

34. Report on the Implementation of the Past Cases Review Report *Courage, Cost and Hope*

Contact name and details	The Revd Gwyneth Owen Chair of the Past Cases Review Implementation Group
Resolutions	See end of Report

Summary of content and impact

Subject and aims	To update the Conference on the implementation of the recommendations of the Past Cases Review Report <i>Courage, Cost and Hope</i>
Main points	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Significant progress has made in respect of most of the 23 recommendations. • Outstanding work to be completed is detailed with indications of expected completion/implantation.
Background context and relevant documents (with function)	The Report on the Past Cases Review (2015) <i>Courage, Cost and Hope</i>
Consultations	The connexional safeguarding team, ecumenical safeguarding colleagues, the Conference Officer for Legal and Constitutional Practice, the District Chairs and the Methodist Council, survivor/victims of abuse.
Impact	Significant changes of behaviour and practice are outlined around ministerial accountability and the accountability of the Church as part of a change of culture recommended in the 2015 Report of the Past Cases Review.

1. Introduction

- 1.1 The 2015 Conference received the report on the Past Cases Review, *Courage, Cost and Hope* which summarised the findings of the Review and contained recommendations to ensure that the Church learnt the lessons from its past.

The Conference appointed an Implementation Group (PCRIG) in order to ensure that due care is paid to the implementation of the recommendations of the Past Cases Review. The Implementation Group was directed to report to the Council as often as required and to the Conference in 2016 and 2017. (**Recommendation 1**)

- 1.2 The membership of the PCR Implementation group is as follows:
 The Revd Gwyneth M Owen (Chair)
 Ms Jane Stacey
 The Revd Dr Stuart Jordan
 The Revd Henry Lewis
 Mr Doug Swanney
 The Revd Helen D Cameron
 In attendance: Mr Tim Carter

- 1.3 This report therefore seeks to update the Conference on an overview of progress made to date. Reference will be made to each of the recommendations in the 2015 Report under a number of themed areas of practice and processes within the life of the Church.

2. Listening to the voices of survivors/victims

- 2.1 The first meeting of the PCRIG began with an exploration about how best to engage with survivors/victims of abuse within the Church and how to ensure their voices informed the work of the group and the implementation of the Report recommendations. It was agreed to establish a survivors' reference group to ensure that all policies/guidelines or training materials that were produced in line with the recommendations would be informed by a survivor/victim perspective (**Recommendation 20**). It was recognised that in some cases this would involve reviewing draft documents and in others it would mean more active involvement in the development process. It was acknowledged that support would be necessary to facilitate this survivor engagement and unfortunately the Safeguarding Team were unable to devote resources to this until the appointment of the new Safeguarding Adviser was made. Progress in this area has now been made by the new Safeguarding Adviser, Mr Tim Carter, and a number of individuals who are willing to contribute to the process have been identified and a first meeting of those involved has been arranged. The first scrutiny of draft materials has been carried out and feedback offered from a survivor's perspective on the draft supervision policy, the pilot programme of supervision in two Districts and the draft Record of Supervision proformas for use in 1:1 and group supervision contexts.
- 2.2 Engaging with survivors/victims is wider than just receiving their views on the PCR recommendations and to further develop understanding of their perspective the Chair of PCRIG and the Connexional Safeguarding Adviser attended a survivors' conference organised by the Liverpool District project Church Action on Sexual Abuse Issues (CASAI) in January 2016. There have also been extensive discussions with the Church of England's Safeguarding Team and others as to how support for survivors/victims can be improved and definite proposals will shortly be produced. (**Recommendation 23**)

3. Ministerial Supervision

- 3.1 **Recommendation 7 of *Courage, Cost and Hope*** was one of the most far reaching of the recommendations.

This recommendation stated that *"a system of structured supervision for ministers be instituted to address the identified weakness in relation to accountability and support in terms of safe practice"*.

Very significant progress has been made on implementing this recommendation and this is detailed below.

