had been circulated prior to the meeting and was accepted by the Members

### **7c Work Programme and review of Cumberlege recommendations**

The updated paper had been circulated prior to the meeting.

It was noted that:

- under Administration, item 2, the support for the CSAS management Committee should be recorded as **CSAS**.
- under Administration item 6, Attendance at Diocesan and Religious Commission meetings- it should be recorded that the Religious Safeguarding Coordinators and Officers meetings are attended by members of the NCSC every quarter.
- under Cumberlege Recommendations to be addressed- no 44 should show that that recommendation is included in the Independent Risk Assessment Protocol.

**(ACTION: R A)**

#### **7d Budget report 2009 and Budget allocation for 2010**

Members noted the content of the draft budget report for 2009 which had been circulated prior to the meeting.

The Chair advised members that the NCSC had not yet received its budget allocation for 2010 and that CSAS had received its budget allocation in February. There had been a number of items removed from the previously agreed CSAS budget.

Charles Wookey joined the meeting and was welcomed by the Chair. He apologised for the delays in advising CSAS of their budget for 2010 and agreed that the terms of reference for agreeing the budget should have been followed and there should have been an explanation concerning the items deleted from the budget. He agreed that the budget should be reinstated for TriX, and advised that he was seeking a one off grant for the remaining IT items relating to the National Data Base and the key fobs. He advised, and Adrian Child confirmed, that there had been an agreement to defer the EBulk project to 2011.

Charles went on to suggest that the draft budget plan for 2011 should be developed and discussion commence during the summer, in order to meet the budgeting timetable. He also advised that the CSAS proposals should be presented with a supporting statement from the NCSC, confirming that the budget is appropriate for the work to be carried out.

Members expressed their concern that outside funding was being sought for what is a statutory requirement and also questioned the removal of the Training budget for CSAS staff. Charles explained that this may be due to the centralization of the training budget within CBCEW, where training could be provided more efficiently for greater numbers of staff, but agreed that it was unsatisfactory to have it removed without explanation.

Members also expressed their concern about problems with the management of the IT servers and the National Data Base. Charles advised that the Assistant General Secretary for operations had written to Bishop Lang with proposals to improve this and that work would start immediately. Declan Lang confirmed that he had received the letter and would now reply to the AGS (operations).

The Chair thanked Charles for attending the meeting.

**It was agreed that** the budget timetable should be obtained from CBCEW and made available to members for the June meeting, **(ACTION: RA)**

#### **7e Membership of NCSC**

The Chair advised members that Steve Landy (representing Chairs of Religious Commissions) had retired from his post with the NSPCC and therefore resigned his membership of the NCSC and Ann Collier (Lay representative) and John Rawsthorne (CBCEW Representative) had decided not to seek a further term of office. Ann Cunningham (CoR Representative) was prepared to serve a second term of office and this had been supported by CoR.

The CBCEW will nominate the replacement for John Rawsthorne at their Low Week meeting.

It was agreed that

- the Chair should approach the chairs of Religious Safeguarding Commissions for a nomination to replace Steve Landy **(ACTION: Chair)**
- an advert be placed for a new lay member **(ACTION: Chair and RA)**

Members asked whether the advert could be for more than one lay member, but were advised that a change to the membership would have to be approved by the CBCEW and the CoR.

**7f Diocesan and Religious Commission**

**i attendance at meetings**

Members were referred to the addition of some dates for the programme of Diocesan and Religious Commission meetings and asked to inform Rose Anderson if they were able to attend any of the meetings. **(ACTION: R A)**

**ii Succession Planning for Regional Religious Commissions**

This item was discussed under item 6a above

**7g NCSC website - Update and activity report**

Rose Anderson reported that there had been no "contacts" via the website and that the weekly access to the site was between 70 and 100 hits. Members' passwords for the members' page of the site were circulated to those present.

**8 Annual Report**

**2009/2010- Costings**

Adrian Child referred to the paper which had been circulated prior to the meeting.

He proposed, and **it was agreed that** the design and printing should be carried out by Sarah Moss Designs.

**It was also agreed that** the number of leaflets be reduced for the 2009/2010 report.

**(ACTION A Child)**

**9 Anglophone conference 2010(31<sup>st</sup> May – 4<sup>th</sup> June) Dublin**

Members were advised that Peter Doyle would attend the conference in addition to the Chair, Rose Anderson and Mike Denton.

**Anglophone Conference 2011 – Rome**

Members were advised of the dates for the 2011 conference -30<sup>th</sup> May – 3<sup>rd</sup> June, and were reminded that it was the responsibility of England and Wales to organise this conference.

**10 Any other business**

There were no items of other business.

**11 Date and time of next meeting: 8th June 2010 commencing at 11.00**

Future meetings: 14<sup>th</sup> September, 14<sup>th</sup> December.

All meetings will be held at The Parish of Our Lady of Mount Carmel and St Simon Stock  
41 Kensington Church Street London W8 4BB

## NATIONAL CATHOLIC SAFEGUARDING COMMISSION

**Minutes of the Meeting held on Tuesday 9<sup>th</sup> March 2010 from 11.00 to 16.00**

**At: The Parish of Our Lady of Mount Carmel and St Simon Stock  
41 Kensington Church Street  
London W8 4BB**

**Present:** Bill Kilgallon (Chair)  
Sister Jane Bertelsen  
Roger Bird  
Father Matthew Blake  
Valerie Brasse  
Sister Ann Cunningham  
Bishop Peter Doyle  
Susie Hayward  
Bishop Declan Lang  
Father Kristian Paver  
Bishop John Rawsthorne (until item 7d)

**In attendance:** Adrian Child, Director, CSAS  
Rose Anderson, Secretary, NCSC  
Carol Parry, National Development and Learning Adviser, CSAS (for item 5d)  
Peter Turner, Safeguarding Officer, Archdiocese of Westminster (for item 5d)  
Charles Wookey, Assistant General Secretary, CBCEW (for item 7d)

1 **Apologies for absence were received from:** Kevin Caffrey and Ann Collier

2 **The opening prayer** was led by Bishop Peter Doyle.

3 **Minutes of the meeting held on 8<sup>th</sup> December 2009** were accepted as a correct record.

4 **Matters arising from the minutes of 8<sup>th</sup> December 2009:**

**4a. Action List:** The completed actions were noted

*6b Thematic Reviews.* **It was agreed that** Rose Anderson should contact Eileen Dunn to determine progress with the terms of Reference and Project Plan for Thematic Reviews. **(ACTION: RA)**

**It was also agreed that** the Chair and John Rawsthorne would consider who should represent the Bishops on this group **(ACTION: Chair and JR)**

Members were invited to join this group and give their names to The Chair.

