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1. This statement made by me accurately sets out the evidence that I am prepared to give to the Royal Commission into Institutional Responses to Child Sexual Abuse. The statement is true and correct to the best of my knowledge and belief. Where direct speech is referred to in this statement, it is provided in words or words to the effect of those which were used, to the best of my recollection.

2. My full name is Jeffrey William Driver. I was born in 1951.

3. I have prepared this statement in response to a request from the Royal Commission dated 2 November 2015.

My qualifications and career history

4. Qualifications:
   - Licentiate in Theology, Australian College of Theology, 1977
   - Scholar in Theology, Australian College of Theology, 1983
   - Master Theology, Sydney College of Divinity, 1991
   - PhD, Charles Sturt University, 2008

Career History:
   - Cadet Journalist – Journalist - Sub-Editor
   - Ordained Deacon 1977
   - Curate, Reservoir 1977
   - Ordained Priest 1978
   - Curate, Orange 1978-81 (Diocese Bathurst)
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- Rector, Mid-Richmond 1981-85 (Diocese Grafton)
- Rector, Jamison 1985-89
- Rector/Archdeacon, Young 1989-95
- Executive Director St. Mark's Nat Theological Centre
- Archdeacon for Ministry Formation (Lecturer New Testament) 1995-97
- Head School of Theology CSU 1996-97
- Rector, St Paul's, Manuka & Diocese Archdeacon 1997-2001;
- Chair, Anglicare C&G, 1996---2001 (all Diocese Canberra & Goulburn).
- Consecrated Bishop of Gippsland, Victoria, 17 November 2001
- Translated and installed as Archbishop of Adelaide and Metropolitan of South Australia on 21 October 2005
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Introduction and Narrative Summary

1. In response to your letter of 2 November 2015, I have prepared a statement addressing questions included in the attached Schedule A. Some of the detailed material related to questions in the schedule has already been lodged with the Commission. Where this is the case it will be indicated. Further material is included in a series of appendices.

2. I was elected Archbishop on 21 May 2005, and installed as Archbishop of Adelaide on 21 October 2005, so material relating to the period before this time is almost entirely drawn from diocesan records supplemented by my impressions of that time formed by more than a decade of service in the Diocese. When I accepted appointment to Adelaide, I was Bishop of Gippsland. After my election as Archbishop, I sought to familiarise myself with the issues that the Diocese of Adelaide was facing and was regularly briefed in the lead up to my installation.

3. The Anglican Church of Australia and the Diocese of Adelaide, has welcomed the announcement of the Royal Commission of Inquiry. We are anxious to support the Commission's work, particularly, for the sake of the many survivors of abuse, who we hope will now feel a sense of being heard and recognised by the Australian community.

4. The issue of child sexual abuse within the Diocese of Adelaide began to assume some prominence during the 1990s. Prior to 1992, either the Archbishop or an Archdeacon usually dealt with claims of sexual abuse. In 1992, serious complaints were made in relation to a priest and this led to a number of initiatives being taken, including the establishment of a 'Critical Incidents Task Force' that had the role of developing guidelines for dealing with allegations of inappropriate sexual behaviour made against the clergy. As the result of the work of this group, a protocol for dealing with allegations of inappropriate sexual activity was passed by Synod in 1996.

5. A Diocesan Response Group was established in 1994. It had the role of making an initial evaluation of complaints against clergy and advising the Archbishop what further steps, if any, needed to be taken.

6. Between 1995 and 1999 a number of allegations were made suggesting that a prominent Church of England Boys Society leader, Robert Brandenburg, may have been involved in a number of cases of abuse. Brandenburg committed suicide in 1999 after being charged by Police with a number of offences. In the annual session of Diocesan Synod in 2000, Archbishop Ian George referred to the Brandenburg matters. He condemned the abuse that had occurred, expressing his deep sorrow at its occurrence. He encouraged those who had been victims to contact a helpline that had been established.

7. An interim Professional Standards Director was appointed in 2003, working from the Diocesan Office and an interim Professional Standards Protocol was put in place. Nevertheless, what was regarded as an insufficiently proactive response to the Brandenburg revelations
continued to be criticised, particularly by two prominent members of the clergy who eventually (2003) conducted a press conference and called for a public inquiry.

8. A Board of Inquiry was established in 2003 by the Diocese and conducted by The Hon. Trevor Olsson and Dr Donna Chung. The Report of the Board of Inquiry [ANG.0044.001.0068] noted the steps that were taken through the 1990s, but also observed a tendency to adopt a defensive approach in the handling of claims of sexual abuse.

9. Further reflecting on the diocesan response over previous years, the Board of Inquiry referred to 'a professed lack of knowledge' about child sexual abuse amongst parishes and Church organisations suggesting that this had a number of negative impacts:
   - Complaints and concerns were treated as single, one-off incidents, and not considered as possibly being part of a broader pattern that might involve more than one victim.
   - When there was an admission of inappropriate sexual behaviour, the alleged perpetrator’s promise that such behaviours would not continue was often considered adequate intervention.
   - There was disbelief by Church workers about the prevalence of child sexual abuse in society and in their communities of interest.
   - The tactics commonly used by child sexual abuse perpetrators to gain the victim’s trust and the trust of the victim’s family to help maintain the victim’s silence were not recognised, thereby enabling abuse to continue.

10. The Report of the Board of Inquiry was tabled in State Parliament on 31 May 2004, with the Archbishop and Diocese being widely criticised for the handling of matters relating to child sexual abuse. The Archbishop’s handling of another incident about the same time, involving a school chaplain, was the subject of further criticism. On 11 June 2004, Archbishop Ian George resigned after a lack of confidence in his position was expressed by the Professional Standards Committee and the Diocesan Council.

11. Following the resignation of the Archbishop, a resumed session of the 2004 Synod agreed to adopt and implement all of the recommendations of the Board of Inquiry. The Synod also passed a motion of ‘unreserved apology’ [Synod 2004 Apology to Victims [ANG.9610.01001.0337]] to those who had been harmed by people holding positions of power and trust in the Church. Synod also agreed to review the composition of the Professional Standards Committee in light of the findings of the Board of Inquiry.

12. In another response to the Board of Inquiry, the Diocese put in place its Healing Steps process in August 2004. In developing Healing Steps, the Diocese sought the assistance of an independent advisor with years of experience working in social welfare and dispute resolution, Ms Fay Marles AM (previously Victoria’s first Commissioner for Equal Opportunity, then Chancellor of the University of Melbourne).
13. **Healing Steps** was never seen as rigid process, with fixed ‘steps’ to be followed inflexibly by those who chose to use it. Rather, as the name infers, it recognised that there were important ‘guiding principles’ of alternative dispute resolution that the Diocese needed to embrace as it sought to respond to those who had been abused by those in a position of sacred trust. The 2004 *Healing Steps* booklet [ANG.0048.001.3352 & IND.R-003252.PS.0472] describes the process as ‘an option which approaches claims from a pastoral perspective toward a resolution appropriate to the circumstances of each individual’. It was made clear that ‘this alternative is neither part of, nor a substitute for pursuing claims through a legal process’.

*Healing Steps* was intended to be:

- **Independent** – the Church coordinates the process, but ensures that key elements are undertaken by individuals and bodies independent of the Church. From the beginning, mediations were conducted by an independent facilitator in premises other than Church property.
- **Optional** – the process is one option available and its use does not preclude a survivor seeking redress through other means. People considering pursuing claims against the Diocese are encouraged to seek legal advice in order to consider all the options available to them.
- **Supported**—at any time during the process those seeking redress from the Diocese were encouraged to access additional support and advice from sources independent of the Church. As the process was developed, the Professional Standards Director was given a standing capacity to make available at an early stage a package of counselling to support people as they came forward and considered how they might develop their claims.
- **Transforming**—the key objective was to enable survivors of abuse to ‘move on in life in a positive way’. The mediation process recognised that the journey of each individual is different as are the steps towards greater healing for those who have been abused or traumatised.

14. The adoption of *Healing Steps* in 2004 represented a major shift in the nature of the Diocese of Adelaide’s response to claims related to abuse. Previously, the response of the Diocese had been characterised by a significant emphasis on liability. As the Commission will understand, given the nature of sexual abuse, liability is often hard to establish. *Healing Steps* did not set aside the need for appropriate investigation of critical incidents, but it did establish an important ‘default’ towards believing those who came forward with claims. Survivors have repeatedly made it clear that ‘being believed’ was a key element in their journey towards some resolution.

15. Prompted by resolutions of the 2004 Synod, a report by Dr Zoe Morrison (February 2005) was entitled *Reporting the Abuse of Children and Young People and responding to Adult Sexual Assault: A study into attitudes and behaviours of clergy and Church workers in the Anglican Diocese of Adelaide when dealing with the abuse of children and sexual assault of adults* [ANG.0044.001.0001]. The report demonstrated an increased awareness by clergy of matters relating to child protection and affirmed educational measures that had been put in place. It
revealed that there continued to be an ‘under-reporting’ of child abuse by clergy, particularly to the appropriate government authorities. Concern was expressed by some clergy about a perceived lack of independence of the diocesan Professional Standards Office and questions were raised as to whether ‘old, male-dominated hierarchical power structures’ were related to a lack of accountability around dealing with child abuse.

16. A diocesan working group produced a report called For the Sake of the Gospel: A review of the Professional Standards Policy, Protocols and Practices of the Diocese of Adelaide. [ANG.9610.01001.0211] in August 2005. It took into account the findings of the Morrison Report (Reporting the Abuse of Children and Young People and responding to Adult Sexual Assault: A study into attitudes and behaviours of clergy and Church workers in the Anglican Diocese of Adelaide when dealing with the abuse of children and sexual assault of adults [ANG.0044.001.0001]) as it reviewed the diocesan professional standards policies, procedures and practices. A significant part of this report focused on the question of ‘culture’. The report stated that there appeared to be a ‘widespread view that a struggle exists between moving from the old culture to the new culture outlined by Synod ... The ‘old’ culture is seen to endorse a defensive and somewhat adversarial approach’.

17. The working group affirmed that for cultural change to be effective within the Church it needed to be ‘grounded theologically’. While a developed theological position was not possible within the limitations of the report, it did provide a theological reference point in a vision of the Church based on the (non-hierarchical) mutuality of God, the Holy Trinity and ‘the love revealed in Jesus the Redeemer’. For the Sake of the Gospel: A review of the Professional Standards Policy, Protocols and Practices of the Diocese of Adelaide. [ANG.9610.01001.0211] also included a raft of practical recommendations, touching on issues such as clergy selection and training, the composition of professional standards structures, the job description, location and autonomy of the Professional Standards Director, and the relationship of professional standards to Church office.

18. The General Synod of 2004 passed a number of key child protection and professional standards measures that have since been taken up widely across the Dioceses. A Model Professional Standards Ordinance was passed and recommended to the Dioceses for adoption. This model Ordinance provided for the adoption of a Professional Standards Protocol and a Code of Conduct for Church workers [ANG.0181.001.0148]. The General Synod of 2004 also passed legislation providing for the development of a National Register to provide information about the disciplinary actions against clergy and lay workers. An updated version of this was passed by General Synod in 2007. As envisaged by the Model Professional Standards Ordinance [ANG.9310.01001.0303] a code of conduct for clergy and Church workers, Faithfulness in Service [ANG.0006.001.0225], was passed and commended to dioceses for adoption.

19. Under The Constitution of the Anglican Diocese of Adelaide [ANG.9610.01001.0014] legislation cannot be passed by the diocesan Synod without a diocesan Bishop in place. This delayed the adoption of some of the General Synod measures of 2004 until after the installation of a new
diocesan Bishop (October 2005). Measures put in place in the interim intentionally reflected developments at a national level.

20. The 2005 Synod (absent the new Bishop) did proceed with some matters not requiring the passing of legislation. Synod considered a motion that ‘generous pastoral and financial responses are made to all victims of sexual abuse in our Church’. Before this motion was put to the vote, one of the survivors of abuse by Robert Brandenburg was invited to address Synod, without the usual time restrictions. The Synod began to consider the financial impact of redress upon the Diocese and gave in-principle support to the sale of the Bishop’s residence, Bishops Court, on the understanding that while funds from the sale were subject to trust restrictions and could not be used directly to fund Professional Standards redress, the sale could release funds to assist the overall financial strategy. As it happened, other financial measures were put in place in October 2005 to fully fund the payment of claims (see below).

21. Following the installation of the present Archbishop a set of immediate priorities were established in consultation with the Diocesan Council. They included:

- Continued development of Professional Standards structures in line, where possible, with emerging national models and recommendations.
- Responding to the survivors of abuse through Healing Steps or other processes as elected by survivors.
- Development of a diocesan financial strategy to facilitate Synod’s commitment to a generous pastoral and financial response to survivors of sexual abuse.

22. The adoption of a Professional Standards Ordinance, based on the National ‘model’ Ordinance, required the development of an accompanying protocol. A working group had the task of preparing both these instruments to be considered by the annual session of Synod in 2006. In May 2006 a special session of Synod considered some of the financial measures necessary to fund the provision of pastoral and financial support to the survivors of abuse. It also passed an Ordinance adopting the General Synod Holy Orders, Relinquishment and Deposition Canon 2004 [ANG.0173.001.0076] (providing for simplified and more accountable disciplinary outcomes against clergy).

23. A financial strategy enabling the Synod’s response to those who had been abused was developed in the course of 2006. It had a number of components:

- Borrowing to fund payments ($8 million).
- The liquidation of some capital assets (the Synod actually had few).
- Reductions of expenditure, including the conclusion or reassignment of some staffing positions.
- An additional assessment levy on all parishes.

24. Within the reorganisation of staffing, a position was created for a part-time Safer Ministry Educator.
25. Mediation processes with the survivors of abuse were progressed, often using the **Healing Steps** model. This model provided for a meeting and personal apology from the Archbishop on behalf of the Church. They were facilitated by an independent mediator and occurred at a 'neutral' venue. Thirty-six settlements for redress were reached in 2006. A number of survivors of abuse availed themselves of the opportunity of an interview with me as Archbishop and to receive an apology on behalf of the Church. My sense was that these times of being heard were of great importance to a number of survivors and that some of the legal counsel for survivors who may have had some cause for initial cynicism about this provision came to be more accepting of its value. These encounters were costly for all involved, yet were sometimes marked by remarkable grace on the part of those who had experienced much pain.

26. The annual session of Synod was held in October 2006 (*Resolutions passed by Synod in October 2006* [ANG.01001.0.125]). This session of Synod adopted the **National Register Canon 2004** [ANG.0050.003.2766] and a **Professional Standards Ordinance** that was substantially the same as the National model Ordinance (differences included a wider definition of abuse). The **General Synod Code of Conduct, Faithfulness in Service** [ANG.0006.001.0225] was adopted by resolution.

27. The Synod affirmed the expectation that by June 2008 all clergy, ordination candidates, authorised lay readers and lay preachers would have completed mandatory notification training and ‘Power and Trust’, ‘Recognise and Respond’ and ‘Safety and Screening’ seminars. All 'lay assistants' were subject to the same expectation with the exception of the unit ‘Recognise and Respond’.

28. Following the adoption of the **Professional Standards Ordinance 2006** [ANG.0173.001.0136] by Synod, Diocesan Council endorsed an associated protocol, as provided for under the Ordinance. Late in 2006, the interim Professional Standards Director resigned. The person who had been in the role since 2003 had a long association with the governance of the Diocese. She was succeeded by a Director who, deliberately, had no association with the leadership of the Diocese (and, in fact, was not an Anglican). Subsequently, the Professional Standards Office was moved away from the Diocesan office to premises that had no association with a Church.

29. One of the questions that arose at this time was in regard to the relationship of Anglicare SA to certain redress claims. Robert Brandenburg had been an employee of Anglicare SA and its predecessor entities for a period during the 1990s and the campsites, where some of the abuse had occurred, were under Anglicare SA control. At this stage, Anglicare SA was an entity governed by a Council established under an Ordinance of Synod. Anglicare SA became an incorporated association in 2000.