- 3.2 A draft supervision policy was produced by a working party that has the appropriate and relevant skills, knowledge and expertise as supervision practitioners, to reflect the relevant dimensions of accountability and theological underpinning necessary. The draft policy was adopted by the Methodist Council in October 2015. The Council agreed to implement a pilot programme of structured supervision in two Districts. The PCRIG was delighted to receive requests from many Districts to be part of the pilot programme. The PCRIG chose two contrasting Districts, namely the Liverpool and South East Districts.
- 3.3 Resources and appropriate training in supervision skills were offered to the District Chairs and deputy Chairs and the superintendents of these two Districts. For those who had recently completed training in supervision for probationers extra resources were made available which explored the significant difference between supervising a probationer minister at the beginning of their ministry and experienced and senior circuit colleagues. This part of the recommendation is on target with the pilot programme of supervision

commencing in the Liverpool and South-East Districts in March 2016. The pilot is expected to last until at least January 2017 in order to ensure that sufficient levels of feedback from the participants can be obtained. It is possible that, in consultation with the pilot Districts, the pilot is extended until the 2017 Conference. Feedback from pilot participants in the Liverpool and South East Districts is already informing the future proposals about frequency of supervision, use of the supervision records and the relationship of supervision to Ministerial Development Review (MDR). An early and positive piece of feedback from the superintendents who are part of the pilot programme has been that it would be beneficial for superintendent ministers to be well established in supervision of their own practice before being asked to supervise others. The Group welcomes the wisdom of this insight and expects to incorporate such a suggestion into the proposals which will come to the 2017 Conference regarding the implementation of the supervision programme.

3.4 District Chairs

The PCIRIG is also delighted to report that an excellent team of accredited senior supervision practitioners has been co-opted as supervisors of the District Chairs and will be co-ordinated by the Revd Dr Jane Leach and the Assistant Secretary of the Conference. This team of accredited supervision practitioners will offer regular 1:1 formal supervision to all District Chairs commencing in September 2016. The costs of establishing and delivering regular, formal supervision to every District Chair will be funded from the Central Services Budget and co-ordinated by the Conference Office. This structured programme of regular supervision will connect to, and be supportive of, the existing MDR provision for each Chair of District.

It is also pleasing to report that training in supervision skills is being offered to every Chair of District and will take place in May, June and October 2016. The PCIRIG has been delighted by the commitment shown by the Chairs of District to this resourcing and equipping despite significant existing workloads.

- 3.5 The pilot programme is also already offering insights into how attractive the prospect of group supervision might be but also evidencing how demanding in reality it is to do well. A circuit ministerial team is a complex group to work with in terms of group supervision and we expect a lot more exploration of the skills required to facilitate group supervision to be needed before group supervision can become a reality.

The PCIRIG wishes to record its gratitude and appreciation to the Chairs of District, the superintendent ministers and circuit colleagues in the Liverpool and South East Districts for their commitment to the pilot programme of supervision and the insights already being fed back which will benefit all ministers in the Connexion as further development work is undertaken.

- 3.6 The training of superintendent ministers in skills of supervision for working with probationers will continue in its current two two-day course format. The course will be delivered by a team at the Queen's Foundation where, in addition to skills training, the relationship between supervisor and supervisee can be nurtured before the 1 September of the first circuit appointment. It is envisaged that this specialist work will be required for at least three to five years. It has been helpful to explore with this year's group of supervisors that they were beginning a supervisory relationship with a probationer in September 2016 which would continue beyond the first two years of ministry.

4. Ministerial Code of Conduct

(Recommendation 6)

The Methodist Council in April 2016 agreed to establish a working party chaired by the Revd Kenneth G Howcroft and convened by the Revd Dr Jonathan Hustler to consider the creation of a code of ministerial practice. The draft code of conduct or practice will be presented to

the Methodist Council in January 2017 in order that it might be presented to the 2017 Conference. It is expected that such a code will be based on the existing Conference statements and guidance on living under discipline and will gather all such material in one location. It is also expected that such a code could become a helpful exploration of wisdom concerning our ministerial practice and be a useful tool in supervision and MDR.

5. Recording pastoral practice, storage and access to records

- 5.1 *Courage, Cost and Hope* drew attention to the poor quality of pastoral record keeping that was evidenced by some of the submissions to the PCR. **Recommendation 3** was “that policy and guidance be provided to define what should be recorded by ministers and others undertaking pastoral work and this be clear about the requirements for each specific role as well as providing guidance for best practice”.