**(ACTION: All)**

*7b Terms of Reference.*

It was noted that the CoR Executive were considering asking the members to approve these at the AGM on 25th March.

*7d Work programme- Recognitio.* There was discussion on the ramifications of applying for and gaining Recognitio, and the need for the policies to be clear and final. **It was agreed that** this should be kept under review, and that a complete package of policies would have to be presented to the Bishops' Conference prior to application for Recognitio. **(ACTION: ALL)**

Members were informed that during the recent Ad Limina visit to the Vatican the Bishops had been congratulated on their work to promote safeguarding in the Church in England and Wales.

**4b Other matters arising, not already on the agenda.** There were no other matters raised.

**CSAS****5a Management group – minutes of meeting held on 8<sup>th</sup> February 2010**

The Chair advised members that he and the vice chairs would be attending a meeting with the General Secretary of CBCEW at 16.30 that day, to discuss outstanding issues regarding the NCSC and CSAS budgets and the IT provision and support.

Referring to *item 3, Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith* Declan Lang advised members that the Vatican was seeking advice on the predictors of future behaviour of people who view abusive images of children. The Vatican had received conflicting advice on the predictors. **It was agreed that** at present the Commission was not in a position to offer this advice.

Referring to *item 4- IT Review Report* Adrian Child advised members that it was his view that there should be an independent IT system for CSAS.

Referring to *item 10 – Regional Religious Commissions* the Chair advised members that there had been a meeting to discuss this issue, earlier in the day and this would be reported under item 7f on the agenda.

**5b Safer Recruitment/ISA/CRB**

Revised Safer Recruitment /Selection Policies, Procedures and Codes of Practice.

Adrian Child advised members that the revised document had been seen by the Policy Subgroup. Members were impressed that the document covered the issues very comprehensively, but were concerned at the size of the document and the lack of definition of which parts were policy/procedure/guideline. Adrian advised that the paper version had been prepared for the purpose of consultation on the contents, but that it would not be published in this way. The contents would appear in the electronic policy manual, where access would be directed to the relevant section for the entered search. Members advised that there should be cross referencing when similar issues were covered in separate policies.

Adrian advised that there were sections currently incomplete as full ISA guidance had not been published on all of the issues.

Regulated Activity Providers (RAPs)

Members discussed the following proposals for the designation of RAPs:

- Bishops/Archbishops: Are designated the RAPs for parish priests and clergy working within the jurisdiction of their Diocese.
- Congregation Leader/Local Superior: Are designated the RAPs for members of Religious Orders.
- Parish Priests: Are designated the RAPs for the activities that involve volunteer groups that are taking place within their parish.
- Activities delivered by Religious: The “local manager” is designated the RAP for activities delivered by Religious for example Care Home Manager; Retreat Centre Manager etc
- Catholic organisations that have their own charitable identity: Where a Catholic organisation has its own charitable status or identity, the organisation is the RAP (although that activity may be operating within parishes). For example it is the responsibility of St Vincent de Paul Society to ensure that those working for that organisation are ISA registered. Additionally in the event that one of their helpers was subsequently barred by the ISA from working with vulnerable groups, SVP would be responsible for removing that person from any regulated activity post they were undertaking on behalf of SVP.
- Catholic schools: The RAP is as designated by the Catholic Education Service (CES) as per usual school directives.

**It was agreed that** the definition for Congregation Leader/Local Superior should have “in the country” added, as the responsibility would lie with the leader resident in England or Wales. **(ACTION: A Child)**

Members also discussed the role of Trustees, with ultimate responsibility for employment contracts, and whether this responsibility could be delegated under the RAP regulations.

**It was agreed that** Valerie Brasse would seek clarification on this. **(ACTION: V B)**

**5c Workload tracker**

Members noted the contents of the workload Tracker which had been circulated prior to the meeting. There was concern that there was delay in the presentation of the “Information Sharing Policy” to the Commission. Adrian Child explained that this was due to the need to clarify issues about data protection and the sharing of information across the dioceses and religious congregations which had been highlighted during the Reviews

of certain cases. The dioceses and orders, as charities in their own right each have their own data protection controller. He advised that the CCIA had commissioned Hill Dickinson Solicitors to provide a protocol outlining the position of the Church with regard to data protection and any exemptions which may apply in the application of the Review and Investigation protocols.

#### **5d Organisational Structures review –update.**

The Chair welcomed Carol Parry and Peter Turner who were present for this item.

The paper – “A Review of (Diocesan) Safeguarding Organisational Structures in the Catholic Dioceses of England and Wales” had been circulated prior to the meeting.

Peter Turner explained that the working group had initially been tasked with reviewing both diocesan and religious safeguarding structures. However this had not been possible and the first review looked at diocesan structures.

The members of the working group were:

Peter Turner: Chair of Working Group & Safeguarding Adviser, Westminster

Carol Parry: National Training & Development Adviser, CSAS

Jane Jones: Safeguarding Coordinator, Birmingham

Fr Kieron O'Brien: Safeguarding Coordinator, Arundel & Brighton

Sr Darryl Candy: Religious Safeguarding Coordinator

Fr Ray Collier: Religious Safeguarding Representative

And the Terms of reference were:

- To consider needs and draw conclusions about appropriate levels of safeguarding resources to ensure that Dioceses fulfil their safeguarding responsibilities to children, young people and vulnerable adults;
- To identify current levels of resources allocated to safeguarding in Dioceses and Congregations;
- To identify how current systems and lines of accountability are working;
- To identify strengths and limitations in the way that resources are allocated and systems are working;
- To report on findings and make recommendations about what constitutes an appropriate structure and level of safeguarding resource for Dioceses and Congregations.

The review commenced with a focus group from the Safeguarding Coordinators and Officers meeting and was followed with four separate questionnaires which had been sent to:

- All Bishops
- All Safeguarding Coordinators
- All Safeguarding Officers/Advisers
- All Diocesan Financial Secretaries.

All of the returns were anonymised before being seen by the working group.

Carl Parry informed the members that a thematic analysis of the returns was carried out before making the ten recommendations in the report. The recommendations were then discussed in turn.

It was agreed that there should be an implementation plan. Valerie Brasse and Susie Hayward agreed to join the working group to develop the plan.

**(ACTION: P Turner, C Parry, V B and S H)**

The Chair thanked Carol and Peter for their work and for the helpful contribution to the debate.

## **6 Sub Groups**

### **6a Non aligned Religious- progress report**

Jane Bertelsen reported that Sr Helen had now contacted all religious orders in England and Wales. She had found that 189 orders were not aligned to a safeguarding commission, and of these 85 were not members of CoR. 145 orders were aligned to a safeguarding commission.