30. With the emergence of claims relating to Brandenburg, Anglicare SA was provided advice that claims relating to matters before incorporation were entirely the responsibility of the Synod. The Synod accepted that it had ultimate responsibility for events that happened within
Anglicare before its separate incorporation. At the same time, it received advice that incorporation did not necessarily extinguish all liability on behalf of Anglicare SA. The Diocesan Chancellor had also offered the view that it would be consistent with the Constitution of Anglicare SA to make a contribution towards assisting those who had been abused within entities that had become Anglicare SA.

31. This matter was the subject of some debate and negotiation over several years. In 2011 the Board of Anglicare SA agreed to ‘to walk side-by-side with The Synod of the Anglican Diocese of Adelaide and to provide pastoral support for victims of abuse’. A Memorandum of Understanding with Anglicare SA [ANG.0178.001.0108] was subsequently entered into in early 2013.

32. The commitment of the Diocese to respond in a timely way to the claims of the survivors of abuse also raised issues and questions as to insurance cover. The Diocese had been advised that in many of the cases where we went on to provide some form of financial settlement, it would have been unlikely that any liability could have been established and that, therefore, no insurance cover was available. Furthermore, it was clear that in seeking to pursue a settlement involving the diocesan insurers, survivors would be placed in a much more adversarial position. The Diocese chose not to do that and, although we have subsequently sought to negotiate a settlement with the insurers, we have at this point received no assistance from them.

33. In late 2006, the Diocese began to look at issues surrounding the presence in congregations of persons with histories of child sexual abuse, mostly having had legal convictions or having been charged and awaiting further legal proceedings. The Professional Standards Committee spent considerable time developing a Memorandum of Understanding in line with national Church proposals that impose a high level of constraint and supervision around attendance. Around this time, the Diocese contributed to a nationwide research project looking at the history of child sexual abuse in the Anglican Church. This report Child Sexual Abuse in the Anglican Church by Parkinson and Oates was published in 2009.

34. The 14th General Synod met in October 2007 and passed the National Register Canon 2007 [ASQ.261.005.0182] and the four protocols made under its provisions. It also passed an Episcopal Standards Canon 2007 [ANG.0048.002.3200].

35. Although the National Register Canon 2004 [ANG.0050.003.2766] was adopted by the Diocesan Synod on 27 October 2005, it was some time before this web based facility went ‘live’. When it did, it proved difficult to access and use. Adelaide’s Professional Standards Director, with the support of the PSC, expressed concern about the workability of this facility. It was not until 2012 that, from Adelaide’s perspective, this facility became genuinely workable.

36. The annual session of Diocesan Synod, meeting in October 2008, adopted the Episcopal Standards Canon [ANG.0048.002.3200] as passed in 2007 by General Synod. The Synod also
passed General Synod amendments to the Professional Standards Ordinance. During 2008, the Diocesan Guidelines for Protecting Children [ANG.961.01001.0322] were revised.

37. During 2008 the South Australian Government's Commission of Inquiry into the Abuse of Children in State Care released its report ('The Mullighan Report') [ANG.0044.001.0170]. The report carried 54 recommendations, including a call for a more uniform approach to redress. Following the release of the report, as Archbishop, I joined with the Premier and other Church leaders in once again expressing an apology to those who were abused while in care. About a year later I felt the need to express concern to the Attorney General about the slowness of the State Government's response to survivors. The 2009 annual session of Synod passed a resolution calling on the State Government to expedite the provision of support services and adequate redress for victims of abuse in State care. In response (October 2009), the Attorney-General, The Hon Michael Atkinson, advised that Cabinet had approved a 'new approach for dealing with these claims to ensure a compassionate but appropriate Government response'. The response was based around legislative provisions for the victims of crime.

38. In 2008 the Diocese of The Murray signed a Memorandum of Understanding with the Diocese of Adelaide to enable Adelaide's Professional Standards Director to serve both Dioceses, with substantially common supporting legislation and structures, facilitating uniformity in approach across the two Dioceses.

39. The 2009 Synod also passed amendments to the Professional Standards legislation in line with developments at a national level. The Synod also passed a resolution expressing concern at 'the increased tendency in Australian society towards the premature sexualisation of children'. During 2009 the Diocesan Council established a working group to review the Professional Standards Ordinance 2006 [ANG.0173.001.0136]. This working group also included representatives of the Diocese of The Murray. Among various matters considered were:

- The nature of the review provision and its effect on the overall process.
- Considerations around provisions for suspension.
- The possibility of an agreed outcome based on a respondent's acceptance of a recommendation by the Professional Standards Committee to the Board should it proceed (this measure was intended to reduce the time a process might take in some instances, particularly where there was substantial agreement around facts).

40. In 2010 the Professional Standards Committee conducted a review of the Healing Steps process. Changes made were modest, but included a provision for the Church to seek confirmation from an independent investigation to substantiate a claim. The revision makes it more explicit that no survivor of abuse is required to make undertakings of confidentiality as part of the settlement of claims.

41. A review of Diocesan Safer Ministry education and processes was conducted early in 2013, both as an internal audit process, and with reference to The Path to Safer Ministry - A
'Roadmap' of National Professional Standards Resources [ANG.0134.024.0001] approved by the General Synod Standing Committee in 2011. In general terms, Adelaide Diocesan practices were found to be fully compliant with SA State and National Church expectations, but several areas emerged as requiring further attention:

- The need to move beyond a compliance culture of education, to an ‘all of Church community’ responsibility for safety outlook.
- The importance of moving beyond the ‘after the fact’ notification awareness, that is the primary focus of the Families SA mandatory reporting training curriculum, with a more proactive approach ensuring a transparent and responsible safe environment and practices culture.
- The importance of all involved in leadership and participation in ministry (including all voluntary workers) being aware of Safer Ministry responsibilities, policy and practice – not just those directly involved in child-related activities. This involved a significant widening and re-adjustment of Adelaide diocesan ministry and parish leadership accreditation and Safer Ministry education requirements (as reflected in the 2013 Safer Ministry Programme Information).
- Further exploration and awareness of special areas of vulnerability and responsibility given the higher than average representation of spiritually, socially and mentally vulnerable persons in our Church communities.

42. The Anglican Diocese of Adelaide is a member of the SA Safer Churches Network. The primary purpose of this network is to provide representatives from Christian Churches and associated agencies with the opportunity to come together to share experiences, exchange information and contribute to the development of policies and practices that lead to the development of safer Churches, particularly, in the area of child protection, the disabled, elderly and vulnerable. The Anglican Diocese of Adelaide is also a member of the National Council of Churches in Australia, and attends the NCCA run ‘Safe As Churches?’ Consultations. As Archbishop, I attended as a key note presenter at one of these consultations.

43. Proposals developed by the working group, established in 2009 to review the Professional Standards Ordinance 2006 [ANG.0173.001.0136], were the subject of a ‘Synod Conference’ in 2013. Further consideration of these changes by Synod was deferred in order to provide an opportunity for dialogue at a national level so as to ensure that any measures adopted in Adelaide were in line with national Church developments. As it eventuated, many of the changes proposed by the Diocese of Adelaide were incorporated in a revised Model Ordinance for professional standards and a new Episcopal Standards Ordinance 2015.

44. The 2011 meeting of the Bishops of the Anglican Church of Australia agreed on pastoral guidelines in regard to child abuse and use of private confession (Protocol 14). This protocol followed on from earlier work done by the Bishops’ Meeting in 2006. The protocol was incorporated in the Archbishop’s Pastoral Guidelines in Adelaide.
45. At the General Synod in 2014 a Canon was passed in regard to the confessional, making more explicit the need for certain matters to be reported, including child abuse. This Canon was adopted by Ordinance in annual session of the Synod of the Diocese of Adelaide a few weeks later, though with the Archbishop withholding assent while an accompanying protocol was developed (this had the goodwill of the Synod). The Dioceses were later advised that questions had arisen concerning the validity of this Canon and it was recommended that it not be adopted at present.

46. In 2014 negotiations were commenced with the Diocese of Willochra with the view to a Memorandum of Understanding for the provision of professional standards services within that diocese. With an agreement already in place with the Diocese of The Murray, this would mean that the same professional standards structures would serve the whole State of South Australia. That Memorandum of Understanding has now been signed.

47. In 2015 the annual session of Synod of the Diocese of Adelaide passed legislation adopting new Professional Standards and Episcopal Standards Ordinances. Both these Ordinances were based on the development of a national model.

48. In the decade ending October 2015, the Diocese of Adelaide settled 83 claims for redress. The average settlement amount was $65,080 and the median amount was $59,060. There are four claims currently before the Synod.

49. The Diocese remains committed to a proactive and generous response to historic incidents of abuse and continuous improvement in the area of child protection. My sense as Archbishop is that the attitude and values that underpin a positive and appropriate response to historic issues and current needs are increasingly imbedded in the culture of the Diocese.

+ Jeffrey Adelaide

11 December 2015
Schedule A Responses
The Anglican Diocese of Adelaide

Q1.  The date the Diocese was established.
50.  The Diocese was established by Letters Patent in 1847. The first Synod was convened in 1865. Unlike Synods in some dioceses in Australia, the Synod of the Diocese of Adelaide was not incorporated under a special Act of Parliament. It became an incorporated association pursuant to the Associations Incorporation Act 1858.

51.  The Synod of the Church of England in the Diocese of Adelaide Incorporated was incorporated on 21 February 1871, and changed its name to The Synod of the Diocese of Adelaide of the Anglican Church of Australia Incorporated on 10 April 1980.

Q2.  The Province in which the Diocese is located.
52.  The Anglican Diocese of Adelaide in located in the Province of South Australia.

Q3.  The current number of parishes in the Diocese.
53.  There are currently 62 parishes comprising 94 congregations.

Q4.  The approximate number of Church members in the Diocese.
54.  There is an average of 9,596 regular attenders at Church services each week in the Diocese of Adelaide, based on data from an annual statistical survey completed by all parishes and congregations. This figure is based on data collected for the 2014 reporting year.

Q5.  The number of clergy currently licensed to officiate in the Diocese, including retired clergy with permission to officiate.
55.  As at 2 November 2015 there are:

- 116 Active Licensed clergy (generally means that the clergy person is in receipt of a stipend).
- 78 Clergy with a Permission to Officiate (clergy who are not in regular paid ministry, many who are over the age of 70 and retired, but on occasion act in some form of ministry capacity).
- 10 Retired Clergy (clergy who are retired and do not have permission to act in any ministry capacity).
Q6. The financial position of relevant Diocesan entities, including by reference to its asset holdings, liabilities and cash reserves (a high level overview is sufficient).

56. As at 30 June 2015 the financial position of Synod Operations was the following:

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Current Assets</td>
<td>$1,861,686</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Non Current Assets</td>
<td>$44,173,260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Assets</strong></td>
<td><strong>$46,034,946</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Current Liabilities</td>
<td>$1,509,625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Non Current Liabilities</td>
<td>$813,815</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Liabilities</strong></td>
<td><strong>$2,323,440</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Assets</td>
<td>$43,711,506</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

57. Total assets include some monies held in trust for specific purposes.

58. For complete financial position of Synod Operations see Synod Notice Paper [ANG.0146.001.0277] commencing at page 15.

59. Synod Operations form part of a consolidated financial report for the Synod that includes the activities of Anglican Funds South Australia (a community financial institution for individual and parish investments), other special funds and bequests held in trust for specific purposes and parishes and assets relating to The Trusts of the See of Adelaide. The figures above do not include the assets (principally real estate, ie Churches, halls and rectories) and monies held by the parishes (principally funds held in operating accounts), neither those of Anglicare SA Ltd. (which is a separate Diocesan entity).

60. For complete audited financial statements see 2015 Synod Reports & Accounts Book [ANG.0146.001.0327] commencing at page 38.

Q7. A description of the general relationship between the Diocese and parish asset holdings.

61. The arrangements that govern the relationship of parishes with the Synod are contained within the following Ordinances:

- Model Declaration of Trust Ordinance [ANG.0146.001.0330]
- Parochial Administration Ordinance [ANG.0146.001.0332]
- Registration of Congregations and Parishes Ordinance [ANG.0146.001.0368]

62. Essentially, physical assets, property, goods, chattels, money and investments are all held under trust in the name of The Synod of the Diocese of Adelaide of the Anglican Church of Australia Incorporated for the purposes of each parish or ministry. The Synod cannot access or claim rights over parish assets without the parish’s voluntary relinquishment of their rights and prerogatives over the assets. For example, if a parish closes and is not amalgamated into
another parish, the assets are transferred from being held in trust to the actual assets of the Synod and appear on the balance sheet of the Synod. There are five parishes in the Diocese that are subject to individual trusts over which the Synod has no control.

63. Accordingly, assets held in the name of the Synod for the benefit of parishes do not appear within the financial statements of the Synod.
## Governance of the Anglican Diocese of Adelaide


Q8. The names, employment status, and periods of appointment of those people occupying the following positions in the Diocese between 1 January 1990 and the date of this letter:

- **a) Bishop**
- **b) Assistant Bishop**
- **c) Chancellor**
- **d) Deputy Chancellor**
- **e) Registrar / General Manager**
- **f) Professional Standards Director**
- **g) Chair of the Professional Standards Committee or similar body**
- **h) Diocesan Solicitor, or any person appointed to advise the Diocese on legal matters relating to child sexual abuse**
- **i) Diocesan Advocate, or any person appointed to represent the Diocese in disciplinary proceedings for clergy and other Church workers**
- **j) Presiding members of the Professional Standards Board, Panel of Triers, Disciplinary Tribunal, Diocesan Tribunal or similar bodies, and**
- **k) Trustees on any Boards of Trustees established to manage the real property of the Diocese.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Period</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bishop (Paid position)</td>
<td>Keith Rayner</td>
<td>(1975-1990)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ian George</td>
<td>(1991-2004)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jeffrey Driver</td>
<td>(2005-present)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Bishop (Paid position)</td>
<td>Bruce Rosier</td>
<td>(1990-1991)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lionel Renfrey</td>
<td>(retired 1969, but retained his Permission To Officiate until 1997)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stuart Smith</td>
<td>(1992-1997)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stephen Pickard</td>
<td>(2007-2010)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>David McCall</td>
<td>(Bishop assisting the Archbishop, 2010)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Timothy Harris</td>
<td>(2011-present)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Christopher McLeod</td>
<td>(2015-present)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chancellor</td>
<td>Hon Justice Brian Cox</td>
<td>(1977-1995)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Honorary position)</td>
<td>Hon Justice David Bleby</td>
<td>(1995 – present)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deputy-Chancellor</td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Anne Hywood</td>
<td>(2003-2008)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Peter Sandeman</td>
<td>(2008-2009)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ven. Michael Whiting</td>
<td>(2009-2010 Acting Registrar)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Keith Stephens</td>
<td>(2010-present)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Appointed Interim Professional Standards Director after her appointment was minuted by Diocesan Council on 4 June 2003.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Elaine Bourne</td>
<td>(May to August 2006)  Acting Professional Standards Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Claire Lunnay</td>
<td>(September 2006-2007) Supplemented by Elaine Bourne (and Tim Ridgway, Diocese of Willochra, on one matter)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Helen Carrig</td>
<td>(24 April-22 May 2015) Acting Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Theodora Ekonomopoulos</td>
<td>(24 August 2015-present) Commenced 01 August 2015.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Peter Caporaso</td>
<td>Deputy Professional Standards Director (August 2015-present)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Chair (Convenor) of Professional Standards Committee (Honorary position) | Interim Professional Standards Committee established in November 2003.  
*Members:*  
Rev’d John Stephenson, Rev’d Stephen Clark, Gillian Mickan, Elaine Bourne, Deirdre Ragless, Anne Prior |
|---|---|
| Anne Prior | (mid-2004-2005)  
*Members:*  
Anne Prior, Gillian Mickan, Simon Schrapel, John Strachan, Elaine Bourne, Rev’d John Stephenson, Rev’d Caroline Pearce, Phillip Scales |
Professional Standards Ordinance 2006 established this committee on a new footing.  
On 8 November 2006, Diocesan Council resolved that the following should be appointed.  
*Members:*  
Rev’d Caroline Pearce, Elaine Bourne, Michael Dawson, Sue Harrington |
| Simon Schrapel | (2007-2010)  
*Members:*  
Elaine Bourne, Michael Dawson, Rev’d Caroline Pearce, Philip Scales, Susan Harrington, Alistair Lea, Tim Ridgway. |
| Alistair Lea (Convenor) | (2011)  
*Members:*  
Rev’d Caroline Pearce, Elaine Bourne, Annette Cinnamon, Susan Harrington, Philip Scales, Tim Ridgway  
*Appointments:*  
Rev’d Peter Brown, Jan Nicholson |
| Susan Harrington (Acting Convenor) | (2012)  
*Members:*  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chair appointed from members</th>
<th>Rev’d Caroline Pearce, Annette Cinnamond, Tim Ridgway, Rev’d Peter Brown, Jan Nicholson (2013)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Members:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rev’d Caroline Pearce, Annette Cinnamond, Tim Ridgway, Rev’d Peter Brown, Jan Nicholson.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Appointments:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rev’d David Patterson, Catherine Bridgland, Carolyn Grantskalns</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Convenor appointed from members</th>
<th>Rev’d David Patterson, Catherine Bridgland, Carolyn Grantskalns (2014)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Members:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Annette Cinnamond, Tim Ridgway, Rev’d Peter Brown, Jan Nicholson.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rev’d David Patterson, Catherine Bridgland, Carolyn Grantskalns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Resignation: Rev’d Caroline Pearce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Appointment: Amanda Harfield.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Catherine Bridgland (Convenor)</th>
<th>Rev’d David Patterson, Catherine Bridgland, Carolyn Grantskalns, Amanda Harfield (2015)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Members:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Annette Cinnamond, Tim Ridgway, Rev’d Peter Brown, Jan Nicholson, Rev’d David Patterson, Carolyn Grantskalns, Amanda Harfield.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Other Similar Bodies**