The Methodist Council in April 2016 received an update on the work of the PCRIG from the Assistant Secretary of the Conference; including a simple but effective proforma which can constitute a daily log of Pastoral Ministry. The PCRIG recommends that such a record is kept of all pastoral visits to people in their own homes as best practice. Such a proforma or log can be used in hard copy or be made available electronically. Interest has been expressed in this record being available as an app, for example. Such a log of visits should be kept by all involved in pastoral visits especially when the person undertaking the visit is not accompanied.

5.2 Daily log of pastoral ministry:

1. Name of person visited
2. Date of visit
3. Venue
4. Reason for the visit
5. Necessary action, if any, who it involves
6. Date of next visit

- 5.3 The PCRIG welcomes the proposals contained within the Methodist Council report for a *Revised Charter for Outgoing & Incoming Ministers* (see the Methodist Council report, part one – item 3 in the Conference Agenda). In particular, the reference to safeguarding records including any Covenants of Care, is considered to be helpful.

6. Complaints and Discipline

- 6.1 **Recommendations 10-14** of *Courage, Cost and Hope* relate to Complaints and Discipline processes. The PCRIG has been grateful for the guidance of the Conference Officer for Legal and Constitutional Practice and the Connexional Complaints Worker in engaging with the issues identified in these recommendations. It is important to note that a number of the recommendations relating to Complaints and Discipline processes have been achieved:

- An annual training event for members of the Connexional Complaints Panel continues to be developed and this year involved a training session on the findings of the Past Cases Review.
- The Conference Officer for Legal and Constitutional Practice ensures that training and guidance is given to new superintendents in their responsibilities as Local Complaints Officers and ongoing guidance and updating is offered in the annual superintendents courses.
- All members of the Connexional Complaints Panel have been informed that they must undertake both the Foundation Module and Leadership Module of the *Creating Safer Space* Safeguarding training. A record will be retained of their safeguarding training.

- The new sections made available for the Leadership Module to cover the impact of abuse on victims, patterns/models of abuse and risk management in the Church will be made available as training resources for all those hearing complaints relating to a safeguarding concern.
- The Connexional Complaints Worker also reminds members of Connexional Complaints Panels and Local Complaints Officers about aspects of the process which might get neglected and informs them about issues arising from recent case experience.
- Guidance on specific questions such as choice of venues for meetings and the conduct of conversations with complainants, respondents and others is currently under consideration.

6.2 There have been no substantive problems identified in taking all the recommendations forward but there is a significant resource issue in completing all the work contained in **Recommendations 12, 13 and 14** immediately. This work involves consulting with the Law and Polity Committee and the Complaints and Discipline Liaison Group about potential changes to policy and standing orders; the mapping of this work has begun. The numbers of people involved in the affected processes is high and the programme of change will take time to complete. It should be noted that this is a vast subject, which has been addressed piecemeal hitherto. The work required may be extensive and wide-reaching and is not a matter of only revising a number of standing orders. These Recommendations were passed to the Law and Polity Committee with the suggestion that a piece of work in this area be proposed to the 2016 Conference. The piece of work undertaken by the Law and Polity Committee will need to consider issues such as what records should be kept, for how long, where, by whom, and how data subjects should be informed about what is held.

A full report will be available for the 2017 Conference and in the meantime the PCRIG will regularly review progress. The PCRIG wishes to thank the Conference Officer for Legal and Constitutional Practice and the Connexional Complaints Worker for their work in relating to the PCR implementation processes.

7. Safeguarding training/policy

7.1 In order to support the cascading of messages from the PCR, **Recommendation 5** stated “that all people who deliver safeguarding training at Foundation or Leadership Module level be required to attend training on the findings of the PCR”.

The PCRIG has considered some material that could be used for this training but is currently giving further thought as to how the quality assurance framework for safeguarding training could be improved as part of the process of implementing cultural change. The Safeguarding Adviser is working closely with staff in the Discipleship and Ministries Learning Network (DMLN) and it is hoped to implement a new framework from September 2016 which will include the PCR lessons material.

7.2 Resources have now been freed up within the Connexional Safeguarding Team and work has begun to update the Foundation Module with a target publishing date for new materials of September 2016. The new sections of the Leadership Module are also now in development and the target completion date is December 2016. (**Recommendation 15**)

(Recommendation 16) A revised list of which roles are required to attend safeguarding training at which level is found in **Appendix B** following a review by the safeguarding team.