Sr Helen is now collecting all of the contact details for the aligned orders. She will then collect the contact details of the non aligned orders.

There was discussion on the next phase of the project and the need to identify priorities for work within the group of non aligned orders.  
Members also discussed the relationship between the Religious Safeguarding Commissions and the CoR, and were informed by the Chair of the meeting which had taken place earlier that morning.  
It was agreed that the NCSC should request a meeting with the CoR Executive concerning the responsibility for Safeguarding within the Religious Orders and Restructuring of the Religious Safeguarding Commissions. **(ACTION: Chair)**

## **6b Policy**

### **i Thematic Reviews**

This item was discussed under 4a 6b earlier in the meeting.

### **ii Review Protocol**

Members noted the proposed changes to the Review Protocol, circulated prior to the meeting and which had been considered by the Policy subgroup. .

Members noted that legal advice concerning third party disclosure was the responsibility of the Safeguarding Coordinator. Adrian Child advised that the protocol was working, but there were problems with the timescale for the reviews.

Review Panel members with expertise in Safeguarding Vulnerable Adults had not yet been required to attend a review panel. It was agreed that Adrian Child would contact them. **(ACTION: A Child)**

### **iii Domestic Abuse**

Adrian Child referred to the papers which had been circulated prior to the meeting and reminded members that this had been a three way project between the Department for Family Life (CBCEW), CARITAS Social Action and CSAS.

The documents would be incorporated in the e-policy as guidance. He advised that there is a wider project which will include training material, with a CD, for parish and other church groups.

### **iv Independent Investigation**

Adrian Child referred to the report on the pilot study, which had been circulated prior to the meeting.

He reminded members that initially the pilot was to have been carried out in the Northern Province, but as this had not been practicable the pilot was extended across England and Wales. Problems identified were:

#### *General Protocol Issues:*

- Definitions required for "independent" and "investigation." Neither term appear appropriate.
- Clarification of status of and support for investigators whilst undertaking this work if they are employed within another Diocese.
- Clarification around the panel hearing in terms of support for any victims/witnesses.
- Within current arrangements for the religious, how would a panel hearing be set up?
- Clarification regarding data protection issues

#### *Servicing issues*

- Who provides administrative support?
- Who provides legal or canonical advice and support?
- Who supervises or supports the investigator?

Following discussion **it was agreed that** the original working group should draw up a revised protocol. The revised protocol would be presented at a future meeting of the NCSC. **(ACTION: A Child and R B)**

## **7 NCSC Organisational issues**

### **7a Terms of Reference CoR approval**

This item was discussed under item 4a 7b above

### **7b NCSC Strategic Business Plan**

The revised paper had been circulated prior to the meeting and was accepted by the Members

### **7c Work Programme and review of Cumberlege recommendations**

The updated paper had been circulated prior to the meeting.

It was noted that:

- under Administration, item 2, the support for the CSAS management Committee should be recorded as **CSAS**.
- under Administration item 6, Attendance at Diocesan and Religious Commission meetings- it should be recorded that the Religious Safeguarding Coordinators and Officers meetings are attended by members of the NCSC every quarter.
- under Cumberlege Recommendations to be addressed- no 44 should show that that recommendation is included in the Independent Risk Assessment Protocol.

**(ACTION: R A)**

#### **7d Budget report 2009 and Budget allocation for 2010**

Members noted the content of the draft budget report for 2009 which had been circulated prior to the meeting.

The Chair advised members that the NCSC had not yet received its budget allocation for 2010 and that CSAS had received its budget allocation in February. There had been a number of items removed from the previously agreed CSAS budget.

Charles Wookey joined the meeting and was welcomed by the Chair. He apologised for the delays in advising CSAS of their budget for 2010 and agreed that the terms of reference for agreeing the budget should have been followed and there should have been an explanation concerning the items deleted from the budget. He agreed that the budget should be reinstated for TriX, and advised that he was seeking a one off grant for the remaining IT items relating to the National Data Base and the key fobs. He advised, and Adrian Child confirmed, that there had been an agreement to defer the EBulk project to 2011.

Charles went on to suggest that the draft budget plan for 2011 should be developed and discussion commence during the summer, in order to meet the budgeting timetable. He also advised that the CSAS proposals should be presented with a supporting statement from the NCSC, confirming that the budget is appropriate for the work to be carried out.

Members expressed their concern that outside funding was being sought for what is a statutory requirement and also questioned the removal of the Training budget for CSAS staff. Charles explained that this may be due to the centralization of the training budget within CBCEW, where training could be provided more efficiently for greater numbers of staff, but agreed that it was unsatisfactory to have it removed without explanation.

Members also expressed their concern about problems with the management of the IT servers and the National Data Base. Charles advised that the Assistant General Secretary for operations had written to Bishop Lang with proposals to improve this and that work would start immediately. Declan Lang confirmed that he had received the letter and would now reply to the AGS (operations).

The Chair thanked Charles for attending the meeting.

**It was agreed that** the budget timetable should be obtained from CBCEW and made available to members for the June meeting, **(ACTION: RA)**

#### **7e Membership of NCSC**

The Chair advised members that Steve Landy (representing Chairs of Religious Commissions) had retired from his post with the NSPCC and therefore resigned his membership of the NCSC and Ann Collier (Lay representative) and John Rawsthorne (CBCEW Representative) had decided not to seek a further term of office. Ann Cunningham (CoR Representative) was prepared to serve a second term of office and this had been supported by CoR.

The CBCEW will nominate the replacement for John Rawsthorne at their Low Week meeting.

It was agreed that

- the Chair should approach the chairs of Religious Safeguarding Commissions for a nomination to replace Steve Landy **(ACTION: Chair)**
- an advert be placed for a new lay member **(ACTION: Chair and RA)**

Members asked whether the advert could be for more than one lay member, but were advised that a change to the membership would have to be approved by the CBCEW and the CoR.

**7f Diocesan and Religious Commission**

**i attendance at meetings**

Members were referred to the addition of some dates for the programme of Diocesan and Religious Commission meetings and asked to inform Rose Anderson if they were able to attend any of the meetings. **(ACTION: R A)**

**ii Succession Planning for Regional Religious Commissions**

This item was discussed under item 6a above

**7g NCSC website - Update and activity report**

Rose Anderson reported that there had been no "contacts" via the website and that the weekly access to the site was between 70 and 100 hits. Members' passwords for the members' page of the site were circulated to those present.