65. There were various Diocesan bodies created relating to the issue of child sexual abuse, for example the following:

66. **Critical Incidents Working Party** – (established 30 September 1992/unclear when this Working Party ceased) also known as the Critical Incidents Task Force, whose report to Synod in 1994 recommended the establishment of the Diocesan Response Group. This working party was created by the Archbishop and first convened in late 1992. The membership comprised Brian N Smith (chair), Bishop Bruce Rosier, Rev’d Philip Carter, Christine Doerr, Tania Black, Robert Field, Gerard Menses and Peter Bleby.

68. **Sexual Abuse Response Task Group** – (established 2003/concluded June 2003), intended to liaise with other diocesan bodies. The membership comprised: Ven John Collas, Jan Horsnell, Margaret Chittleborough, Mark Pickhaver, Rev’d Peter Stuart, Peter Casson.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Diocesan Solicitor</th>
<th>David Wicks, LL.B</th>
<th>(1984-1992) Synod Solicitor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>After 1992/1993 no Synod Solicitor is specified. The Synod engages a number of solicitors, depending on the advice or representation required.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Diocesan Advocate</th>
<th>Not applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(representative of the Diocese in disciplinary proceedings)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

|---------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------|-----------------------|------------------------|--------------------------|----------------------------------|
### Presiding Members of the Diocesan Tribunal

(Honorary position)

We are reading this to mean ‘Assessors in Ecclesiastical Trials’

Only one Diocesan Tribunal has been held in recent times. The last being in 2004.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Presiding Member:</th>
<th>(1989-1990)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Archbishop Keith Rayner</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Panel of Assessors:**


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Presiding Member:</th>
<th>(1990-1991)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Archbishop Keith Rayner</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Panel of Assessors:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Presiding Member:</th>
<th>Archbishop Ian George</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1991-1992)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Presiding Member:</th>
<th>Archbishop Ian George</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Panel of Assessors:</td>
<td>Right Rev'd Stuart Smith; Ven Brian Smith; Rev'd David Keay, Rev'd Philip Carter, Rev'd David Binns, Rev'd Ian Mussared, Rev'd Anthony Tamblyn, Rev'd Canon William Goodes, P Kinsley, Ian Curwen-Walker, Helen Carrig, John Harley, Gerard Menses, Anne Pickhaver, Christopher Gent, Tim Goodes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1992-1993)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Presiding Member:</th>
<th>Archbishop Ian George</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1993)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Presiding Member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presiding Member:</td>
<td>Archbishop Ian George</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1997-1998)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Presiding Member:</th>
<th>Archbishop Ian George</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1998-1999)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Presiding Member:</th>
<th>Archbishop Ian George</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1999-2000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presiding Member:</td>
<td>Archbishop Ian George</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Presiding Member:</th>
<th>Archbishop Ian George</th>
<th>(2001-2002)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Presiding Member:</td>
<td>Archbishop Ian George</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Presiding Member:</th>
<th>Archbishop Ian George</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
### 2004-2005

**Presiding Member:**
Archbishop Ian George

**Panel of Assessors:**
Rev’d Christopher Chataway,
Rev’d Canon Andrew Cheesman,
Rev’d Paul Harrington, Rev’d Dr
Warren Huffa, Rev’d Stuart
Langshaw, Rev’d Nigel Mitchell,
Ven Conrad Patterson, Ven John
Stephenson, Elizabeth Bleby,
Ruth Giles, Chris Purton,
Anthony Radford, Peter
Sandeman, Edward Sandercock,
Baden Teague, Rosemary White.

### 2005-2006

**Presiding Member:**
Archbishop Jeffrey Driver

**Panel of Assessors:**
Rev’d Christopher Chataway,
Rev’d Canon Andrew Cheesman,
Rev’d Paul Harrington, Rev’d Dr
Warren Huffa, Rev’d Stuart
Langshaw, Rev’d Nigel Mitchell,
Ven Conrad Patterson, Ven John
Stephenson, Elizabeth Bleby,
Ruth Giles, Chris Purton,
Anthony Radford, Peter
Sandeman, Baden Teague,
Rosemary White.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Presiding Member:</th>
<th>(2006-2007)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Archbishop Jeffrey Driver</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Panel of Assessors:**
- Rev'd Simon Bailey, Rev'd David Bassett, Elizabeth Bleby, Christopher Chataway, Andrew Cheesman, Stephen Clark, Fred Field, Ruth Giles, Rev'd Paul Harrington, Paul Hunt, Rev'd Paul Mitchell, Ven Conrad Patterson, Chris Purton, Anthony Radford, Ted Sandercock

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Presiding Member:</th>
<th>(2007-2008)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Archbishop Jeffrey Driver</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Panel of Assessors:**
- Rev'd Simon Bailey, Rev'd John Stephenson, Rev'd David Thornton-Wakeford, Fred Field, Chris Purton, Janette Young

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Presiding Member:</th>
<th>(2008-2009)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Archbishop Jeffrey Driver</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Panel of Assessors:**
- Rev'd Simon Bailey, Rev'd John Stephenson, Rev'd David Thornton-Wakeford, Fred Field, Chris Purton, Janette Young

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Presiding Member:</th>
<th>(2009-2010)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Archbishop Jeffrey Driver</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Panel of Assessors:**
- Rev'd Simon Bailey, Rev'd John Stephenson, Rev'd David Thornton-Wakeford, Fred Field, Chris Purton, Janette Young
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Presiding Member:</th>
<th>Panel of Assessors:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Archbishop Jeffrey Driver</td>
<td>(2010-2011)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Rev'd David Bassett, Ven Sally Boothey, Ven Chris Chataway, Rev'd Neil Mathieson, Ven Paul Mitchell, Peter Dyke, Chris Purton

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Presiding Member:</th>
<th>Panel of Assessors:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Archbishop Jeffrey Driver</td>
<td>(2012)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Rev'd David Bassett, Ven Sally Boothey, Ven Chris Chataway, Rev'd Neil Mathieson, Ven Paul Mitchell, Peter Dyke, Chris Purton

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Presiding Member:</th>
<th>Panel of Assessors:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Archbishop Jeffrey Driver</td>
<td>(2013)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Presiding Member:</th>
<th>(2014)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Archbishop Jeffrey Driver</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Panel of Assessors:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ven David Bassett, Rev’d Stephen Clark,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rev’d Dr Warren Huffa, Ven Paul Mitchell,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jim Raw, Ben Renfrey, Vivien Bleby,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helen Carrig, Rev’d Peter Brown,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rev’d Keith Brice, Ann Nadge,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catherine Bridgland, Rev’d Craig Broman</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Presiding Member:</th>
<th>(2015)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Archbishop Jeffrey Driver</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Panel of Assessors:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ven David Bassett, Rev’d Stephen Clark,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rev’d Dr Warren Huffa, Ven Paul Mitchell,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jim Raw, Ben Renfrey, Vivien Bleby,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helen Carrig, Rev’d Peter Brown,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rev’d Keith Brice, Ann Nadge,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catherine Bridgland, Rev’d Craig Broman</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trustees of any Boards – Members of Diocesan Council (Honorary positions)</th>
<th>In addition to the Archbishop of Adelaide and, ex officio, the Dean of Adelaide, the Archdeacons, the Chancellor and the Diocesan Secretary, Diocesan Council comprised the following individuals:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1991-1992)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1992-1993)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Rev'd David Richardson,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rev'd Susannah Pain, Rev'd Susan Straub, Rev'd Anthony Tamblyn,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harold Bates-Brownsword, David Bleby, Dianne Bradley, Barbara Brummitt, Helen Carrig, Una Clifford, Ian Curwen-Walker, John Dibben, Margaret Flint, Lavinia Gent, Tim Goodes, John Harley, Colin Lawton, Gerard Menses, Andrew Moore, Tim Pennington, Warren Rogers, Anne Skinner, Dorothy Thorpe, Beverly Wiesner..</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Rev'd David Richardson,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rev'd Philip Carter, Rev'd Graham Head, Rev'd Stuart Langshaw,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Rev'd David Richardson; Rev'd Barry Davis, Rev'd Andrew King, Rev'd Stuart Langshaw, Rev'd Christopher McLeod, Rev'd Dr John Roffey, Rev'd Susan Straub, Harold Bates-Brownsword, Dianne Bradley, Barbara Brummitt, C Bungey, B Carne, Helen Carrig, Ian Curwen-Walker, Fred Field, Margaret Flint, Lavinia Gent, Tim Pennington, Denise Roder, Warren Rogers, Peter Sandeman, Edward Sandercock, Anne Skinner, Christine Solomon, Baden Teague, Beverly Wiesner, Gerard Menses</td>
<td>(1997-1998)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Rev'd David Richardson, Rev'd Dr Scott Cowdell, Rev'd Andrew King, Rev'd Stuart Langshaw, Rev'd Dr John Roffey, Rev'd Stephanie Swansson, Dianne Bradley, B Carne, Helen Carrig, G Cunningham, Ian Curwen-Walker, Fred Field, Lavinia Gent, Sue Henry-Edwards, Euan Miller, J Nelson, Peter Nicholls, Tim Pennington, Warren Rogers, Peter Sandeman, Edward Sandercock, Christine Solomon, Rosemary White, K Ramsay.</td>
<td>(1998-1999)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rev'd Dr Scott Cowdell; Rev'd Brenton Daulby; Rev'd Andrew King, Rev'd Stuart Langshaw, Rev'd Dr John Roffey, Dianne Bradley, Helen Carrig, G Cunningham, Ian Curwen-Walker, Fred Field, Margaret Flint, Lavinia Gent, Sue Henry-Edwards, Euan Miller, J Nelson, Peter Nicholls, Rebecca Pannell, Tim Pennington, Warren Rogers, Edward Sandercock, Christine Solomon, Rosemary White</td>
<td>(1999-2000)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Rev’d Dr Scott Cowdell; Rev’d Brenton Daulby; Rev’d Stuart Langshaw, Rev’d Stephen Ogden, Rev’d Dr John Roffey, Dianne Bradley, Helen Carrig, G Cunningham, Ian Curwen-Walker, Fred Field, Margaret Flint, Lavinia Gent, Sue Henry-Edwards, Euan Miller, J Nelson, Peter Nicholls, Rebecca Pannell, Tim Pennington, Warren Rogers, Edward Sandeckock, Christine Solomon, Rosemary White, K Ramsay.

Rev’d Stuart Langshaw, Very Rev’d Stephen Ogden, Rev’d Donald Owens, Rev’d John Stephenson, Rev’d Dr Catherine Thomson, Rev’d Peter Williams, Dianne Bradley, Helen Carrig, G Cunningham, Ian Curwen-Walker, J Dibben, Fred Field, Margaret Flint, Sue Henry-Edwards, Euan Miller, Peter Nicholls, R Pannell, Tim Pennington, Chris Purton, Warren Rogers, T Saunders, Christine Solomon, Baden Teague, Rosemary White, Rev’d Peter Stuart, R Slater.

Very Rev’d Stephen Ogden, Rev’d Paul Harrington, Rev’d Stuart Langshaw, Rev’d Caroline Pearce, Rev’d Peter Stuart, Rev’d David Thornton-Wakeford, Rev’d Peter Williams, Dianne Bradley, Helen Carrig, Dawn Colsey, G Cunningham, Ian Curwen-Walker, John Dibben, Margaret Flint, Sue Henry-Edwards, Euan Miller, Peter Nicholls, R Pannell, Tim Pennington, Allan Perryman, Chris Purton, Warren Rogers, Christine Solomon, Baden Teague, Rosemary White, Jan Horsnell, J Potter

(2000-2001)

(2001-2002)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very Rev'd Stephen Ogden, Rev'd Peter Balabanski, Rev'd Mara Di Francesco, Rev'd Paul Harrington, Rev'd Stuart Langshaw, Rev'd Caroline Pearce, Rev'd Peter Williams, Dianne Bradley, Helen Carrig, Dawn Colsey, G Cunningham, Ian Curwen-Walker, John Dibben, Margaret Flint, Peter Nicholls, R Pannell, Tim Pennington, Allan Perryman, Chris Purton, Warren Rogers, Christine Solomon, Baden Teague, Rosemary White, Jan Horsnell, J Potter.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(2003-2004)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very Rev'd Stephen Ogden, Rev'd Paul Harrington, Rev'd Stuart Langshaw, Rev'd Nigel Mitchell, Rev'd Caroline Pearce, Rev'd Peter Williams, Dianne Bradley, Helen Carrig, Dawn Colsey, Ian Curwen-Walker, Richard Dennis, Maxine Goulding, Michael Lane, Nereda Ozols, Rebecca Pannell, Dennis Paterson, Tim Pennington, Allan Perryman, Chris Purton, Anthony Radford, Hilary Reddrop, Warren Rogers, Peter Sandeman, Keith Smith, Baden Teague, Rosemary White, Jan Horsnell</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(2004-2005)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(2005-2006)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Rev’d Stephen Ogden, Rev Paul Harrington, Rev’d Stuart Langshaw, Red Nigel Mitchell, Rev’d Caroline Pearce, Rev’d Peter Williams, Helen Carrig, Dawn Colsey, Ian Curwen-Walker, Richard Dennis, Maxine Goulding, Jan Hornell, Michael Lane, Nereda Ozols, Rebecca Pannell, Dennis Patterson, Tim Pennington, Christopher Purton, Anthony Radford, Hilary Reddrop, Warren Rogers, Peter Sandeman, Keith Smith, Rosemary White, Ven Dr Tim Harris, Allan Perryman, Ven Ruth Mathieson, Rev’d Stephen Pickard.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most Rev’d Jeffrey Driver, Right Rev’d Stephen Pickard; Ven Ruth Mathieson; Ven Paul Mitchell; Rev’d Paul Harrington; Rev’d Janet Phillips; Rev’d Joan Riley; Rev’d John Stephenson; Rev’d David Covington-Groth; Hon Justice David Bleby; Peter Sandeman; Lynn Arnold; Helen Carrig; Richard Dennis; Alastair Lea; Katrina Loveday; Allan Perryman; Chris Purton; Hilary Reddrop; Keith Smith; Ven Peter Stuart; Very Rev’d Stephen Ogden</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Most Rev’d Jeffrey Driver, Rt Rev’d Stephen Pickard, Rev’d Ruth Mathieson, Katrina Loveday, Allan Perryman, John Stephenson, Chris Purton, Hilary Reddrop, Ven Paul Mitchell, Rev Joan Riley, Peter Sandeman, Lynn Arnold, Helen Carrig, Richard Dennis, Alastair Lea, Rev’d Paul Harrington, Rev’d David Covington-Groth, Rev’d Janet Phillips, Keith Smith, David Bleby

(2009-2010)

Ven Sally Boothe, Rev’d David Covington-Groth, Rev’d Elizabeth Dyke, Very Rev’d Sarah Macneil, Ven Paul Mitchell, Stephanie Swansson, Rev’d Joan Riley, Rev’d Martyn Woodsford, Rev’d Andy Wurm, Lynn Arnold, Geoff Bloor, Helen Carrig, Alastair Lea, Sandy Mitchell, Allan Perryman, Chris Purton

(2010-2011)

Note that as of this year, changes in reporting style mean that every member of the council is named, including the office holders specified at the start of this section.)