7.3 There have been discussions in a number of settings about producing materials for wider discussion within church communities about safe relationships (**Recommendation 17**). The PCRIG is pleased to report that the connexional safeguarding team and officers of the DMLN are currently exploring the possibility of developing material based on the PCR Report findings which could be used by small groups in Local Churches.

- 7.4 It is hoped to start work on reviewing safeguarding policies (**Recommendation 18**) shortly, this work has been deferred because of resource constraints. This work will be done in co-operation and consultation with the Church of England Safeguarding Team who are also reviewing their policies.
- 7.5 **Recommendation 6** that the findings of the PCR be incorporated into the training of ministers irrespective of the pathway they are following has been completed.
- 7.4 **Recommendation 19** The PCIRIG welcomed the setting up of a working group to review Covenants of Care processes as requested by Memorial 35 presented to the 2014 Conference. The Council has agreed the terms of reference and appointed the group. The PCIRIG will ensure that there is consultation between the two groups before a report on this work is prepared for the 2017 Conference.

8. Further learning post the publication of *Courage, Cost and Hope*

- 8.1 When the *Courage, Cost and Hope* Report was written there were a significant number of past cases that still required follow up and **Recommendation 21** was included to ensure that any important learning from this material was not lost. This additional learning is being reflected in the revisions of the safeguarding training materials.

When the report was published, with extensive media coverage, it triggered the submission of a further 60 cases. Significantly many of these were submitted by survivors/victims who felt able to come forward because of the publication of the report and the accompanying apology. A number were people who had left the Church because of their experiences. This further reinforces the key message of the *Courage, Cost and Hope* Report that the impact of abuse, often amplified by how it is subsequently dealt with, is deep and long lasting.

The Safeguarding Adviser expects that all the cases requiring follow-up will have been allocated for consideration by case workers by the end of June 2016.

- 8.2 Follow-up work is being carried out regarding the numbers of those ministers who failed to make a return to the Past Cases Review. The data regarding ministers who did not make a return has been shared with the Chairs of District. A significant number of those who did not submit a return are ministers of other denominations authorised to serve on the Stations, probationers who did not receive a briefing before arriving in their initial appointment or those serving in appointments outside the control of the Church. It is possible that the rate of Methodist ministers in the active work who did not make a return is lower than was initially reported. The Chairs' Meeting has committed to holding pastoral conversations with those ministers in the active work who might have been expected to make a return in order to ensure that any outstanding data is passed to the safeguarding team.

9. Culture audit

An audit of progress on the cultural change recommendations of the *Courage, Cost and Hope* Report will take place in the autumn of 2016 and be based on interviews with randomly selected District Chairs, superintendent ministers and circuit ministers from three districts. The framework for the audit was agreed by the Methodist Council in October 2015. The PCIRIG believe that the questions for the audit should be made widely available on the Methodist Church website as a helpful tool to enable people to assess how the PCR work has made an impact on their practice. The questions are attached to this report as Appendix A. circuit staff meetings, area diaconal groups, and Presbyteral Synods may find it helpful to reflect on these questions. **Recommendation 9** is therefore being progressed very effectively.

10. Selection criteria for key roles.

As part of embedding culture change **Recommendation 2** was that

“selection criteria for district chairs, the Warden of the Methodist Diaconal Order and Members of the Senior Leadership Group of the Connexional Team include awareness of and ability to deal effectively with safeguarding issues.”

This action has been completed.

11. Conclusion

Courage, Cost and Hope was received by the Conference at the end of June 2015 and the PCRIG was set up to oversee the implementation of the 23 recommendations. It was recognised that the implementation task would be far reaching because the report was calling for significant culture change in the life of the church and in ministerial and pastoral practice. In some of the key areas of culture change, such as the development of a programme of structured supervision, excellent progress has been made. In most other areas, despite resource challenges, progress is well underway. The PCRIG expects to be able to report to the 2017 Conference that all the recommendations of the report will be implemented in full or with a clear process and timetable for completing the implementation set out.

The PCRIG is realistic that substantial change in culture, practice and attitude to issues of ministerial accountability will take at least a decade to become deeply embedded in the life of the Church. The PCRIG invites the Methodist people into a commitment to work towards such a change of attitude, practice and culture with courage and hope and a willingness to bear the cost of such change in order that we might become a Church which is not satisfied merely to call ministers into accountability but seeks to be a Church which in every regard, in its fidelity and unity, is also accountable to God and the world.