**8 Annual Report**

**2009/2010- Costings**

Adrian Child referred to the paper which had been circulated prior to the meeting.

He proposed, and **it was agreed that** the design and printing should be carried out by Sarah Moss Designs.

**It was also agreed that** the number of leaflets be reduced for the 2009/2010 report.

**(ACTION A Child)**

**9 Anglophone conference 2010(31<sup>st</sup> May – 4<sup>th</sup> June) Dublin**

Members were advised that Peter Doyle would attend the conference in addition to the Chair, Rose Anderson and Mike Denton.

**Anglophone Conference 2011 – Rome**

Members were advised of the dates for the 2011 conference -30<sup>th</sup> May – 3<sup>rd</sup> June, and were reminded that it was the responsibility of England and Wales to organise this conference.

**10 Any other business**

There were no items of other business.

**11 Date and time of next meeting: 8th June 2010 commencing at 11.00**

Future meetings: 14<sup>th</sup> September, 14<sup>th</sup> December.

All meetings will be held at The Parish of Our Lady of Mount Carmel and St Simon Stock  
41 Kensington Church Street London W8 4BB

## NATIONAL CATHOLIC SAFEGUARDING COMMISSION

**Minutes of the Meeting held on Tuesday 9<sup>th</sup> March 2010 from 11.00 to 16.00**

**At: The Parish of Our Lady of Mount Carmel and St Simon Stock  
41 Kensington Church Street  
London W8 4BB**

**Present:** Bill Kilgallon (Chair)  
Sister Jane Bertelsen  
Roger Bird  
Father Matthew Blake  
Valerie Brasse  
Sister Ann Cunningham  
Bishop Peter Doyle  
Susie Hayward  
Bishop Declan Lang  
Father Kristian Paver  
Bishop John Rawsthorne (until item 7d)

**In attendance:** Adrian Child, Director, CSAS  
Rose Anderson, Secretary, NCSC  
Carol Parry, National Development and Learning Adviser, CSAS (for item 5d)  
Peter Turner, Safeguarding Officer, Archdiocese of Westminster (for item 5d)  
Charles Wookey, Assistant General Secretary, CBCEW (for item 7d)

1 **Apologies for absence were received from:** Kevin Caffrey and Ann Collier

2 **The opening prayer** was led by Bishop Peter Doyle.

3 **Minutes of the meeting held on 8<sup>th</sup> December 2009** were accepted as a correct record.

4 **Matters arising from the minutes of 8<sup>th</sup> December 2009:**

**4a. Action List:** The completed actions were noted

*6b Thematic Reviews.* **It was agreed that** Rose Anderson should contact Eileen Dunn to determine progress with the terms of Reference and Project Plan for Thematic Reviews. **(ACTION: RA)**

**It was also agreed that** the Chair and John Rawsthorne would consider who should represent the Bishops on this group **(ACTION: Chair and JR)**

Members were invited to join this group and give their names to The Chair.

**(ACTION: All)**

*7b Terms of Reference.*

It was noted that the CoR Executive were considering asking the members to approve these at the AGM on 25th March.

*7d Work programme- Recognitio.* There was discussion on the ramifications of applying for and gaining Recognitio, and the need for the policies to be clear and final. **It was agreed that** this should be kept under review, and that a complete package of policies would have to be presented to the Bishops' Conference prior to application for Recognitio. **(ACTION: ALL)**

Members were informed that during the recent Ad Limina visit to the Vatican the Bishops had been congratulated on their work to promote safeguarding in the Church in England and Wales.

**4b Other matters arising, not already on the agenda.** There were no other matters raised.

**CSAS****5a Management group – minutes of meeting held on 8<sup>th</sup> February 2010**

The Chair advised members that he and the vice chairs would be attending a meeting with the General Secretary of CBCEW at 16.30 that day, to discuss outstanding issues regarding the NCSC and CSAS budgets and the IT provision and support.

Referring to *item 3, Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith* Declan Lang advised members that the Vatican was seeking advice on the predictors of future behaviour of people who view abusive images of children. The Vatican had received conflicting advice on the predictors. **It was agreed that** at present the Commission was not in a position to offer this advice.

Referring to *item 4- IT Review Report* Adrian Child advised members that it was his view that there should be an independent IT system for CSAS.

Referring to *item 10 – Regional Religious Commissions* the Chair advised members that there had been a meeting to discuss this issue, earlier in the day and this would be reported under item 7f on the agenda.

**5b Safer Recruitment/ISA/CRB**

Revised Safer Recruitment /Selection Policies, Procedures and Codes of Practice.

Adrian Child advised members that the revised document had been seen by the Policy Subgroup. Members were impressed that the document covered the issues very comprehensively, but were concerned at the size of the document and the lack of definition of which parts were policy/procedure/guideline. Adrian advised that the paper version had been prepared for the purpose of consultation on the contents, but that it would not be published in this way. The contents would appear in the electronic policy manual, where access would be directed to the relevant section for the entered search. Members advised that there should be cross referencing when similar issues were covered in separate policies.

Adrian advised that there were sections currently incomplete as full ISA guidance had not been published on all of the issues.

Regulated Activity Providers (RAPs)

Members discussed the following proposals for the designation of RAPs:

- Bishops/Archbishops: Are designated the RAPs for parish priests and clergy working within the jurisdiction of their Diocese.
- Congregation Leader/Local Superior: Are designated the RAPs for members of Religious Orders.
- Parish Priests: Are designated the RAPs for the activities that involve volunteer groups that are taking place within their parish.
- Activities delivered by Religious: The “local manager” is designated the RAP for activities delivered by Religious for example Care Home Manager; Retreat Centre Manager etc
- Catholic organisations that have their own charitable identity: Where a Catholic organisation has its own charitable status or identity, the organisation is the RAP (although that activity may be operating within parishes). For example it is the responsibility of St Vincent de Paul Society to ensure that those working for that organisation are ISA registered. Additionally in the event that one of their helpers was subsequently barred by the ISA from working with vulnerable groups, SVP would be responsible for removing that person from any regulated activity post they were undertaking on behalf of SVP.
- Catholic schools: The RAP is as designated by the Catholic Education Service (CES) as per usual school directives.

**It was agreed that** the definition for Congregation Leader/Local Superior should have “in the country” added, as the responsibility would lie with the leader resident in England or Wales. **(ACTION: A Child)**

Members also discussed the role of Trustees, with ultimate responsibility for employment contracts, and whether this responsibility could be delegated under the RAP regulations.