The Most Rev’d Jeffrey Driver; Lynn Arnold; David Bleby; Geoff Bloor, Ven Sally Boothe, Helen Carrig, Rev’d David Covington-Groth, Rev’d Elizabeth Dyke, Alastair Lea, Sandy Mitchell, Ven Paul Mitchell, Simon Murray, Allan Perryman, Rev’d Janet Phillips, Chris Purton, Rev’d Joan Riley, Keith Stephens, Rev’d Martyn Woodsford, Rev’d Andy Wurm, Rev’d Ruth Mathieson, Rev’d Paul Harrington, Rev’d John Stephenson, Katrina Loveday, Hilary Reddrop.

Resignations: Rose Alwyn, Very Rev’d Sarah MacNeil.

(2011)

Resignation: Rev'd Joan Riley.


Resignation: Ven Sally Boothe


Appointment: Ven Lyn McRostie.

Resignations/end of term: Ven Elizabeth Dyke; Lynn Arnold, Helen Carrig, Simon Murray.

**Resignation:** Ven Paul Mitchell,
**Appointments:** Ven Lyn McRostie, Simon Murray, Right Rev'd Chris McLeod.
Q9. The current function, composition, and legal status of the:
   a) Bishop-in-Council or Diocesan Council
   b) Board of Trustees established to manage the real property of the Diocese, and
   c) Synod of the Diocese of Adelaide

a) Bishop-in-Council or Diocesan Council

69. The Diocese of Adelaide has a Diocesan Council, established under The Constitution of the
    Anglican Diocese of Adelaide [ANG.9610.01001.0014] and regulated through the Diocesan
    Council and Ministry Units Ordinance [ANG.0146.001.0379].

70. As per section 22 of The Constitution of the Anglican Diocese of Adelaide
    [ANG.9610.01001.0014]: 'The Diocesan Council shall be a council of advice to the Bishop and
    the executive committee of the Synod and subject to provisions of several Ordinances of the
    Synod shall have the power in the name and on behalf of the Synod to exercise or perform all
    or any of the rights authorities and powers of the Synod save except the making altering or
    repealing of any Ordinance the altering or repealing of this Constitution and the exercise of
    any right authority or power to which the Synod shall by Ordinance declare that this Section
    shall not apply'.

71. As at 18 November 2015, Diocesan Council is currently comprised of the following 18 people:

   • The Most Rev'd Dr Jeffrey Driver (Archbishop)
   • The Hon David Bleby QC (Chancellor) (non-voting)
   • Mr Keith Stephens (Secretary of Synod) (non-voting)
   • The Rt Rev'd Timothy Harris (Assistant Bishop)
   • The Rt Rev'd Christopher McLeod (Assistant Bishop)
   • The Rev'd Canon Dr Matthew Anstey
   • The Rev'd David Covington-Groth
   • The Very Rev'd Frank Nelson
   • The Rev'd Janet Phillips
   • The Rev'd Martyn Woodsford
   • The Rev'd Andy Wurm
   • The Ven Lyn McRostie
   • Dr Geoff Bloor
   • Mr Alastair Lea
   • Ms Sandy Mitchell
   • Mr Allan Perryman
   • Mr Christopher Purton
   • Mr Simon Murray
b) **Board of Trustees established to manage the real property of the Diocese**

72. The Diocese of Adelaide does not have a Board of Trustees to manage the real property of the Diocese. That function is vested in the Synod and delegated to the Diocesan Council as the management committee of Synod, which in turn, has delegated some responsibility to the Diocesan Administration and Resources Executive, a formal sub-committee of the Diocesan Council.

c) **Synod of the Diocese of Adelaide**

73. As per *The Constitution of the Anglican Diocese of Adelaide* [ANG.9610.01001.0014], the Synod shall be a governing body for the management of the affairs of the Diocese of Adelaide of the Anglican Church of Australia Incorporated with the objective to provide for the life and growth and the order and good government of the Diocese. The Powers of Synod are outlined in Section 9 of the Constitution.

74. The composition of the Synod is as follows:

- The Bishop.
- The Chancellor.
- Every licenced member of the clergy
- Lay members of the Synod representing each parish of the Diocese according to the following scale:
  - For each parish having not more than 74 communicants, one lay member;
  - For each parish having not fewer than 75 communicants nor more than 149 communicants, two lay members;
  - For each parish having not fewer than 150 nor more than 249 communicates, three lay members;
  - For each parish having not fewer than 250 nor more than 399 communicants, four lay members;
  - For each parish having not fewer than 400 communicants, five lay members; or
  - For each parish comprised of two or more congregations, a number of lay members of the Synod equal to the number of congregations comprising the parish; whichever is greater.
- The Secretary of Synod.
- Not more than five lay members appointed by the Bishop.
- Those appointed to Diocesan Council who may not be members of Synod.

75. The Roll of Attendees at the most recent Annual Session of Synod (16-18 October 2015) is attached [ANG.0146.001.0386]. 144 lay members and 114 clergy were summoned by the Archbishop, making a total Synod membership of 259.
Q10. An overview of the responsibilities, theological training, qualifications, licensing and employment arrangements of
a) Deacons,
b) Priests, and
c) Bishops

76. Most clergy in the Diocese of Adelaide are office holders (Status of Clergy Ordinance 2002 [ANG.0173.001.0174]). Some, including those in a variety of chaplaincy positions, are formally employees.

77. The processes of selection and formation of clergy for ordination are dealt with below.

78. The appointment of most incumbents is provided for under the Parochial Administration Ordinance 1985 [ANG.0146.001.0332]. This involves consideration of possible names through a Nomination Committee which includes Parish and Diocesan representatives. This committee nominates to the Archbishop who may refuse a nomination, but rarely does so. If an appointment is to be made involving a clergy member from another diocese, the Archbishop usually contacts the Bishop of the Diocese involved.

79. No appointment is finalised until after the National Register is checked, a Police clearance secured and Safer Ministry screening is completed. Clergy are required to undertake ‘Safer Ministry Education’ and ‘Child Safe Environments’ training every three years and to obtain new Police clearances every three years.

80. Traditionally the incumbents of parishes have had unlimited tenure. However, as a result of a recommendation of the Board of Inquiry 2004, licences issued since that time have a provision for withdrawal on three months’ notice.

81. The appointment of chaplains is made in consultation with the body where the chaplaincy is located (school or agency). Some specific educational requirements may be associated with chaplaincy appointments. For example, hospital chaplains are required to complete clinical pastoral education.

82. Assisting clergy are appointed on the nomination of the Incumbent and Wardens. Again, the Bishop may chose not to license the person proposed, but rarely does so. The same screening and Safer Ministry requirements apply for assisting clergy as for incumbents.

83. The appointment of the Diocesan Bishop is provided for under Ordinance (The Election of a Bishop Ordinance 2002 [ANG.0173.001.0168]). The process involves an initial committee stage, then consideration of a shortlist of names by the Diocesan Synod. Assistant Bishops may be appointed by the Diocesan Bishop with the concurrence of Diocesan Council (Assistant Bishop Ordinance 2002 [ANG.0173.001.0156]). Bishops are subject to a process certifying Canonical fitness. The National Register is consulted.
84. Educational requirements for deacons and priests are in line with General Synod guidelines. Deacons in the Diocese of Adelaide are usually expected to have completed theological education to diploma level.

85. Priests in the Diocese are expected to have completed theological education to degree level. This requirement is relaxed to diploma level in the instance of some late vocations. For both orders, those in formation are expected to complete the equivalent of four years' mentored formation.

86. The formal educational requirements for Bishops are the same as those for priests [under the requirements for Canonical fitness, Bishops must be in priests' orders], but postgraduate qualifications are seen as desirable.

87. The primary source for a description of responsibilities for deacons, priests and Bishops is the Ordinal. Supplementary information may be sourced from relevant sections of the Diocesan Constitution, Ordinances, forms of license and the Commissioning Service.

Bishops

88. In the Ordinal: the Bishop is described as 'a chief minister and pastor in Christ’s Church', with special responsibility to guard its faith, unity and discipline, and promote its mission in the world (A Prayer Book for Australia 1995, pp.779-798 [ANG.0042.001.0461]). The Bishop is to 'ensure that God’s word is faithfully proclaimed, Christ’s sacraments duly administered and Christ's discipline applied justly, with mercy'. The Constitution of the Anglican Diocese of Adelaide [ANG.9610.01001.0014] vests responsibility for the 'good government and the management of the affairs of the Diocese' in the Diocesan Bishop and the Synod.

89. Under Synod Ordinance the Assistant Bishop 'shall undertake such work and perform such Episcopal acts as may be required or permitted by the Bishop' (Assistant Bishop Ordinance 2002 [ANG.0173.001.0156]). In the absence of the Diocesan Bishop or, in the instance of a vacancy of the See, the Assistant Bishop becomes the Diocesan Administrator, having the powers of the Diocesan Bishop with the exception that Ordinances may not be passed through Synod without a duly elected diocesan Bishop present (The Constitution of the Anglican Diocese of Adelaide).

Priests

90. The Ordinal describes the role of a priest as pastoring and leading a local congregation, teaching the Holy Scripture, preaching, administering the Sacraments of the Church and declaring God’s reconciling love. Priests are called to care for the young, needy and vulnerable and to encourage and enable others in ministry and service. They are to take their part in the counsels of the Church.
91. The Diocesan Commissioning Service for clergy describes the role of a priest as that of a pastor and teacher whose responsibility is to proclaim by word and deed the Gospel of Christ. The priest is to lead in the celebration of the sacraments and to love and serve the people among whom he or she is appointed, encouraging Church members in their vocation and ministry.

92. In addition, the *Parochial Administration Ordinance 1985* [ANG.0146.001.0332] provides that the Priest of a Parish will chair the Parish Council and together they will have a range of administrative functions, including the maintenance, control and insurance of Church property, the management of parish finances and the provision of ‘all things necessary for the decent performance of divine service and the administration of the sacraments’.

**Deacons**

93. Deacons who are training to be priests have many of the same duties as priests, but are not able to preside at the Holy Communion. As assisting ministers, they do not (with rare exceptions) chair a meeting of Parish Council. Those who are affirmed as ‘permanent’ deacons often have distinctive areas of ministry in chaplaincy or community service.

94. The Ordinal characterises the role of a deacon as ‘serving God as you serve others in Jesus’ name’. The deacon is to proclaim the good news of God’s love so that hearts might be opened to ‘do justice, love mercy, and walk humbly in the presence of God’. The deacon is to have special responsibility for the young, the careless and indifferent, the sick and the needy. The deacon is to assist in the administration of the sacraments, and to take a part in the life and councils of the Church.

95. Before licensing, all clergy are required to subscribe to the Third Schedule in *The Constitution of the Anglican Diocese of Adelaide* [ANG.9610.01001.0014], take an Oath of Canonical Obedience and sign the Declaration and Assent to the Constitution of the Anglican Church of Australia.

96. All clergy are entitled to a provision of up to 10 days’ professional development each year in approved areas. All are required to maintain a level of currency in the diocesan *Safer Ministry Education* programme.

**Q11. In relation to any corporate entities created by the Diocese to respond to any legal claim arising from allegations of sexual abuse:**

a) The name of the entity
b) The date of incorporation
c) The mode of incorporation, and
d) Any assets held by the corporation.

97. The Synod of the Diocese of Adelaide has not established any corporate entities for the purposes of responding to the legal claims arising from sexual abuse. The Synod of the Diocese
of Adelaide of the Anglican Church of Australia Incorporated is the sole legal entity of the Diocese and has been the entity that has responded to all legal claims.

98. Refer back to Questions 1 and 6 for further information.
The Church of England Boys’ Society (CEBS)

Q12. The Nature of any past and/or present relationship between the Anglican Diocese of Adelaide and any State Diocesan Council of CEBS and/or the Anglican Boy’s Society, including but not limited to any: Legal, financial, and/or administrative relationship; Governance arrangements; Staffing arrangements, and Record-keeping and archiving arrangements.

Background

99. The Melbourne Synod passed a resolution in 1913 establishing the Church of England Boys’ Society (CEBS) in Victoria. The first branch of the CEBS was set up in South Australia in or about 1927.

100. A national body, The Church of England Boys’ Society Australia existed with its own Constitution, and it recommended that branches in any diocese in Australia organise themselves under a Diocesan Constitution. It was expected that Diocesan constitutions would be registered with the National Council of CEBS.

101. No record has been located of formal rules for CEBS in South Australia prior to a constitution dated 1953. That Constitution was revised in 1970, in 1982, and again in 1995.

102. From 1953, CEBS SA was a separately incorporated association. The successive Constitutions note that CEBS SA is an integral part of and exists under the National Constitution of CEBS.

103. Membership of the CEBS State Council was drawn heavily from Anglican clergy.

104. Many of the following responses are found in the four Constitutions of the Society:

- CHURCH OF ENGLAND BOYS’ SOCIETY (Diocese of Adelaide): date stamped 27 March 1953 [ANG.0146.001.0397]
- CHURCH OF ENGLAND BOYS’ SOCIETY IN SOUTH AUSTRALIA: adopted 23 November 1970 [ANG.0178.001.0001]
- CEBS - THE ANGLICAN BOYS’ SOCIETY (S.A.) INC.: adopted 22 June 1982 [ANG.161.001.0004]
- CEBS The Anglican Boys’ Society SA Inc.: as amended December 1995 [ANG.0178.001.0004]
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Clause</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1953 Constitution | Clause 3 | The aim of the Society is to forward the objects of the C.E.B.S. within the Diocese of Adelaide, that is:  
(a) to help young Churchmen to realise their privileges and responsibilities as disciples of Jesus Christ.  
(b) to band them together for Christ and His Church.  
(c) to promote opportunities for spiritual, mental, and physical development and for social intercourse. |
| 1970 Constitution | Clause 3 | The objects of the Society are:  
(a) to help members to realise their privileges and responsibilities as disciples of Jesus Christ;  
(b) to band members together in the service of Jesus Christ and His Church;  
(c) to promote opportunities for spiritual, mental, and physical development of and for social intercourse between members. |
| 1982 Constitution | Clause 3 | The objects of the Society are:  
3.1 to help members accept their privileges and realise and undertake their responsibilities and obligations as disciples of Jesus Christ;  
3.2 to band members together in the service of Jesus Christ and His Church;  
3.3 to promote opportunities for spiritual, mental, and physical development of and for social intercourse between members.  
3.4 to encourage them to live according to their Rule of Life as set out in Schedule 1 of this Constitution. |
| 1995 Constitution | Clause 3 | The objects of the Society are:  
3.1 To proclaim the love of God such that boys and young men may respond and follow Jesus Christ.  
3.2 To be Parish based, and to be integrated into the life and ministry of the Parish.  
3.3 To recognize the opportunities of ministry to families  
3.4 To care for, equip and support leaders in their ministry.  
3.5 In the context of the Christian faith, to ensure that boys are nurtured in their spiritual, mental, social and physical development. |
3.6 To encourage members to live according to their Rule of Life as set out in Schedule 1 of this Constitution.