The following recommendations can be considered completed as at June 2016:

Recommendation 1 That an Implementation Group be established to oversee the implementation of all the PCR's recommendations that are agreed by the Conference and that membership of this group be agreed by the Conference.

Recommendation 2 That selection criterion for district chairs, the Warden of the Methodist Diaconal Order and Members of the Senior Leadership Group of the Connexional Team include awareness of and ability to deal effectively with safeguarding issues.

Recommendation 3 That policy and guidance be provided to define what should be recorded by ministers or others undertaking pastoral work and that this be clear about requirements for each specific role as well as providing guidance for best practice.

Recommendation 4 That policy and guidance be provided about storage and access to pastoral records, specifying particularly requirements on ministerial handover.

Recommendation 6 That the findings from the PCR be incorporated into the training of ministers irrespective of the pathway they are following.

Recommendation 11 That the Past Cases Review definition of a 'Safeguarding concern' be used by Local Complaints Officers, Complaints Teams and Discipline Committees.

Recommendation 12 That work be undertaken to ensure a rigorous system of liaison and consultation between all parts of the complaints process, the resignation (of ministers) process, suspensions, and the Connexional Safeguarding Officer to ensure that appropriate advice is obtained on cases that contain a safeguarding concern or sexual harassment.

Recommendation 16 That the roles that are required to attend training at which level be reviewed. See Appendix B

Recommendation 22 That the resources required for the Safeguarding Team to complete the PCR work as outlined in section I of the full report be agreed.

*****RESOLUTION**

34/1. The Conference received the Report.

34/2. The Conference directed the Methodist Council to review the required attendance for the Leadership Module of *Creating Safer Space* with a view to amending the list to:-

- a) include those lay persons who are appointed to exercise pastoral leadership within a local church;
- b) remove the Local Preachers and Worship Leaders;
- c) remove Safeguarding Officers Church and include in the warmly invited but not mandatory list for the Leadership Module.

34/3. The Conference directed the Methodist Council to review the current 6th bullet point of the Required Attendance for the Leadership Module and to ensure its application is clearly defined.

Appendix A

Past Cases Review Annual Audit

A. Questions for chairs, superintendents and ministers of identified districts

1. Knowledge of the Past Cases Review report and the key lessons to be learnt

- Have you read the full PCR review report? When did you read it?
- If you have not read it how have you informed yourself of the lessons that need to be learnt?
- What was your initial reaction when the PCR report was released to the media with the apology made by the Methodist Church on 28 May 2015?
- Were there any events organised in your district and/or circuit to discuss the report and the lessons contained within it?
- Did you attend any of these events if they were held? If not did you receive a written report following the event(s) or verbal feedback? How helpful were the events and/or feedback received to you?
- Have you been aware of any resistance to the messages of the PCR?

2. Reflection on how the lessons have impacted on practice at district, circuit and individual level

- Can you say what impact, if any, the report has had on your individual practice, including your understanding of safeguarding? Please be as specific as you can giving examples whenever possible.
- How do you record your pastoral work and how do you store your records?
- Has the PCR report had any impact on this?
- To your knowledge what impact, if any, has the report had on practice at circuit level? Please be as specific as you can, giving examples whenever possible.
- To your knowledge what impact, if any, has the report had on practice at district level?
- Do you think the report has led to an increased awareness of safeguarding within your church congregation and a better understanding of why people need to attend safeguarding training?

3. Barriers experienced in trying to put the lessons into practice

- Please tell us what have been the barriers to trying to put the lessons into practice for you individually, in relation to your direct practice and the practice of anyone else for whom you hold a supervisory/oversight role of some kind?
- What action have you taken to try to overcome these barriers and how successful was it?

4. Other feedback/comment

- Please give us feedback on any relevant topic including how you could be helped/supported to take forward the lessons identified in the PCR report

B. Questions for specialist Connexion wide roles (Safeguarding Adviser, Assistant Secretary of the Conference, Complaints and Discipline Lead)

All these roles will have been involved in the detail of the implementation of some of the recommendations from the report in relation to their specific roles. All three roles will have had opportunities to assess more broadly how the culture change that is recommended in the report is being received and understood across the Connexion and it is this that the audit questions are trying to focus on.