**It was agreed that** Valerie Brasse would seek clarification on this. **(ACTION: V B)**

**5c Workload tracker**

Members noted the contents of the workload Tracker which had been circulated prior to the meeting. There was concern that there was delay in the presentation of the “Information Sharing Policy” to the Commission. Adrian Child explained that this was due to the need to clarify issues about data protection and the sharing of information across the dioceses and religious congregations which had been highlighted during the Reviews

of certain cases. The dioceses and orders, as charities in their own right each have their own data protection controller. He advised that the CCIA had commissioned Hill Dickinson Solicitors to provide a protocol outlining the position of the Church with regard to data protection and any exemptions which may apply in the application of the Review and Investigation protocols.

#### **5d Organisational Structures review –update.**

The Chair welcomed Carol Parry and Peter Turner who were present for this item.

The paper – “A Review of (Diocesan) Safeguarding Organisational Structures in the Catholic Dioceses of England and Wales” had been circulated prior to the meeting.

Peter Turner explained that the working group had initially been tasked with reviewing both diocesan and religious safeguarding structures. However this had not been possible and the first review looked at diocesan structures.

The members of the working group were:

Peter Turner: Chair of Working Group & Safeguarding Adviser, Westminster

Carol Parry: National Training & Development Adviser, CSAS

Jane Jones: Safeguarding Coordinator, Birmingham

Fr Kieron O'Brien: Safeguarding Coordinator, Arundel & Brighton

Sr Darryl Candy: Religious Safeguarding Coordinator

Fr Ray Collier: Religious Safeguarding Representative

And the Terms of reference were:

- To consider needs and draw conclusions about appropriate levels of safeguarding resources to ensure that Dioceses fulfil their safeguarding responsibilities to children, young people and vulnerable adults;
- To identify current levels of resources allocated to safeguarding in Dioceses and Congregations;
- To identify how current systems and lines of accountability are working;
- To identify strengths and limitations in the way that resources are allocated and systems are working;
- To report on findings and make recommendations about what constitutes an appropriate structure and level of safeguarding resource for Dioceses and Congregations.

The review commenced with a focus group from the Safeguarding Coordinators and Officers meeting and was followed with four separate questionnaires which had been sent to:

- All Bishops
- All Safeguarding Coordinators
- All Safeguarding Officers/Advisers
- All Diocesan Financial Secretaries.

All of the returns were anonymised before being seen by the working group.

Carl Parry informed the members that a thematic analysis of the returns was carried out before making the ten recommendations in the report. The recommendations were then discussed in turn.

It was agreed that there should be an implementation plan. Valerie Brasse and Susie Hayward agreed to join the working group to develop the plan.

**(ACTION: P Turner, C Parry, V B and S H)**

The Chair thanked Carol and Peter for their work and for the helpful contribution to the debate.

## **6 Sub Groups**

### **6a Non aligned Religious- progress report**

Jane Bertelsen reported that Sr Helen had now contacted all religious orders in England and Wales. She had found that 189 orders were not aligned to a safeguarding commission, and of these 85 were not members of CoR. 145 orders were aligned to a safeguarding commission.

Sr Helen is now collecting all of the contact details for the aligned orders. She will then collect the contact details of the non aligned orders.

There was discussion on the next phase of the project and the need to identify priorities for work within the group of non aligned orders.  
Members also discussed the relationship between the Religious Safeguarding Commissions and the CoR, and were informed by the Chair of the meeting which had taken place earlier that morning.  
It was agreed that the NCSC should request a meeting with the CoR Executive concerning the responsibility for Safeguarding within the Religious Orders and Restructuring of the Religious Safeguarding Commissions. **(ACTION: Chair)**

## **6b Policy**

### **i Thematic Reviews**

This item was discussed under 4a 6b earlier in the meeting.

### **ii Review Protocol**

Members noted the proposed changes to the Review Protocol, circulated prior to the meeting and which had been considered by the Policy subgroup. .  
Members noted that legal advice concerning third party disclosure was the responsibility of the Safeguarding Coordinator. Adrian Child advised that the protocol was working, but there were problems with the timescale for the reviews.  
Review Panel members with expertise in Safeguarding Vulnerable Adults had not yet been required to attend a review panel. It was agreed that Adrian Child would contact them. **(ACTION: A Child)**

### **iii Domestic Abuse**

Adrian Child referred to the papers which had been circulated prior to the meeting and reminded members that this had been a three way project between the Department for Family Life (CBCEW), CARITAS Social Action and CSAS.  
The documents would be incorporated in the e-policy as guidance. He advised that there is a wider project which will include training material, with a CD, for parish and other church groups.

### **iv Independent Investigation**

Adrian Child referred to the report on the pilot study, which had been circulated prior to the meeting.  
He reminded members that initially the pilot was to have been carried out in the Northern Province, but as this had not been practicable the pilot was extended across England and Wales. Problems identified were:

#### *General Protocol Issues:*

- Definitions required for "independent" and "investigation." Neither term appear appropriate.
- Clarification of status of and support for investigators whilst undertaking this work if they are employed within another Diocese.
- Clarification around the panel hearing in terms of support for any victims/witnesses.
- Within current arrangements for the religious, how would a panel hearing be set up?
- Clarification regarding data protection issues

#### *Servicing issues*

- Who provides administrative support?
- Who provides legal or canonical advice and support?
- Who supervises or supports the investigator?

Following discussion **it was agreed that** the original working group should draw up a revised protocol. The revised protocol would be presented at a future meeting of the NCSC. **(ACTION: A Child and R B)**

## **7 NCSC Organisational issues**

### **7a Terms of Reference CoR approval**

This item was discussed under item 4a 7b above

### **7b NCSC Strategic Business Plan**

The revised paper had been circulated prior to the meeting and was accepted by the Members

### **7c Work Programme and review of Cumberlege recommendations**

The updated paper had been circulated prior to the meeting.  
It was noted that:

- under Administration, item 2, the support for the CSAS management Committee should be recorded as **CSAS**.
- under Administration item 6, Attendance at Diocesan and Religious Commission meetings- it should be recorded that the Religious Safeguarding Coordinators and Officers meetings are attended by members of the NCSC every quarter.
- under Cumberlege Recommendations to be addressed- no 44 should show that that recommendation is included in the Independent Risk Assessment Protocol.

**(ACTION: R A)**

#### **7d Budget report 2009 and Budget allocation for 2010**

Members noted the content of the draft budget report for 2009 which had been circulated prior to the meeting.

The Chair advised members that the NCSC had not yet received its budget allocation for 2010 and that CSAS had received its budget allocation in February. There had been a number of items removed from the previously agreed CSAS budget.