Legal, financial and/or administrative relationship

105. Legally CEBS and the Diocese were separate entities. Financial and administrative functions were also separate. The 1953 and the 1970 Constitutions state that real property controlled by the Society is to be held on trust for the Society by the Synod of the Diocese of Adelaide. Upon winding up, assets held by CEBS were to be distributed to another body having similar objects.

Real Estate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Clause</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1953 Constitution</td>
<td>Clause 27(a)</td>
<td>All real property within the control of the Executive is vested in the Synod upon trust for the Society.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970 Constitution</td>
<td>Clause 24(a)</td>
<td>All real property within the control of the Executive is vested in the Synod upon trust for the Society.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1982 Constitution</td>
<td>Constitution silent on this matter. (NB All CEBS real estate owned by Synod from 1980 onwards – see question 13 below).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995 Constitution</td>
<td>Constitution silent on this matter. (NB All CEBS real estate owned by Synod from 1980 onwards – see question 13 below).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Personal Property

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Clause</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1953 Constitution</td>
<td>Constitution silent on this matter.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970 Constitution</td>
<td>Clause 24(b)</td>
<td>Executive holds all personal property on trust and to the use of the Society.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1982 Constitution</td>
<td>Clause 18</td>
<td>Executive holds all personal property on trust and to the use of the Society.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995 Constitution</td>
<td>Clause 18</td>
<td>Executive holds all personal property on trust and to the use of the Society.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Winding Up

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Clause</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1953 Constitution</td>
<td>Constitution silent on this matter.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970 Constitution</td>
<td>Constitution silent on this matter.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1982 Constitution</td>
<td>Constitution silent on this matter.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995 Constitution</td>
<td>Clause 20</td>
<td>Upon winding up, property of the Society to be distributed to another body or bodies having similar objects to the society and approved under the provisions of section 23 of the Income Tax Assessment Act 1936.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Governance arrangements

106. Each Constitution contains detailed provisions about membership, management at State level and organisation at branch level. Management at State level was in the hands of an Executive. Reports on the Society’s activities were to be provided to the Synod or to the Secretary of Synod annually. Branches of CEBS could only be formed in parishes with the agreement of the incumbent, and leaders of branches were to be appointed by the incumbent. Although, the Archbishop of Adelaide was ex-officio President of CEBS by virtue of the CEBS Constitution, the present Archbishop upon arrival in Adelaide in October 2005 refused to take on that role in light of the circumstances surrounding CEBS and Brandenburg, out of pastoral concern for survivors.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1953 Constitution</th>
<th>Clause 7</th>
<th>Branches can be formed in parishes only with the consent of the Incumbent and Executive. [Non parochial branches can also be formed if Executive agrees.]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Clause 8</td>
<td>Management of each branch in hands of Committee – Incumbent (or nominee) Leaders, Secretary and Treasurer and others nominated by branch.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Clause 10</td>
<td>Each Leader appointed by Incumbent and approved by Executive. Each assistant Leader to be approved by Incumbent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Clause 12</td>
<td>Management of the Society is by a Diocesan Council, consisting of a President (the Bishop of Adelaide), Incumbents of parishes in which there are registered branches of the Society and others.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Clause 17(b)</td>
<td>Bishop of Adelaide (as President of the Society) is on Diocesan Executive Committee, together with Director for Youth Work, the Chief Commissioner and District Commissioners.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Clause 18</td>
<td>The Executive was to govern the Society, including controlling all finance and property of the Society. It was to appoint a Chief Commissioner and an honorary auditor annually.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Clause 23</td>
<td>Report of the Society to be presented annually by the Executive (Committee) to the Synod.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1970 Constitution</th>
<th>Clause 7</th>
<th>Branches can be formed in parishes only with the consent of the Incumbent and approval of the Executive.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Clause 4</td>
<td>Members are communicant boys of the Church of England in Australia under 18 years old. Associate members are unconfirmed boys of the Church of England in Australia between 6 and 18 years old.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clause 10</td>
<td>Branch Governor, assistant Branch Governors and Leaders together with any female Leaders or assistant Leaders to be communicant members of the Church of England in Australia. Incumbent’s approval required for appointment of assistant Branch Governors and for appointment of Leaders and for appointment of female Leaders or assistant Leaders.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clause 11</td>
<td>Subject to the Incumbent’s approval branches can make their own rules and regulations to achieve the Society’s objects.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clause 12</td>
<td>The President of the Society is the Bishop of Adelaide. The 2 Deputy Presidents are the Bishops of Willochra and The Murray.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clause 13</td>
<td>The affairs of the Society to be managed by the Council, which includes the President, the Deputy Presidents and Incumbents of parishes with branches of the Society. The President is the Chairman of the Council.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clause 18</td>
<td>The Executive Committee of the Society, which includes the President and the Deputy Presidents, has authority to control and manage the business, affairs, finances and property of the Society. The President is the Chairman of the Executive committee.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| 1982 Constitution | Clause 4(b) | Leader baptised and ought ... to be ‘a member of the Anglican Church or a Church in communion with it’. |
|                  | Clause 4(d) | Incumbents of parishes in which there are branches shall be members of the Society. Admission as a Member shall take place within a regular Church service. |
|                  | Clause 7.1  | Branch attached to Parish. |
|                  | Clause 7.2  | No branch to be formed without consent of Incumbent and Executive. |
|                  | Clause 7.4  | If Incumbent’s consent is withdrawn group is no longer a branch. |
|                  | Clause 8.1  | Administration of the Branch shall be conducted by a committee - Incumbent, (Branch Governor-added in handwriting) Leaders, Secretary, Treasurer and others. |
|                  | Clause 8.2  | Policy of Branch subject to Incumbent’s direction; Incumbent has right to veto. |
|                  | Clause 8.4  | The Governor of the Branch shall be appointed by the Incumbent. Leaders and assistants appointed by Governor with the approval of the Incumbent. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clause 11.1.1</th>
<th>State Council consists of Officers of the Society, namely the President (Archbishop of Adelaide), 2 Deputy Presidents (Bishops of Willochra and The Murray), Incumbents of Parishes that have Branches.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clause 12.1</td>
<td>The Executive Committee consists of the President and Deputy Presidents....and Commissioners of the Society.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clause 12.3</td>
<td>The Executive must send copy of the Report of the General Meeting to Secretaries of Synod in all South Australian dioceses. The Executive has power to control and manage the business, affairs, finances, and property of the Society.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1995 Constitution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clause 4.1.2</th>
<th>Leaders As per 4(b) 1982</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clause 4.1.3</td>
<td>Incumbents As per 4(d) 1982</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clause 4.2</td>
<td>Admission as a Member shall take place within a regular Church service.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clause 7.1</td>
<td>Branch attached to Parish (as per 1982)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clause 7.2</td>
<td>No branch to be formed without consent of Incumbent and Executive (as per 1982).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clause 7.4</td>
<td>If Incumbent's consent is withdrawn group is no longer a branch (as per 1982).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clause 8.1</td>
<td>Administration of the Branch shall be conducted by a committee - Incumbent, Branch Governor, Leaders, Secretary, Treasurer and others (as per 1982).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clause 8.2</td>
<td>Policy of Branch subject to Incumbent's direction; Incumbent has right to veto (as per 1982).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clause 8.4</td>
<td>The Governor of the Branch shall be appointed by the Incumbent. Leaders and assistants appointed by Governor with the approval of the Incumbent (as per 1982).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clause 11.1.1</td>
<td>State Council consists of Officers of the Society, namely the President (Archbishop of Adelaide), 2 Deputy Presidents (Bishops of Willochra and The Murray), Incumbents of Parishes that have Branches (as per 1982).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clause 12.1</td>
<td>The Executive Committee consists of the President and Deputy Presidents....and Commissioners of the Society (as per 1982).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clause 12.3.4</td>
<td>The Executive must send copy of the Report of the General Meeting to Secretaries of Synod in all South Australian dioceses.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Staffing arrangements

107. No specific mention is made in the 1953, 1970 and 1982 Constitutions of the Society about employing staff. However, the 1953 Constitution draws a distinction between the appointment of an honorary auditor and appointing a Chief Commissioner.

108. In 1978, as Chief Commissioner of CEBS, Robert Brandenburg was employed full time in that role, at a salary of $10,000 per annum. CEBS’ inability to meet the ongoing salary is cited by CEBS as a reason in favour of transferring ownership of the Hoyleton and Mylar campsites to the Synod, as this proposal would enable CEBS to extinguish debts it had incurred to the Synod, and would also see the Synod pay part of Brandenburg’s salary, as Campsite Manager. It is apparent from the minutes of the Diocesan Campsites Committee that the Campsites Manager was employed by the Diocesan Campsites Committee from August 1981, and that the Synod paid the Campsite Manager’s salary and was reimbursed by the Diocesan Campsites Committee.

Responsibility for overseeing work of the Society:
[NB an office, no mention of paid employment]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1953 Constitution</th>
<th>Clause 19</th>
<th>Chief Commissioner appointed by the Executive to whom he shall be responsible for the general oversight of the work of the Branches...for the co-ordination of the work of the District and other Commissioners; and other duties given by the Executive.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1970 Constitution</td>
<td>Clause 21</td>
<td>Chief Commissioner appointed triennially by the Council for the general oversight of the work of the Branches; coordination of the work of the Commissioners; and other duties allotted by the Executive.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1982 Constitution</td>
<td>Clause 16</td>
<td>Chief Commissioner appointed biennially by the Council to oversee work of branches; coordination of the work of the Commissioners; and other duties allotted by the Executive.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995 Constitution</td>
<td>Clause 16</td>
<td>Chief Commissioner appointed biennially by the Council to oversee work of branches; coordination of the work of the Commissioners; and other duties allotted by the Executive (as per 1982).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Clarification that the Society can employ members.

| 1953 Constitution | Constitution silent on this matter. |

| Anglican Diocese of Adelaide Response (V2.0 – 20 January 2016) | Page 54 of 156 |
1970 Constitution | Constitution silent on this matter.
1982 Constitution | Constitution silent on this matter.
1995 Constitution | Clause 19 Society is non-profit making, but members can be paid in good faith of remuneration in return for any service actually rendered to the Society.

Record keeping and archiving arrangements

109. CEBS was required by its 1982 and 1995 Constitutions to keep proper records of assets and liabilities. However, Branches kept their own records, and set their own policies, and do not appear to have been obliged to forward their records to the State Executive.

110. A CEBS note dated 1970 indicates that branches were regarded as being responsible for their own record keeping.

1982 Constitution | Clause 12.3.11 The Executive is to keep proper records of the Society’s assets and liabilities and receipts and payments and produce statements in relation to the same when requested by the Council or a majority of the Executive.
1995 Constitution | Clause 12.3.11 As per 1982

111. Although CEBS had responsibility to maintain its own records, Diocesan archives does contain some CEBS material. Some of these materials were received when CEBS ceased its activities in 2008.

Q13. The nature of any past and/or present relationship between 1 January 1965 and the date of this letter, between the Diocese and any camp sites or other venues used by CEBS and/or the Anglican Boys’ Society for camping activities, including any child protection policies and procedures maintained by the Diocese in respect of youth attending camps at those venues.

Background – before 1979

112. Before 1979 the Synod had no direct involvement in the ownership or management of campsites used by CEBS/Anglican Boys’ Society. At that stage, there were 3 campsites regularly in use by Anglican groups: Hoyleton, Mylor (Camp Gooden) and Port Elliot (St Luke’s). CEBS owned the campsites at Hoyleton and Mylor.

1973 | Hoyleton was ‘handed to the Anglican Church in the Diocese of Adelaide (CEBS) for a ‘peppercorn’ rent’ by the Minister of Education in 1973.
8 August 1978 | Standing Committee of Synod agreed to acquire Mylor and Hoyleton Campsites from CEBS for $10,000 – thereby extinguishing a bridging loan agreement between Synod and CEBS.

St Luke’s campsite

| 1979 | 21 allotments of land at Port Elliot sold before Diocesan Campsites Committee took over responsibility for the campsite. |

1 January 1979 to 24 November 1988

113. A Diocesan Campsites Committee was formed to manage the operation of campsites used for Anglican camps. It met for the first time on 1 March 1979. Ownership of the two CEBS campsites at Hoyleton and Mylor had been transferred to Synod in 1979.

114. The Diocesan Campsites Committee adopted a Constitution or Rules in 1979 (Campsites Committee Constitution 1979 [ANG.0146.001.0394]). These were revised in 1982 (Campsites Committee Constitution 1982 [ANG.0146.001.0393]).

115. Membership of the Committee was as follows:
   - 3 members appointed by Diocesan Council of Synod
   - 3 members appointed by CEBS
   - 3 members appointed by St Luke’s, Whitmore Square
   - 1 member appointed by GFS (Girls Friendly Society)
   - 1 member appointed by Young Anglican Fellowship in South Australia
   - 1 member appointed by the Anglican Board of Christian Education. (Clause 2, Constitution)

116. The Committee had to report not later than 31 May in each year to Diocesan Council on its activities and financial position for the year ending 31 March. (Clause 12, Constitution).

117. The Committee was to appoint a Manager on such terms and conditions as the Committee saw fit. The Manager’s role was to manage and care for the campsites subject to the directions of the Committee (Clause 6).
118. The Chair of the Committee reported (Minutes of 18 August 1981 [ANG.0181.001.0025]) that
‘he had acted on the notice of motion dealing with the employment of the manager. He had
presented a report to Diocesan Council stating that Mr Robert Brandenburg was now
employed by the Diocesan Campsites Committee’.

119. The salary arrangements for the Camp Manager were finalised on 12 November 1981.
Diocesan Council agreed to handle the payments of salary and superannuation for the
campsites manager. The committee was to pay Church Office monthly.

120. As the Diocesan Campsites Committee was a committee of the Synod, the Synod was
responsible for the management of the following campsites:

- Camp Gooden, Mylor
- St Luke’s Camp, Port Elliot
- Camp Hoyleton, Hoyleton and

121. The Diocesan Campsites Committee had an office in the St Barnabas Building (Synod property)
(Minutes 12 November 1981 [ANG.0181.001.0025]). It paid ‘rent’ to Church Office, and
shared the space with CEBS Australia Trading (National CEBS Shop). The Campsites Manager
also worked as National Trading Officer for National CEBS and performed administrative work
for Camping Association of South Australia (CASA). CASA paid between $4,000 and $6,000 to
the Diocesan Campsites Committee for the provision of these services.

122. The Synod passed a resolution in 1988 that Diocesan Campsites be brought under Anglican
Community Services. Noted in the Diocesan Campsite Committee Minutes 3 November 1988
[ANG.0181.001.0022]): ‘A schedule of co-ordinating the Anglican Community services shows
that the Diocesan Campsites will be included in the new Anglican Community Services by
the end of 1989. The meeting felt that the composition of the Committee could be revamped
at that time when the whole constitution would be amended.’

123. The last meeting of the Diocesan Campsites Committee took place on 24 November 1988. An
Executive Committee for Anglican Campsites comprising Rev’d Hillman, GO Geddes and M
Butcher was formed during the transition period.

124. The interim committee met on 9 February 1989 (ACS-Campsites Committee - Minutes 09
February 1989 [ANG.0181.001.0146]). The minutes from that meeting are unsigned, but a
further (and final) meeting was scheduled for 6 April 1989.

125. Responsibility for management of the campsites moved from the Diocesan Campsites
Committee to the Community Care Division of the Social Welfare Council (of Anglican
Community Services) in or about April 1989.

126. NB: Some Pt Elliot land was sold to Pt Elliot Council for use as a Council car park, and 23
blocks were subdivided from the Port Elliot campsite holding and sold between 1986 and 1992.
1989 onwards

127. Anglican Community Services (ACS) managed the 4 campsites from 1989 onwards. Harrogate and Mylor were sold in 1997. The proceeds of the sale of the Mylor camp were applied to the purchase of a campsite at Barossa Goldfields, which was already being used by CEBS.