- Can you give us your perspective on how the cultural changes that are both explicit and implicit in the PCR report are being received and understood across the Connexion? Please give us specific examples whenever possible.
- Can you identify for us the main barriers to change that you have experienced either directly or have heard about from others?

C. Questions for District Safeguarding Officers (written questionnaire)

- Please tell us, to your knowledge, what events were held across your district to support awareness and understanding of the PCR report and implementing recommendations in practice? How many of these did you organise and how many were you invited to participate in?
- To your knowledge, what impact has the PCR report had on the understanding about safeguarding and safeguarding practice within your district? Please give specific examples whenever possible.
- Specifically has there been any impact on people understanding the importance of attending safeguarding training?
- What have been the major barriers to implementing the lessons identified that either you have experienced directly or have heard about from others?
- What further support would be helpful to the implementation of the lessons from the PCR report?
- Supervision is central to the cultural change recommended in the report. How many times have you received supervision in the last 12 months? How would you rate the quality of that supervision?

Appendix B

CREATING SAFER SPACE Safeguarding Training

ATTENDANCE PROVISION

Leadership Module

The Leadership Module should be undertaken by all those who carry out the following roles in the Methodist Church. They are someone to whom others may go for advice, guidance and leadership about a safeguarding matter. By virtue of their position in the Methodist Church they are seen as someone who will be a role model for others in relation to ministry, behaviour, attitudes and responses to safeguarding matters.

Core List – Required Attendance

- Safeguarding coordinator – Circuit
- Safeguarding Officer – District
- Members of the District Safeguarding Group
- Members of the District Policy Committee
- All presbyters or deacons with an active preaching or pastoral ministry including those supernumerary ministers who have pastoral care of a church
- Those who are in paid employment or a voluntary role which includes leadership within the Methodist Church, which involves direct work with children, youth or adults
- Members of the Connexional Complaint Panels, Discipline Committees, Pastoral and Appeals Committees.
- Safeguarding Officers Church
- Those in recognised roles involving pioneering, fresh expressions or evangelism
- Those who deliver the Foundation Module
- Local preachers including those on trial
- Worship leaders including those in training
- Mentors for the Youth Participation scheme
- Members of the Safeguarding Committee
- Requirement that specific groups not required to attend the whole module should attend training covering specific sections eg Volunteers in direct work with children, young people or vulnerable adults

Warmly invited but not mandatory:

Supernumerary ministers apart from those for whom it is required

When planning the training session consideration should be given to the roles of those attending and which the sections of the Leadership Module should be covered.

Foundation Module

Core List – Required Attendance

- Presbyters with an active preaching or pastoral ministry
- Deacons with an active preaching or pastoral ministry
- Pre-ordination students and probationers
- Lay employees and volunteer workers with pastoral responsibility
- Pastoral visitors
- Anyone working with 0-18 year olds in the name of the church
- Anyone working in activities targeted at adults who are vulnerable (eg luncheon club for the housebound)
- Church stewards
- Circuit stewards
- Local preachers
- Worship leaders
- Those training for local preaching or worship leading
- Church and circuit safeguarding representatives
- Choir/music group/drama leaders – where there are 0-18 year olds or vulnerable adults in the group.
- District staff especially policy committee members, complaints and discipline, mediators
- Core teaching staff at Methodist Church Learning Institutions
- Connexional staff with direct safeguarding links eg children and youth workers
- ‘Covenant of Care’ group members
- Members of the Connexional Complaints Panels, Discipline Committees, Pastoral and Appeals Committees.
- Any student who will be undertaking a Mission Placement
- Young leaders (16-18 years)
- Members of the Safeguarding Committee

Warmly invited but not mandatory

- Evangelism/mission enablers
- Leaders of other organisations, working with 0-18yr olds or vulnerable adults, who use church premises
- Remaining Choir/music group/drama leaders
- Any other group leaders within the church, who may have adults within their particular group who are vulnerable.
- Property stewards and other keyholders
- Caretakers
- Church/circuit meeting secretaries
- Church/circuit/district administrators
- Remaining District and connexional staff
- Remaining teaching staff at Methodist Church Learning Institutions