Charles Wookey joined the meeting and was welcomed by the Chair. He apologised for the delays in advising CSAS of their budget for 2010 and agreed that the terms of reference for agreeing the budget should have been followed and there should have been an explanation concerning the items deleted from the budget. He agreed that the budget should be reinstated for TriX, and advised that he was seeking a one off grant for the remaining IT items relating to the National Data Base and the key fobs. He advised, and Adrian Child confirmed, that there had been an agreement to defer the EBulk project to 2011.

Charles went on to suggest that the draft budget plan for 2011 should be developed and discussion commence during the summer, in order to meet the budgeting timetable. He also advised that the CSAS proposals should be presented with a supporting statement from the NCSC, confirming that the budget is appropriate for the work to be carried out.

Members expressed their concern that outside funding was being sought for what is a statutory requirement and also questioned the removal of the Training budget for CSAS staff. Charles explained that this may be due to the centralization of the training budget within CBCEW, where training could be provided more efficiently for greater numbers of staff, but agreed that it was unsatisfactory to have it removed without explanation.

Members also expressed their concern about problems with the management of the IT servers and the National Data Base. Charles advised that the Assistant General Secretary for operations had written to Bishop Lang with proposals to improve this and that work would start immediately. Declan Lang confirmed that he had received the letter and would now reply to the AGS (operations).

The Chair thanked Charles for attending the meeting.

**It was agreed that** the budget timetable should be obtained from CBCEW and made available to members for the June meeting, **(ACTION: RA)**

#### **7e Membership of NCSC**

The Chair advised members that Steve Landy (representing Chairs of Religious Commissions) had retired from his post with the NSPCC and therefore resigned his membership of the NCSC and Ann Collier (Lay representative) and John Rawsthorne (CBCEW Representative) had decided not to seek a further term of office. Ann Cunningham (CoR Representative) was prepared to serve a second term of office and this had been supported by CoR.

The CBCEW will nominate the replacement for John Rawsthorne at their Low Week meeting.

It was agreed that

- the Chair should approach the chairs of Religious Safeguarding Commissions for a nomination to replace Steve Landy **(ACTION: Chair)**
- an advert be placed for a new lay member **(ACTION: Chair and RA)**

Members asked whether the advert could be for more than one lay member, but were advised that a change to the membership would have to be approved by the CBCEW and the CoR.

**7f Diocesan and Religious Commission**

**i attendance at meetings**

Members were referred to the addition of some dates for the programme of Diocesan and Religious Commission meetings and asked to inform Rose Anderson if they were able to attend any of the meetings. **(ACTION: R A)**

**ii Succession Planning for Regional Religious Commissions**

This item was discussed under item 6a above

**7g NCSC website - Update and activity report**

Rose Anderson reported that there had been no "contacts" via the website and that the weekly access to the site was between 70 and 100 hits. Members' passwords for the members' page of the site were circulated to those present.

**8 Annual Report**

**2009/2010- Costings**

Adrian Child referred to the paper which had been circulated prior to the meeting.

He proposed, and **it was agreed that** the design and printing should be carried out by Sarah Moss Designs.

**It was also agreed that** the number of leaflets be reduced for the 2009/2010 report.

**(ACTION A Child)**

**9 Anglophone conference 2010(31<sup>st</sup> May – 4<sup>th</sup> June) Dublin**

Members were advised that Peter Doyle would attend the conference in addition to the Chair, Rose Anderson and Mike Denton.

**Anglophone Conference 2011 – Rome**

Members were advised of the dates for the 2011 conference -30<sup>th</sup> May – 3<sup>rd</sup> June, and were reminded that it was the responsibility of England and Wales to organise this conference.

**10 Any other business**

There were no items of other business.

**11 Date and time of next meeting: 8th June 2010 commencing at 11.00**

Future meetings: 14<sup>th</sup> September, 14<sup>th</sup> December.

All meetings will be held at The Parish of Our Lady of Mount Carmel and St Simon Stock  
41 Kensington Church Street London W8 4BB

## NATIONAL CATHOLIC SAFEGUARDING COMMISSION

**Minutes of the Meeting held on Tuesday 9<sup>th</sup> March 2010 from 11.00 to 16.00**

**At: The Parish of Our Lady of Mount Carmel and St Simon Stock  
41 Kensington Church Street  
London W8 4BB**

**Present:** Bill Kilgallon (Chair)  
Sister Jane Bertelsen  
Roger Bird  
Father Matthew Blake  
Valerie Brasse  
Sister Ann Cunningham  
Bishop Peter Doyle  
Susie Hayward  
Bishop Declan Lang  
Father Kristian Paver  
Bishop John Rawsthorne (until item 7d)

**In attendance:** Adrian Child, Director, CSAS  
Rose Anderson, Secretary, NCSC  
Carol Parry, National Development and Learning Adviser, CSAS (for item 5d)  
Peter Turner, Safeguarding Officer, Archdiocese of Westminster (for item 5d)  
Charles Wookey, Assistant General Secretary, CBCEW (for item 7d)

1 **Apologies for absence were received from:** Kevin Caffrey and Ann Collier

2 **The opening prayer** was led by Bishop Peter Doyle.

3 **Minutes of the meeting held on 8<sup>th</sup> December 2009** were accepted as a correct record.

4 **Matters arising from the minutes of 8<sup>th</sup> December 2009:**

**4a. Action List:** The completed actions were noted

*6b Thematic Reviews.* **It was agreed that** Rose Anderson should contact Eileen Dunn to determine progress with the terms of Reference and Project Plan for Thematic Reviews. **(ACTION: RA)**

**It was also agreed that** the Chair and John Rawsthorne would consider who should represent the Bishops on this group **(ACTION: Chair and JR)**

Members were invited to join this group and give their names to The Chair.

**(ACTION: All)**

*7b Terms of Reference.*

It was noted that the CoR Executive were considering asking the members to approve these at the AGM on 25th March.

*7d Work programme- Recognitio.* There was discussion on the ramifications of applying for and gaining Recognitio, and the need for the policies to be clear and final. **It was agreed that** this should be kept under review, and that a complete package of policies would have to be presented to the Bishops' Conference prior to application for Recognitio. **(ACTION: ALL)**

Members were informed that during the recent Ad Limina visit to the Vatican the Bishops had been congratulated on their work to promote safeguarding in the Church in England and Wales.

**4b Other matters arising, not already on the agenda.** There were no other matters raised.

**CSAS****5a Management group – minutes of meeting held on 8<sup>th</sup> February 2010**

The Chair advised members that he and the vice chairs would be attending a meeting with the General Secretary of CBCEW at 16.30 that day, to discuss outstanding issues regarding the NCSC and CSAS budgets and the IT provision and support.