128. In 2001, the Diocesan Secretary required CEBS to sign a letter formalising the use of the Barossa Goldfields campsite [ANG.0181.001.0037]. Records would indicate that ACS was no longer managing campsites.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1989</td>
<td>‘Since 1989, A.C.S. has adopted a philosophy of caring for and encouraging the use of the Campsites on behalf of the Diocese.’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 May 1991</td>
<td>ACS on behalf of Synod extended the lease of the Harrogate campsite to 31 December 2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>Owner of Harrogate campsite decided to sell the land: ACS purchased it (on behalf of Synod)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 1997</td>
<td>DC approved sale of Harrogate Campsite, with proceeds to be used towards cost of redeveloping St Luke's Campsite at Port Elliot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 October 1997</td>
<td>DC approved the sale of Camp Gooden (Mylor), with proceeds to go to purchase of Goldfields (camp) site by Synod.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 2001</td>
<td>Signed agreement between CEBS and Synod re the use of Goldfields Campsite for 5 years from 1 April 2001 with right of renewal for further 5 years.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 August 2006</td>
<td>St Luke's Campsite was sold.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 2007</td>
<td>The Barossa Goldfields campsite had been sold by November 2007</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Goldfields Campsite

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1986</td>
<td>CEBS started to use an unused block of Church land owned by Leigh Trust in the Barossa Goldfields.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 October 1997</td>
<td>DC approved the sale of Camp Gooden (Mylor), with proceeds to go to purchase of Goldfields (camp) site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 2001</td>
<td>Signed agreement between CEBS and Synod re the use of Goldfields Campsite for 5 years from 1 April 2001 with right of renewal for further 5 years.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre November 2007</td>
<td>Email from Anne Hywood to Ken Pidgeon re Barossa Goldfields Property (Reference to D Plumridge advising of sale of Barossa Goldfields Campsite.) [ANG.0181.001.0007]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Camp Rules/Child Protection Policies and Procedures

129. The only documents that refer to camp rules produced for campsites while the Diocesan Campsites Committee managed the campsites, are located across two sets of rules that relate to St Luke’s Campsite. These refer to practicalities such as smoking, alcohol and areas that are out of bounds to campers. Rules were also set by caretakers at the campsites.

130. The Diocesan Campsites Committee relied on CEBS and other users of the campsites to use their own rules. The earliest references that have been located in Diocesan archives relating to CEBS’ rules are contained in the minutes of the CEBS SA Executive on 30 November 1951 (CEBS Mylor Campsite Rules 1951 [ANG.0146.001.0398]). The rules relate to the campsite at Mylor, after the first hut had been constructed there. For the most part the rules relate to practical matters such as hire charges, inventories, and expectations about how the property is to be treated. It did place a maximum occupancy of the hut at 9 persons, and stipulated that no group could use the hut unless accompanied by a Leader, who was responsible for the property and for the behavior of the group.

131. In the 1953 Minute book of CEBS SA (CEBS Mylor Campsite Rules 1953 [ANG.0146.001.0395]), there is a reference to the tightening up of regulations to ensure uniformity between branches.

‘VI GENERAL RULES
b) CAMPS. No Branch may camp without the consent of the Rector of the Parish, and the written consent of parents. The (District Commissioner) should be notified of location and dates of camp. The rules governing camping must be strictly adhered to.’

132. A revised set of Rules for the Mylor Campsite is contained in the 1956 Minutes of CEBS SA (CEBS Mylor Campsite Rules 1956 [ANG.0146.001.0396]).

133. While The Church of England Boys’ Society in the Diocese of Adelaide was separately incorporated and had its own Constitution, it was ‘an integral part of and exists under the National Constitution of the Church of England Boys’ Society in Australia’ – (See for example CEBS Constitution 1953, Clause 2 [ANG.0146.001.0397]).

134. The National Council of the Church of England Boys’ Society in Australia produced handbooks and/or manuals, which provided a comprehensive resource for leaders and others involved in CEBS SA. These manuals ‘presented the aims of the movement together with the basic policies and rules of the Society’. The first national handbook was published in 1922. By 1968 the manual stated that ‘(i)n each new printing, an endeavour has been made to bring the publication up to date and in line with current trends in youth work.’

135. The earliest copy of a national Manual located in Diocesan archives was published in October 1968 (CEBS National Manual 1968 [ANG.0146.001.0399]). There are no specific sections on child protection in that edition of the manual, but in the Responsibilities section, it is stipulated that:
'When entrusting boys to the care of leaders, parents have a right to expect that the same care will be taken of their sons as they would take themselves. The leader's moral obligation is not concerned only with protection against accidental injury. It must be realised that when a boy attends any C.E.B.S. function, whether it be a branch meeting, a camp or any other activity, the boy is being taken out of his parental care and parents are entitled to assume that at least the same standards of control are being exercised.

When taking boys on all camps and outings you must obtain written parental authority and also ask if there are any special circumstances, e.g. Asthma, Epilepsy, non-swimmers, heart murmur, allergies, food and drugs.

It is also extremely unwise to find yourself in the position of being in any building or place with any one member of the branch.

You must also take care that you do not place yourself in any situation that could be misconstrued.'

136. The separately incorporated CEBS SA also produced publications for leaders.

137. The earliest publication located in Diocesan archives is a publication entitled CEBS SA The Responsibilities of a Leader – General & Legal [ANG.0146.001.0445], published in December 1983. It contains the above passage verbatim. It also contained instructions about the appropriate way in which volunteers who were not CEBS leaders could be involved in camp activities:

‘Complete charge of the programme or activity must be taken by a registered Leader.

Volunteers may only work with groups of boys under the guidance of that Leader. This means that the volunteer must be working in close proximity to the Leader in charge. A Leader could not, for instance, ask a volunteer to take a small group on a walk away from the camp area by himself or herself.’


138. This publication also contained guidance on transporting members in private vehicles to and from CEBS activities and adopted the South Australian Education Department’s guidelines as to the appropriate leader/student ratios for general and for specific adventure activities. It contained directions about obtaining consent forms from parents, both for regular activities, and also for activities outside Church grounds. A template consent form for outdoor activities was included in the publication.

139. Subsequent revisions to this document in 1990 and 1995 do not materially change these sections.

141. Archival copies of a CEBS SA leaflet entitled Leader Training – Summary of the Revised Requirements in South Australia under CEBS National Leader Training Scheme, dated November 1985 [ANG.0146.001.0476] and revised in May 1995 [ANG.0146.001.0468], have been located. From these documents it is apparent that mandatory reporting of child abuse had been introduced into Leader Training by May 1995.
Church and para-Church institutions

Q14. Any arrangements under which schools or other institutions in your Diocese are permitted to use the Anglican Church name in their title or brand.

142. The Synod of Adelaide does not have any specific Ordinances, policies, guidelines or requirements concerning the use of the term Anglican. The Synod of Adelaide has not adopted General Synod Use of Church Names Canon 1989 which provides a canon to regulate the use of names and descriptions relating to the Anglican Church of Australia. This Canon was not adopted by the Synod of the Diocese of Adelaide because it only applies to dioceses in the State of New South Wales. From time to time, the Synod issues, in consultation with Anglican schools, statements that characterise an Anglican School, see The Principal Qualities that Distinguish an Anglican School [ANG.0146.001.0483] for an example. All schools that use the term Anglican in one form or another have a relationship with the Diocese through their constitutions.

Q15. The current legal, financial, administrative, governance and/or any other relationship between the Anglican Diocese of Adelaide and:

a) Any para-church Diocesan youth group, such as the Crusaders or Youthworks
b) Anglicare, or entities known as Anglicare
c) Anglican schools, and/or
d) Any Anglican-run or affiliated children’s homes

a) Any para-Church Diocesan youth groups, such as the Crusaders or Youthworks.

143. The Diocese of Adelaide participates in an annual para-Church youth camp known as ‘Redefinition’, together with the Evangelical Fellowship in the Anglican Communion SA Branch (EFAC SA). The Diocesan Youth Officer, provides administration and logistical support for the camp, as well as ensuring Diocesan Safer Ministry policies are applied. EFAC SA requires all participating youth leaders to meet the Safer Ministry screening and training requirements of the Diocese. The Diocese organises a quarterly youth event called ‘Thrive’ which is aimed at the secondary school demograph. It is coordinated by the Diocesan Youth Officer.

144. Girls Friendly Society, a non-active group in the Diocese, is still an incorporated entity. In recent years it has made small grants to parishes to assist with youth ministry.

b) Anglicare, or entities known as Anglicare

145. Anglicare SA Limited and Anglicare SA Housing Limited (a subsidiary of Anglicare SA Limited) are entities of the Synod. Anglicare SA Limited’s Constitution [Anglicare SA Limited Constitution April 2014 [ANG.0173.001.0001] and Anglicare SA Limited Constitution October 2015 [ANG.0146.001.0484]] and the Incorporation of Anglicare SA Ordinance 2000 [ANG.0146.001.0520] connect these welfare agencies to the Diocese through their objectives,
how their boards are appointed and by their outward expression that they are parts of the Anglican Church. The current board of Anglicare SA (and by default Anglicare SA Housing) is comprised of the following:

- The Bishop who will be the President;
- One person appointed by the Bishop;
- Three persons elected by the Synod (of whom not more than two will be clergy);
- Three persons elected by the Diocesan Council (who need not be members of Diocesan Council);
- Three persons elected by the Board;
- One person appointed by the Diocese of Willochra;
- One person appointed by the Diocese of the Murray.

146. There are no formal financial relationships between Anglicare SA and the Synod with the exception of:

- the leasing of some property from the Synod;
- sharing some expenses relating to the provision of chaplaincy services and the education of chaplains;
- shared expenses in the provision of ministry to Aboriginal people through the appointment of an Aboriginal Bishop; and
- sharing of resources at a local parish level in the provision of welfare services and programmes.

147. Anglicare SA, from time to time, invests in Anglican Funds South Australia (a trading name of the Synod) Community Fund (lending and term investments) and the Endowment Fund (unit priced investments).

148. Historically, Anglicare SA has provided information technology services to the Diocesan Office through a fee for service arrangement. However, at the time of this submission this service is being discontinued.

149. Prior to Anglicare SA’s separate incorporation from the Synod in 2000, Anglicare SA, while being a separately managed entity, constituted under Ordinance of the Synod, with its own Council and employment arrangements, was consolidated with the Synod’s financial reports and accounts. While the Synod and Anglicare SA (along with its previous operational names, such as Anglican Community Services) were essentially the one entity, the Anglicare SA component of the organisation was operated separately from the general corporate affairs of the Synod.

150. The Synod does not receive any surplus or profits from the activities of Anglicare SA. Anglicare SA’s Constitution would prohibit any such arrangements in any case.
Note: St John’s Youth Services Incorporated

151. Historically, prior to 1981 St John’s Youth Services Incorporated operated as an activity of the Parish of St John’s Halifax Street, Adelaide, providing short-term shelter and assistance to the homeless and those in need, particularly youth. Since St John’s Youth Services incorporation in 1981, there has been no connection to the Synod and the current constitution has no connection to the parish. The Parish leases a portion of the parish hall to St John’s Youth Services and have, since incorporation, invited the Parish Priest to sit on the Board.

c) Anglican Schools

152. Each school in the Diocese of Adelaide is separately incorporated. The only relationship the Synod has with the 10 Anglican schools in the Diocese is through their governance with the Archbishop/Synod having rights to appoint/confirm members to some of the school boards/councils as prescribed by that school’s constitution. Each school is different and no school has the same appointment formula as another. The Archbishop is the Visitor or President of nine of the ten schools. In recent years the Archbishop has been required to act as Visitor on three occasions to assist a School board navigate through a difficult decision making process. The Archbishop also has the licensing authority of any school chaplain appointed to each school. At the request of the schools, a senior school chaplain has been appointed who holds the Bishop’s licence. This role is one of coordination and mentoring the chaplains across all Anglican schools. This position is primarily funded by the schools.

153. A Schools Liaison Officer is engaged by the Synod to work with the schools and be, as the name suggests, a liaison between the Archbishop and the Synod and the schools. This position is based in the Diocesan Office and the schools contribute to fifty percent of the salary of this position. Outside of this ‘fee for service’ activity, there is no financial relationship between the Synod and the Schools.

154. The Archbishop maintains a close relationship with each of the schools, regularly meeting with the principals and chairs of each board/council. The Archbishop and the assistant Bishops also attend a number of school events and services throughout the year. The Archbishop is regularly consulted by school boards prior to the appointment of a new school principal and, in some instances, has a veto or confirming role over an appointment of a principal. Diocesan Council at its December 2015 adopted the attached document on The Principal Qualities that Distinguish an Anglican School [ANG.0146.001.0483].

Anglican Schools in the Diocese of Adelaide 2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Students</th>
<th>Early Learning</th>
<th>Enrolments</th>
<th>Archbishop’s Role</th>
<th>Board / Council</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pedare Christian College Inc.</td>
<td>Reception (R) - Year 12</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>897</td>
<td>Visitor</td>
<td>• Three persons appointed by the Synod of the Diocese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Students</td>
<td>Early Learning</td>
<td>Enrolments</td>
<td>Archbishop’s Role</td>
<td>Board / Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pulteney Grammar School Inc.</td>
<td>R-12 Boys &amp; Girls</td>
<td>Early Learning Centre (ELC) for 3-4 year old students</td>
<td>924</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>• Two persons nominated by Diocesan Council one of whom shall be an ordained Anglican priest.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Andrew’s School Inc.</td>
<td>R-7 Boys &amp; Girls</td>
<td>ELC for 3-4 year old students</td>
<td>399</td>
<td>Visitor</td>
<td>• The Rector of St Andrew’s Anglican Church is an ex-officio member.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Two persons appointed by the Parish Council of St Andrew’s Church both of whom shall be members of the Anglican Church of Australia.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Columba College Munno Para Inc</td>
<td>R-12 Boys &amp; Girls</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>1,430</td>
<td>Visitor</td>
<td>• Two persons nominated by the Diocese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St John’s Grammar School Inc.</td>
<td>R-12 Boys &amp; Girls</td>
<td>ELC for 3-5 year old students</td>
<td>860</td>
<td>Visitor</td>
<td>• Two persons nominated by the Diocese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Collegiate School of St Peter</td>
<td>R-12 Boys</td>
<td>ELC for 3-5 year old students</td>
<td>1,312</td>
<td>President of Council and Visitor</td>
<td>• One person elected by Diocesan Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Peter’s Collegiate Girls’ School Inc.</td>
<td>R-12 Girls</td>
<td>ELC for 2-4 year old students</td>
<td>618</td>
<td>Visitor</td>
<td>• The Chair of the Board must consult with the Archbishop as to the identity and qualification of each proposed candidate prior to all appointments as Governor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Peter’s Woodlands Grammar School Inc.</td>
<td>R-7 Boys &amp; Girls</td>
<td>ELC for 2-5 year old students</td>
<td>628</td>
<td>Visitor</td>
<td>• One person nominated by the Archbishop.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• The Rector of the Anglican Parish of Glenelg.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• One person nominated by the Parish Council of the Anglican Parish of Glenelg who must be a member of the Parish Council.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trinity College Gawler Inc.</td>
<td>R-12</td>
<td>ELC for 3-5 year old students</td>
<td>3,631</td>
<td>Visitor</td>
<td>• Two persons who shall be licensed members of the</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
d) and/or any Anglican run or affiliated children’s homes.

155. The Diocese no longer operates children homes and has not done so since the 1980’s.

Q16. Please describe generally the relationship between the Diocese and parish run youth groups.

156. The relationship between the Synod and parish run youth groups is very informal. The Diocesan Youth Officer, who coordinates the quarterly youth service ‘Thrive’, is available at the invitation of the parish to advise parishes on youth group and activity initiatives. There is no formal relationship as such. On occasions, the Synod may provide a grant to assist parishes in their youth ministry programmes. Under the *Parochial Administration Ordinance* [ANG.0146.001.0332] the Parish Priest has responsibility for appointing officers of the parish, including the youth officer.
Theological perspectives

Q17. Your understanding of your Diocese’s practices and theological perspectives in relation to:
   a) Marriage of clergy;
   b) Celibacy; and
   c) Homosexuality

157. The Synod of the Diocese of Adelaide has adopted the national Code of Conduct, Faithfulness in Service [ANG.0005.001.0225]. This code affirms human sexuality as a gift from God, requiring that Church workers and clergy take responsibility for their sexual conduct by ‘maintaining chastity in singleness and faithfulness in marriage’ (7.2). The code stresses the need for clergy to be attentive to family relationships and to the stresses that ministry might place upon these relationships [6.18].

158. It has been my practice as Bishop, to avoid where possible placing additional stresses on clergy facing major relational transitions. Generally, I would take care to defer the ordination of a candidate at a time too close to the commencement of a marriage. Equally, I encourage clergy undergoing a relational transition such as a separation to step back from accepting new appointments, or carrying significant diocesan responsibilities.

159. Celibacy is recognised as the calling for some. Those who choose this lifestyle are encouraged to ensure that they have in place relationships of advice, care and support, to ensure that they maintain a healthy and responsible integration of their own sexuality. Celibacy is affirmed within some religious orders in the Anglican Church of Australia. While these orders can be a great gift to the Church, pastoral attentiveness is required around the possibility of religious orders developing a self-protective culture, less inclined to respond with openness to critical incidents. Given that many religious orders cross diocesan boundaries, the relationship of the Visitor Bishop or Guardian to these orders is critical to ensuring the maintenance of a healthy culture.

160. Over the last five years the Synod of the Diocese of Adelaide has considered the following motions and resolutions on the matter of human sexuality:

**Synod October 2011**

**Motion 25 – Acknowledging our conflict over questions of gender and sexuality, and the need for resolution and safety**

That this Synod acknowledges the heartfelt pain of living in a Church where there are strongly held conflicting views concerning human gender and sexuality. Without limiting the issue for debate, questions include disagreements over views of male headship, the ordination and consecration of women, the sexual lives of single people, and people in same sex relationships. In acknowledging these differences, and the tension around these matters, we affirm the need for processes that make it safe to work on all our conflict, while seeking at all times to ensure every individual is treated with respect and care. **CARRIED**
Motion 27 – Safe conversations and a Working Party for Gender and Sexuality Matters

That this Synod expresses its appreciation to the Archbishop and those other people who have agreed to help in the Diocese to hold safe conversations on issues of human sexuality and in the forming of a working party to guide an ongoing process of exploration. Furthermore, the Synod humbly asks if some consideration in these processes could be given to the question of how we can manage conflict in the longer term, around the strongly held differing views concerning human gender and sexuality.

CARRIED

Synod October 2012

Motion 17 – Pastoral Oversight

The motion as amended:

That this Synod while recognising that the General Synod of this Church has on a number of occasions affirmed the view that marriage is a lifelong bond of a man and a woman, to the exclusion of all others, this Synod:

• recognises that many Australians and Anglicans think that marriage equality is a civil right;
• recognises that should marriage equality be enacted it will be a civil matter and that no cleric will be required to officiate at a civil ceremony;
• recognises that Australian same-sex couples are being married overseas and urges generous pastoral oversight for all clergy who seek to minister to the pastoral needs of same-sex couples.

CARRIED

Motion 18 – Safe Space Conversations

That this Synod expresses its appreciation to the Archbishop and the Diocesan Working Group who have begun to facilitate safe space conversations on issues of human gender and sexuality and encourages the Archbishop and Diocesan Council to consider ways to continue respectful dialogue in this area, taking into account:

a) Some input with regard to the nature and practice of respectful conversation around conflicted issues;

b) A full range of perspectives and voices, including those of gay and lesbian people; their views about lesbian and gay lay and ordained leadership in the Anglican Church; their views about marriage for lesbian and gay people;

c) The contribution of suitable presenters from all perspectives; and

d) The use of a range of resources, including those mentioned in this Synod paper.

CARRIED
Motion 19 – Guest Speakers for Diocesan Sponsored Public Lectures
That this Synod respectfully asks the Archbishop to invite Michael Kirby (former High Court Judge), and The Rt Rev’d John McIntyre (Bishop of Gippsland, Victoria), to address public meetings in the Diocese, about their experience and views of lesbian and gay people in the life of the Anglican Church.
CARRIED

Motion 20 – Human Sexuality
That this Synod commits itself to the ongoing task of conversations about human sexuality and gender. As a way of further facilitating these conversations that Synod:
Acknowledges the essay by Richard Norris entitled Some Notes on the Current Debate Regarding Homosexuality and the Place of Homosexuals in the Church, in the Anglican Theological Review, 90:3, 2008, and that copies of this journal were sent to ‘the Bishops and the theological institutions of the Anglican Communion’ (ATR Editor’s Notes) at the time of publication; and
Requests the Diocesan Council establish a committee to look at making this resource available in a readily accessible form for the next Synod.
CARRIED

Q18. The Anglican Church of Australia’s website, as at 30 October 2015, includes the following statement under the heading ‘Internal Diversity’:

‘Significant theological differences also exist which can prevent closer co-operation between dioceses. The conferencing approach and development of community fostering initiatives have served to improve mutual understanding and co-operation on matters of considerable importance, such as child protection.’

Please set out your understanding of any significant theological differences between your and any other diocese, and the effect, if any, of those differences on the protection of children in the Anglican Church.

161. The Anglican Church has always been characterised by a comprehensiveness that embraces a range of opinions and positions. I do not believe that theological differences within the Anglican Church of Australia impact directly on issues of child protection or approaches to redress. There may be indirect impacts in regard to the wider professional standards regime.

162. One example might be in the area of underlying ecclesiology (the theology of the Church). The Anglican Church of Australia has a Constitution that has a major emphasis on ‘dispersed authority’, making substantial changes at a national level largely dependent on diocesan assent.

163. Those whose emphasis is on the Church in its local or congregational expression, tend to be resistant towards moves to increase the power of central or national instruments. I have no reason to question the commitment of every diocese to child protection.
Ordination and theological training

Q19. The relationship, if any between your Diocese and any of the theological colleges in Australia.

164. The Diocese of Adelaide has accepted candidates for ordination from a range of theological and Bible colleges, conditional upon certain subject criteria and ministry formation requirements being satisfied.

165. The Diocese does have a theological college established as an entity under the Synod. St Barnabas Theological College is affiliated with Charles Sturt University and offers courses for those training for ordained and lay ministry as well as a wider student body.

166. The Diocesan discernment, selection and formation programme for those looking towards ordained ministry is run in close cooperation with St Barnabas Theological College. Within the flexibilities of current educational practice, the discernment, selection and formation process takes about five years.

167. It begins with the ‘Year of Discernment’. This year involves a series of group meetings, shared reading and reflection and parish or other ministry involvement. A prerequisite for entry is a reference from the person’s parish as well as an interview with the Archbishop’s chaplain. Any involvement by persons in the Year of Discernment in public ministry is subject to diocesan Safer Ministry checks and educational requirements referred to elsewhere.

168. Subject to satisfactory reports, a person in the ‘Year of Discernment’ may be invited to attend the ‘Vocations Advisory Conference’ held annually over a weekend and involving panel interviews on a range of subjects related to the suitability of a person for ordained ministry. Following a recommendation from this conference, a person may be recommended as an ordinand. At this stage psychological testing is carried out. The instruments of testing currently used are Genesys (an online psychometric assessment), and the Personality Assessment Inventory (PAI) by Leslie Morey. The Diocese has used some form of psychological testing in considering possible candidates for ordination since the 1990s.

169. As ordinands, candidates continue with theological study. In the formation process they meet weekly during semester for the first two years and engage with a range of issues related to ministry practice. On completing ‘Stage 1 Formation’ they move to a further two years of regular intensives. Key supervisory figures during this time are their Examining Chaplain, the Director of Formation and the supervising minister in a parish or chaplaincy placement. Ordination may occur before the completion of the five years, but is dependent upon satisfactory reports from those involved in supervision and formation.
Q20. Your Diocese’s approach, policies and practices in relation to conducting psychological assessments of candidates for ordination training and ordination itself, since 1 January 1960.

170. As mentioned in Question 19, the Diocese has used some form of psychological testing in considering possible candidates for ordination since the 1990s. Full psychometric assessments have taken place since 2002 for all candidates for ordination training and ordination.

171. Following a recommendation from the Vocations Advisory Conference, a person may be recommended as an ordinand. At this stage psychological testing is carried out.

172. The instruments of testing currently used are Genesys (an online psychometric assessment), and the Personality Assessment Inventory (PAI).

173. Genesys provides assessment of aptitudes, personality, values and motives:

- **Aptitudes** - verbal, numerical and abstract reasoning.
- **Personality** - interpersonal, thinking, coping and leadership styles; team role; subordinate and influencing styles; and strengths and development areas.
- **Values and motives** - motivating and demotivating factors.

174. The Personality Assessment Inventory (PAI), authored by Dr Leslie Morey, is a multi-scale test of psychological functioning that assesses constructs relevant to personality and psychopathology evaluation (e.g., depression, anxiety, aggression) in various contexts including psychotherapy, crisis/evaluation, forensic, personnel selection, pain/medical, and child custody assessment. The PAI has 22 non-overlapping scales, providing a comprehensive overview of psychopathology in adults.

175. The PAI contains four kinds of scales:

- **Validity scales** - that measure the respondent’s approach to the test, including faking good or bad, exaggeration, or defensiveness and consist of the Inconsistency, Infrequency, Negative Impression, and Positive Impression scales.
- **Clinical scales** - that correspond to 11 different clinical constructs that have been shown to be important in diagnosing psychological disorders, and include: Somatic Complaints, Anxiety, Anxiety-Related Disorders, Depression, Mania, Paranoia, Schizophrenia, Borderline Features, Antisocial Features, Alcohol Problems, and Drug Problems.
- **Treatment consideration scales** - that assess factors that may potentially complicate treatment if the person was in therapy but which are not captured in psychiatric diagnoses and include: Aggression, Suicidal Ideation, Stress, Non-support, and Treatment Rejection.
- **Interpersonal scales** - that provide indicators of interpersonal dimensions of personality functioning. There are two Interpersonal Scales: Dominance (the extent to which the respondent is either controlling or submissive in their relationships) and Warmth (the
extent to which the respondent is empathic, as opposed to withdrawn and unengaged).

176. Please refer to A Process for the Comprehensive Psychological Assessment of Candidates for Ordination (Report presented to the Standing Committee, November 2012) [ANG.0146.001.0522].
National approaches to professional standards and inter-diocesan cooperation

Q21. Your Diocese’s approach to adopting the Anglican Church of Australia General Synod model Ordinances and policy guidelines on child protection.

177. The Synod of the Diocese of Adelaide has adopted all Professional Standards Model Ordinances as Ordinances of the Adelaide Synod, subject to some minor variations, for example to expand the definitions of what constitutes abuse. Policies, guidelines and resolutions on child protection developed by the General Synod have been integral in creating and shaping Diocesan policies, as demonstrated in Schedule B: Table of General Synod documents and resolutions [ANG.0146.001.0148].

178. A number of figures from the Diocese have played a lead role in the development of child protection Ordinances and policies at the national level within the Anglican Church of Australia. The Honourable David Bleby QC, Chancellor of the Diocese of Adelaide was chair of the Sexual Abuse Working Group which was established by the Standing Committee of General Synod in March 2002, Convenor of the General Synod Episcopal Ministry Task Force, and also served as a member of the Church Law Commission. Mrs Helen Carrig, member of Diocesan Council and early Professional Standards Director, as a member of the General Synod Child Protection Committee and General Synod Professional Standards Commission, was at the forefront in developing policy guidelines around child protection for the national Anglican Church.

Q22. Please indicate which General Synod model Ordinances, policy guidelines and resolutions on child protection have been adopted or responded to by your Diocese, and how by completing the table at Schedule B.

179. Please refer to Schedule B: Table of General Synod documents and resolutions [ANG.0146.001.0148].

Q23. The key differences, if any, between the national Model Professional Standards Ordinance (as amended 2008) and your Diocese’s equivalent Ordinance/s, and the reasons for your Diocese either adopting the national model, not adopting it, or partially adopting it.

180. In response to resolutions passed by General Synod’s Standing Committee in March 2003, urging all dioceses to pass, as soon as possible any model legislation recommended by the Church Law Commission, to give effect to the proposals in the Sexual Abuse Working Group’s Report, the Diocesan Council of Adelaide implemented as a policy those parts of the Model Ordinance relating to the Professional Standards Committee and the Director of Professional Standards in November 2003. An interim Professional Standards Committee and interim Director were appointed. However, without an Ordinance of the Diocesan Synod, it could not implement the other provisions of the model Ordinance.
181. The Model Ordinance was brought to the annual session of Synod in May 2004, but because of its significance it was adjourned for consideration at an adjourned session of that Synod held on 19 June 2004. The Archbishop resigned before the adjourned session of the Synod and no legislation could be passed without an Archbishop in office. The Ordinance was passed at Synod on 28 October 2006.

182. The key differences between the Model Ordinance and the Professional Standards Ordinance 2006 [ANG.0173.001.0136], as passed in the Diocese of Adelaide, relate to an expansion of definitions, in particular what constitutes abuse, and were summarised in the Explanatory Memorandum as follows:

'Scope of matters that may constitute 'information' for the purposes of the application of the Ordinance (see especially clause 2).

The Ordinance uses the term 'information' to describe what may be investigated under its provisions. The Model Ordinance relates to sexual harassment or assault or sexually inappropriate behaviour. This draft incorporates a wider concept of 'misconduct'. That is defined as an activity or deliberate or careless inactivity that (a) involves harassment or causes harm to a person's physical, spiritual, emotional or financial wellbeing; (b) is carried out by a person in a position of power or authority over another for inappropriate gratification of the person or for the exploitation of the other person; (c) involves the exploitation of an office; (d) brings the Church or other relevant body into disrepute; or (e) involves an alleged process failure.

Adoption of an expanded definition was seen as being appropriate in the Report of the Sexual Abuse Working Group, and by the Diocesan Professional Standards Review Task Group. Other dioceses have adopted an expanded definition of 'information' to suit their own requirements.

It is proposed that the Professional Standards Director not be a member of the PSC. This proposal is consistent with a recommendation of the Board of Inquiry (which was endorsed by the Diocesan Professional Standards Review Task Group). A series of amendments has been made to the model Ordinance to give effect to this proposal.

The model provides that matters are referred to the proposed Professional Standards Board by the PSC. Clause 54 of this draft provides that the procedure for referring a matter to the Board shall be specified in the Protocol provided that the procedure has been approved by the Bishop. The draft Protocol sets out this procedure (see clause 11 of the Protocol).

The draft includes a new Part setting out rights of review in relation to certain decisions of the Board (see new Part 8A).

This issue has been raised in some dioceses and an appeals process was recommended by the Diocesan Professional Standards Review Task Group. The draft provisions are based on a scheme adopted in the Diocese of Brisbane. The review would be conducted by an experienced barrister. A matter would be subject to review on the ground (a) that there has been a breach of the rules of natural justice; (b) that there has been a failure to comply with a procedure under the Ordinance; (c) that the Board has acted outside its jurisdiction; or (d) that the decision of the Board is so devoid of plausible justification that no reasonable Board could have made it.'
183. The national *Model Ordinance* was amended in 2008. The Diocese of Adelaide adopted the amendments at Synod on 25 October 2008, with the exception that the Diocese of Adelaide retained its existing definition of ‘misconduct’.


185. Most of the guiding principles that lay behind the *Professional Standards Ordinance 2006* [ANG.0173.001.0136] still underpin the 2015 Ordinance. The 2015 Ordinance, however, does contain significant procedural changes and minor amendments to remain consistent with the model *Episcopal Standards Ordinance* (‘the ES Ordinance’) [ANG.0173.001.0038] relating to diocesan Bishops. The following headings highlight the significant changes in the 2015 Ordinance, incorporating key differences between the national *Model Professional Standards Ordinance*.