Referring to *item 3, Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith* Declan Lang advised members that the Vatican was seeking advice on the predictors of future behaviour of people who view abusive images of children. The Vatican had received conflicting advice on the predictors. **It was agreed that** at present the Commission was not in a position to offer this advice.

Referring to *item 4- IT Review Report* Adrian Child advised members that it was his view that there should be an independent IT system for CSAS.

Referring to *item 10 – Regional Religious Commissions* the Chair advised members that there had been a meeting to discuss this issue, earlier in the day and this would be reported under item 7f on the agenda.

**5b Safer Recruitment/ISA/CRB**

Revised Safer Recruitment /Selection Policies, Procedures and Codes of Practice.

Adrian Child advised members that the revised document had been seen by the Policy Subgroup. Members were impressed that the document covered the issues very comprehensively, but were concerned at the size of the document and the lack of definition of which parts were policy/procedure/guideline. Adrian advised that the paper version had been prepared for the purpose of consultation on the contents, but that it would not be published in this way. The contents would appear in the electronic policy manual, where access would be directed to the relevant section for the entered search. Members advised that there should be cross referencing when similar issues were covered in separate policies.

Adrian advised that there were sections currently incomplete as full ISA guidance had not been published on all of the issues.

Regulated Activity Providers (RAPs)

Members discussed the following proposals for the designation of RAPs:

- Bishops/Archbishops: Are designated the RAPs for parish priests and clergy working within the jurisdiction of their Diocese.
- Congregation Leader/Local Superior: Are designated the RAPs for members of Religious Orders.
- Parish Priests: Are designated the RAPs for the activities that involve volunteer groups that are taking place within their parish.
- Activities delivered by Religious: The “local manager” is designated the RAP for activities delivered by Religious for example Care Home Manager; Retreat Centre Manager etc
- Catholic organisations that have their own charitable identity: Where a Catholic organisation has its own charitable status or identity, the organisation is the RAP (although that activity may be operating within parishes). For example it is the responsibility of St Vincent de Paul Society to ensure that those working for that organisation are ISA registered. Additionally in the event that one of their helpers was subsequently barred by the ISA from working with vulnerable groups, SVP would be responsible for removing that person from any regulated activity post they were undertaking on behalf of SVP.
- Catholic schools: The RAP is as designated by the Catholic Education Service (CES) as per usual school directives.

**It was agreed that** the definition for Congregation Leader/Local Superior should have “in the country” added, as the responsibility would lie with the leader resident in England or Wales. **(ACTION: A Child)**

Members also discussed the role of Trustees, with ultimate responsibility for employment contracts, and whether this responsibility could be delegated under the RAP regulations.

**It was agreed that** Valerie Brasse would seek clarification on this. **(ACTION: V B)**

**5c Workload tracker**

Members noted the contents of the workload Tracker which had been circulated prior to the meeting. There was concern that there was delay in the presentation of the “Information Sharing Policy” to the Commission. Adrian Child explained that this was due to the need to clarify issues about data protection and the sharing of information across the dioceses and religious congregations which had been highlighted during the Reviews

of certain cases. The dioceses and orders, as charities in their own right each have their own data protection controller. He advised that the CCIA had commissioned Hill Dickinson Solicitors to provide a protocol outlining the position of the Church with regard to data protection and any exemptions which may apply in the application of the Review and Investigation protocols.

#### **5d Organisational Structures review –update.**

The Chair welcomed Carol Parry and Peter Turner who were present for this item.

The paper – “A Review of (Diocesan) Safeguarding Organisational Structures in the Catholic Dioceses of England and Wales” had been circulated prior to the meeting.

Peter Turner explained that the working group had initially been tasked with reviewing both diocesan and religious safeguarding structures. However this had not been possible and the first review looked at diocesan structures.

The members of the working group were:

Peter Turner: Chair of Working Group & Safeguarding Adviser, Westminster  
Carol Parry: National Training & Development Adviser, CSAS  
Jane Jones: Safeguarding Coordinator, Birmingham  
Fr Kieron O'Brien: Safeguarding Coordinator, Arundel & Brighton  
Sr Darryl Candy: Religious Safeguarding Coordinator  
Fr Ray Collier: Religious Safeguarding Representative

And the Terms of reference were:

- To consider needs and draw conclusions about appropriate levels of safeguarding resources to ensure that Dioceses fulfil their safeguarding responsibilities to children, young people and vulnerable adults;
- To identify current levels of resources allocated to safeguarding in Dioceses and Congregations;
- To identify how current systems and lines of accountability are working;
- To identify strengths and limitations in the way that resources are allocated and systems are working;
- To report on findings and make recommendations about what constitutes an appropriate structure and level of safeguarding resource for Dioceses and Congregations.

The review commenced with a focus group from the Safeguarding Coordinators and Officers meeting and was followed with four separate questionnaires which had been sent to:

- All Bishops
- All Safeguarding Coordinators
- All Safeguarding Officers/Advisers
- All Diocesan Financial Secretaries.

All of the returns were anonymised before being seen by the working group.

Carl Parry informed the members that a thematic analysis of the returns was carried out before making the ten recommendations in the report. The recommendations were then discussed in turn.

It was agreed that there should be an implementation plan. Valerie Brasse and Susie Hayward agreed to join the working group to develop the plan.

**(ACTION: P Turner, C Parry, V B and S H)**

The Chair thanked Carol and Peter for their work and for the helpful contribution to the debate.

## **6 Sub Groups**

### **6a Non aligned Religious- progress report**

Jane Bertelsen reported that Sr Helen had now contacted all religious orders in England and Wales. She had found that 189 orders were not aligned to a safeguarding commission, and of these 85 were not members of CoR. 145 orders were aligned to a safeguarding commission.

Sr Helen is now collecting all of the contact details for the aligned orders. She will then collect the contact details of the non aligned orders.

There was discussion on the next phase of the project and the need to identify priorities for work within the group of non aligned orders.  
Members also discussed the relationship between the Religious Safeguarding Commissions and the CoR, and were informed by the Chair of the meeting which had taken place earlier that morning.  
It was agreed that the NCSC should request a meeting with the CoR Executive concerning the responsibility for Safeguarding within the Religious Orders and Restructuring of the Religious Safeguarding Commissions. **(ACTION: Chair)**

## **6b Policy**

### **i Thematic Reviews**

This item was discussed under 4a 6b earlier in the meeting.

### **ii Review Protocol**

Members noted the proposed changes to the Review Protocol, circulated prior to the meeting and which had been considered by the Policy subgroup. .

Members noted that legal advice concerning third party disclosure was the responsibility of the Safeguarding Coordinator. Adrian Child advised that the protocol was working, but there were problems with the timescale for the reviews.

Review Panel members with expertise in Safeguarding Vulnerable Adults had not yet been required to attend a review panel. It was agreed that Adrian Child would contact them. **(ACTION: A Child)**

### **iii Domestic Abuse**

Adrian Child referred to the papers which had been circulated prior to the meeting and reminded members that this had been a three way project between the Department for Family Life (CBCEW), CARITAS Social Action and CSAS.

The documents would be incorporated in the e-policy as guidance. He advised that there is a wider project which will include training material, with a CD, for parish and other church groups.

### **iv Independent Investigation**

Adrian Child referred to the report on the pilot study, which had been circulated prior to the meeting.

He reminded members that initially the pilot was to have been carried out in the Northern Province, but as this had not been practicable the pilot was extended across England and Wales. Problems identified were:

#### *General Protocol Issues:*

- Definitions required for "independent" and "investigation." Neither term appear appropriate.
- Clarification of status of and support for investigators whilst undertaking this work if they are employed within another Diocese.
- Clarification around the panel hearing in terms of support for any victims/witnesses.
- Within current arrangements for the religious, how would a panel hearing be set up?
- Clarification regarding data protection issues

#### *Servicing issues*

- Who provides administrative support?
- Who provides legal or canonical advice and support?
- Who supervises or supports the investigator?

Following discussion **it was agreed that** the original working group should draw up a revised protocol. The revised protocol would be presented at a future meeting of the NCSC. **(ACTION: A Child and R B)**

## **7 NCSC Organisational issues**

### **7a Terms of Reference CoR approval**

This item was discussed under item 4a 7b above

### **7b NCSC Strategic Business Plan**

The revised paper had been circulated prior to the meeting and was accepted by the Members

### **7c Work Programme and review of Cumberlege recommendations**

The updated paper had been circulated prior to the meeting.

It was noted that:

- under Administration, item 2, the support for the CSAS management Committee should be recorded as **CSAS**.
- under Administration item 6, Attendance at Diocesan and Religious Commission meetings- it should be recorded that the Religious Safeguarding Coordinators and Officers meetings are attended by members of the NCSC every quarter.
- under Cumberlege Recommendations to be addressed- no 44 should show that that recommendation is included in the Independent Risk Assessment Protocol.

**(ACTION: R A)**

#### **7d Budget report 2009 and Budget allocation for 2010**

Members noted the content of the draft budget report for 2009 which had been circulated prior to the meeting.

The Chair advised members that the NCSC had not yet received its budget allocation for 2010 and that CSAS had received its budget allocation in February. There had been a number of items removed from the previously agreed CSAS budget.

Charles Wookey joined the meeting and was welcomed by the Chair. He apologised for the delays in advising CSAS of their budget for 2010 and agreed that the terms of reference for agreeing the budget should have been followed and there should have been an explanation concerning the items deleted from the budget. He agreed that the budget should be reinstated for TriX, and advised that he was seeking a one off grant for the remaining IT items relating to the National Data Base and the key fobs. He advised, and Adrian Child confirmed, that there had been an agreement to defer the EBulk project to 2011.

Charles went on to suggest that the draft budget plan for 2011 should be developed and discussion commence during the summer, in order to meet the budgeting timetable. He also advised that the CSAS proposals should be presented with a supporting statement from the NCSC, confirming that the budget is appropriate for the work to be carried out.

Members expressed their concern that outside funding was being sought for what is a statutory requirement and also questioned the removal of the Training budget for CSAS staff. Charles explained that this may be due to the centralization of the training budget within CBCEW, where training could be provided more efficiently for greater numbers of staff, but agreed that it was unsatisfactory to have it removed without explanation.

Members also expressed their concern about problems with the management of the IT servers and the National Data Base. Charles advised that the Assistant General Secretary for operations had written to Bishop Lang with proposals to improve this and that work would start immediately. Declan Lang confirmed that he had received the letter and would now reply to the AGS (operations).

The Chair thanked Charles for attending the meeting.

**It was agreed that** the budget timetable should be obtained from CBCEW and made available to members for the June meeting, **(ACTION: RA)**

#### **7e Membership of NCSC**

The Chair advised members that Steve Landy (representing Chairs of Religious Commissions) had retired from his post with the NSPCC and therefore resigned his membership of the NCSC and Ann Collier (Lay representative) and John Rawsthorne (CBCEW Representative) had decided not to seek a further term of office. Ann Cunningham (CoR Representative) was prepared to serve a second term of office and this had been supported by CoR.

The CBCEW will nominate the replacement for John Rawsthorne at their Low Week meeting.

It was agreed that

- the Chair should approach the chairs of Religious Safeguarding Commissions for a nomination to replace Steve Landy **(ACTION: Chair)**
- an advert be placed for a new lay member **(ACTION: Chair and RA)**

Members asked whether the advert could be for more than one lay member, but were advised that a change to the membership would have to be approved by the CBCEW and the CoR.

**7f Diocesan and Religious Commission**

**i attendance at meetings**

Members were referred to the addition of some dates for the programme of Diocesan and Religious Commission meetings and asked to inform Rose Anderson if they were able to attend any of the meetings. **(ACTION: R A)**

**ii Succession Planning for Regional Religious Commissions**

This item was discussed under item 6a above

**7g NCSC website - Update and activity report**

Rose Anderson reported that there had been no "contacts" via the website and that the weekly access to the site was between 70 and 100 hits. Members' passwords for the members' page of the site were circulated to those present.

**8 Annual Report**

**2009/2010- Costings**

Adrian Child referred to the paper which had been circulated prior to the meeting.

He proposed, and **it was agreed that** the design and printing should be carried out by Sarah Moss Designs.

**It was also agreed that** the number of leaflets be reduced for the 2009/2010 report.

**(ACTION A Child)**

**9 Anglophone conference 2010(31<sup>st</sup> May – 4<sup>th</sup> June) Dublin**

Members were advised that Peter Doyle would attend the conference in addition to the Chair, Rose Anderson and Mike Denton.

**Anglophone Conference 2011 – Rome**

Members were advised of the dates for the 2011 conference -30<sup>th</sup> May – 3<sup>rd</sup> June, and were reminded that it was the responsibility of England and Wales to organise this conference.

**10 Any other business**

There were no items of other business.

**11 Date and time of next meeting: 8th June 2010 commencing at 11.00**

Future meetings: 14<sup>th</sup> September, 14<sup>th</sup> December.

All meetings will be held at The Parish of Our Lady of Mount Carmel and St Simon Stock  
41 Kensington Church Street London W8 4BB