**Complaint based system**

186. Currently the Victorian Model and the ES Ordinance are both complaint based. The *Professional Standards Ordinance 2006* [ANG.0173.001.0136] and the *Model Ordinance* are based on the receipt by the Professional Standards Committee of ‘information’, rather than the making of a complaint, however, in reality most investigations originate from a complaint, the 2015 Ordinance recognises this. The 2015 Ordinance still recognises and makes provision for the need of the Professional Standards Committee to collect ‘information’ which may or may not result in an investigation or which may be relevant to a complaint.

**Definition of Misconduct**

187. This definition is key to all proceedings under any Ordinance relating to Professional Standards. The definition of ‘misconduct’ in the Model Ordinance is limited to child abuse and sexual abuse of adults and in the ES Ordinance it is very detailed and extensive. The 2015 Ordinance definition has additional provisions to the 2006 Ordinance. It provides an alternative process for any matter that may be the subject of proceedings for an offence under the *Clergy Discipline Ordinance 1983* [ANG.0173.001.0158] in the Diocesan Tribunal, other than in respect of matters of faith, ritual and ceremonial (as defined in the Constitution). The 2015 Ordinance excludes ‘process failure’.

188. The 2015 Ordinance definition now includes a requirement that the alleged misconduct must call into question the Church worker’s fitness for office or the need for conditions or
restrictions. This provides a filter for the complaints that do not warrant attention under the 2015 Ordinance but may benefit from the use of a grievance procedure.

**Reporting criminal offences**

189. Section 23(3) requires the Professional Standards Director to refer any alleged misconduct that would constitute an indictable offence, to the police or any other appropriate authority. The 2015 Ordinance revises the protocol, requiring the Director to explain to a complainant the reporting obligation and the rights of the complainant if a report is made. This must be done before taking detailed instructions of the nature of the complaint if it relates to a possible indictable offence.

**Simplified procedure on conviction**

190. The 2015 Ordinance, in Part 9, retains the provisions first enacted in Part 8A of the 2006 Ordinance. Part 9 enables a simplified procedure for use in cases of conviction for serious offences that would usually justify removal of a licence. A decision under this part is not a reviewable decision. Under the Model Ordinance, it is a reviewable decision.

**Suspension Orders**

191. These provisions (Part 10) have been substantially rewritten. A suspension order may now include prohibition on certain activities, and in certain circumstances a suspension order will be mandatory (section 35). Review of a suspension order may occur on application to the Review Board for a review of Board decision. As under 2006 Ordinance, recommendations for suspension are made to a Church authority by the Professional Standards Committee. Under the ES Ordinance suspension is by decision of the Board.

**Consent determinations**

192. Part 11 of the 2015 Ordinance, are a set of procedures that apply where the Church Authority is the Bishop. Before engaging the Professional Standards Board, the Professional Standards Committee ('PSC') after consultation with the complainant and respondent, must provide a detailed report to the Bishop with a recommendation as to the determination it would be seeking, the respondent's attitude to acting under Part 11 and whether the PSC considers it appropriate for action to be taken under section 43. The Bishop may, as a result of other information known only to the Bishop, have some information which may assist or cause a reconsideration by the PSC of its proposed course. The Bishop can request the Committee to reconsider, but cannot force a change of course. That decision remains with the PSC. If the matter proceeds, the PSC's report is served on the respondent and the Bishop then determines whether it is an appropriate case for implementation of the PSC's recommendation by agreement with the respondent. If agreement occurs, that has the same effect as a determination of the Board, but without engaging the Board or requiring the
complainant to give evidence. That process is unlikely to be involved if, on the PSC's report, there is likely to be a conflict of evidence on the facts. If the Bishop considers that proceeding by agreement is not appropriate or if there is no agreement, the matter will be referred to the Professional Standards Board in the usual manner.

Board's powers

193. The Board's powers in s 61(1) are extended by two subsections (j) and (k). These allow the Board to determine in writing accordingly and may recommend to the relevant Church authority that the Church worker be directed to do or to refrain from doing a specified act; or that a charge be promoted against the respondent before the Diocesan Tribunal.

194. s 61(2) is a new provision in the 2015 Ordinance, requiring the Board to include one or more of certain recommendations where there is a finding that the respondent is unfit to hold office or unfit, temporarily or permanently, to exercise Ministry and perform any duty or function of office.

195. S 63 Board is able to adjourn its hearing for up to 12 months to enable a course of counselling or medical treatment to be undertaken and assessed. This prevents a decision being made in ignorance of relevant information.

Review of Board determinations

196. The Model Ordinance and the 2006 Ordinance make provision for a review by a barrister on grounds of process failure by the Board, however, the Adelaide Diocese has not found this to be satisfactory in both the way that Board proceedings have been conducted and in the review process itself. The 2015 Ordinance provides for a broader review on the merits by a Review Board, which does not need to conduct a rehearing and, which can decide the question on the papers. This is a more flexible process also adopted in the Episcopal Standards Ordinance and some other Professional Standards Ordinances. With emphasis to proceed expeditiously in various parts of the Ordinance, a merit review will not unduly delay the final resolution.

Proceedings of the Board and Review

197. Part 16 of the 2015 Ordinance introduces a suite of measures to ensure the fair and expeditious disposal of proceedings before the Board and the Review Board, which are also reflected in the ES Ordinance. These measures include the power to require a medical examination. Proceedings before the Board and the Review Board are *prima facie* open sittings, with power of the Board or Review Board to restrict attendance for the whole or any part of a hearing.
Enforcement of Determinations

198. In the 2015 Ordinance, a Church authority has limited power to vary a recommendation of a Board or a Review Board: see section 103. It requires the agreement of the body making the recommendation that the substance of the recommendation is preserved. This differs from the ES Ordinance, s 100, which requires only that the Council of Bishops be satisfied that the substance of the recommendation is preserved. Under the Model Ordinance and the 2005 Ordinance, non-compliance with a determination is an offence. In the case of a licensed person, proceedings could be brought in the Diocesan Tribunal. Two civil cases have confirmed the validity and effectiveness of the Board process standing alone, and so the Board itself has power to recommend removal from office where there has been non-compliance with undertakings to or directions or recommendations made by a Board or Review Board.

Q24. Your views on whether each diocese in Australia should:

a) maintain its own, unique professional standards framework
b) agree to and adopt a nationally consistent professional standards framework that is administered by each diocese
c) refer its powers in relation to professional standards to a centrally administered quasi-independent Church body to make decisions on matters such as clergy and Church worker discipline, complaints-handling and redress, with outcomes of such decisions to be implemented by each diocese, or
d) adopt any other approach for managing professional standards

199. I believe that there should be the highest possible levels of commonality both in principle and practice in regard to child protection and redress for survivors no matter where, or in which institution the abuse occurred. I recognise that such a commonality will require significant negotiation across a range of stakeholders, as well as possible legislative changes.

200. In regard to option (a) I note that under the Constitution of the Anglican Church of Australia [ANG.0160.001.0620], every Diocese must adopt its own professional standards framework. This need not necessarily result in great variation of practice. In my view, there is a general recognition across the dioceses that there should be consistency in regard to child protection and redress. Various models and approaches might be considered to assist the Anglican Church move towards greater commonality in this area.

201. I support the further development of a nationally consistent professional standards framework across the dioceses, administered by each diocese (option b) perhaps with provincial cooperation (option d). This has been the trajectory within the Anglican Church of Australia for more than a decade and the Diocese of Adelaide has demonstrated its commitment to this approach by its willingness to adopt many nationally proposed measures, as well as contributing to their development.

202. It is important to note that most of the variations in existing diocesan provisions relate to professional standards matters other than child protection. Some dioceses, for instance, have demonstrated a commitment to including a wider range of behaviours within the scope of a
Professional Standards Ordinance or protocol, while others favour a narrower scope. This would suggest that achieving a high level of uniformity around those parts of a professional standards framework that relate to child protection might be more achievable than having a full framework that is uniform.

203. While not ruling it out, I have some hesitation in regard to the establishment of centrally administered structure (option c). This hesitation relates to achievability and workability. The Diocesan focus of the Anglican Church of Australia will mean that there will be significant legislative thresholds (including the considerations of 23 diocesan synods) to achieving such a reference of powers. Consideration of such a proposal within the Anglican Church will also need to take account of developments in other churches and institutions as well as the responses of State Governments. It is difficult to see how the considerations of diocesan synods could proceed without being influenced, at least to an extent, by this broader picture, which at this stage is still quite uncertain.

204. I believe any redress framework should continue to have a high level of local accountability and pastoral availability. The experience of the Diocese of Adelaide would suggest that the availability of prompt, personal and pastoral encounter with a Church leader, where there is careful listening and an apology is offered, is a far more effective method of redress than litigation. Any move to a uniform approach should not lose this important feature. While the Adelaide experience is that this option is not always accepted, for some a personal encounter with the recognised leader of a Diocese, where a critical incident occurred, seems to have been of real significance.

205. It is also important to note that the Anglican Church of Australia has a structure of ‘internal provinces’ that aligns at least to an extent with State boundaries. Within the Federation that constitutes the Commonwealth of Australia, the States have significant jurisdictional authority in areas that impact on child protection; in fact, inconsistencies between States on this and related issues continue to be an area of concern.

206. In South Australia over the course of a decade, the Anglican Dioceses have moved towards a single Professional Standards regime with shared staffing. Planning is being progressed that may result in a largely uniform approach to ‘Safer Ministry Education’.

207. So while a high level of commonality around child protection and redress is very much to be desired at a national level, the Provincial structures of the Anglican Church of Australia offer their own opportunities for cooperation and commonality, possibly over a wider range than is likely to be achieved at a national level. Addressing the need for commonality at a State as well as national level provides the opportunity for a greater similarity of practice among the various Churches in any given region, and between the Churches and other institutions within a State jurisdiction.
Q25. Any process, procedure or practice adopted by your Diocese, or adopted or recommended by the General Synod of the Anglican Church of Australia, in relation to responding to complaints of child sexual abuse made in relation to one or more other dioceses, and where multiple dioceses may have jurisdiction to respond, including but not limited to the handling of such complaints, the conduct of disciplinary proceedings, or the payment of compensation.

208. Both the 2006 and 2015 Professional Standards Ordinance provide for responding to complaints of child sexual abuse across Dioceses. The relevant sections are outlined below. With regards to the Province of South Australia there is now one Director of Professional Standards, who acts for the three dioceses in South Australia. With regards to redress, irrespective of which Diocese in South Australia a survivor may have been abused, the Diocese of Adelaide is the responding Diocese. This is to provide for consistency in approach with the application of Healing Steps. With regards to dioceses out of the Province, there is only one know instance where the Diocese of Adelaide has jointly responded with another Diocese to a survivor. In that case the primary response to the survivor was by the Diocese of Brisbane.


Section 26:

(1) The PSC may, if it thinks it appropriate to do so, refer the subject matter of information, or the investigation of information, to an equivalent body or bodies.

(2) When the PSC and an equivalent body or equivalent bodies have the power and duty to investigate information concerning the alleged conduct or omission of the same Church worker and the respective bodies cannot agree on:

(a) which body shall carry out the investigation or any parts of such investigation; or

(b) whether a question or questions specified in section 54 should be referred to the Board or to an equivalent body which has jurisdiction;

then the PSC shall refer the disagreement for decision by the Director and the persons acting in a corresponding capacity for every other diocese acting together.

(3) The PSC shall act in accordance with the unanimous decision of the persons referred to in subsection (2) or, if such persons cannot agree within a reasonable time of the disagreement being referred, in accordance with the decision of the Primate or a member of the House of Bishops appointed by the Primate.

(4) In all matters affecting the operation of this Ordinance, the PSC and the Director shall cooperate with and assist an equivalent body and a person acting in the corresponding capacity of the Director in another diocese.

(5) In making a decision under subsection (2) the Director shall not be bound by the views or instruction of the PSC but shall take into account the most convenient course for all concerned and the proper and expeditious conduct of the investigation or referral as the case may be.

210. The Professional Standards Ordinance (2015) states:
Section 24.

(1) The Director may, if the Director thinks it appropriate to do so, refer the complaint, or the investigation of the complaint, to an equivalent body or bodies.

(2) When the PSC and an equivalent body or equivalent bodies have the power and duty to investigate a complaint concerning the alleged misconduct of the same Church worker and the respective bodies cannot agree on:

(a) which body shall carry out the investigation or any parts of such investigation;

(b) whether the complaint should be referred to the Board or to an equivalent body which has jurisdiction;

then the PSC must refer the disagreement for decision by the Director and the persons acting in a corresponding capacity for every other diocese acting together.

(3) The PSC shall act in accordance with the unanimous decision of the persons referred to in subsection (2) or, if such persons cannot agree within a reasonable time of the disagreement being referred, in accordance with the decision of the Primate or a member of the House of Bishops appointed by the Primate.

(4) In all matters affecting the operation of this Ordinance, the PSC and the Director shall cooperate with and assist an equivalent body.

(5) In making a decision under subsection (2) the Director shall not be bound by the views or instruction of the PSC but shall take into account the most convenient course for all concerned and the proper and expeditious conduct of the investigation or referral as the case may be.
Professional Standards in the Anglican Diocese of Adelaide

Please provide a chronological account of your Diocese's approach to professional standards from 1 January 1990 to the date of this letter, with reference to all key policies, procedures, processes, practices and legislation (if any) relating to the protection of children.

In providing your account, please address each of the following matters.

211. In answering Questions 26-51, the response seeks to outline the policies, procedures, processes and practices that came into effect on these matters. The first date specifically mentioned in each answer represents the earliest documentation that could be confirmed from primary documentation. It has been difficult to ascertain earlier documentation relating to these matters.

212. For specific records refer to Chronology of the Synod of the Anglican Diocese of Adelaide approach to Professional Standards (1 January 1990 - 2 November 2015) [ANG.0146.001.0167]. The chronology covers the requested period, save for the assent given by the Archbishop on 3 December 2015 to the Professional Standards Ordinance 2015 [ANG.0146.001.0530], that was adopted at the Annual Session of Synod (October 2015).
Prevention

Q26. Screening and assessing suitability of Bishops, clergy, lay and volunteer staff (collectively for the purpose of this Statement, Church workers), prior to:

   a) officiating as a member of clergy
   b) participating in activities involving children
   c) holding positions of authority in relation to the formulation of policy on professional standards matters, and/or
   d) presiding over or participating in disciplinary proceedings.

213. While Anglicanism has been in Australia since the first fleet in 1788, the Anglican Church of Australia was established on its present constitutional basis in 1962. Following the establishment of the National Constitution ([Constitution of The Anglican Church of Australia [ANG.0160.001.0620]], a range of canons and rules were put in place for the Government and good order of the Church. These included a framework for ecclesiastical discipline.

214. The primary structures for discipline were established under the National Constitution and therefore have applicability in all dioceses. These include the establishment of Diocesan Tribunals for clergy and a Special Tribunal for Bishops ([Chapter IX, [ANG.0160.001.0620]]. The Diocesan Tribunal may deal with a range of offences including breaches of faith, ritual, ceremonial or discipline ([Chapter IX, para 54 (2) & (3) [ANG.0160.001.0620]]. Offences involving sexual misconduct are specifically named.

215. The Special Tribunal was given jurisdiction to hear and determine charges against members of the House of Bishops and any bishop assistant to the Primate. Assistant bishops were to be dealt with through the Diocesan Tribunal.

216. Some Provinces also have Provincial Tribunals, but this is not the case in South Australia. An appeals process for both diocesan and special tribunals is provided through the Appellate Tribunal ([Chapter IX, para 56-60 [ANG.0160.001.0620]].

217. In the same year the Anglican Church of Australia was established on its present constitutional basis, an ‘Offences Canon’ ([Offences Canon 1962 [ANG.0048.001.7501]]) was passed. It has been adopted in every diocese and deals with a range of breaches, including those of faith, ritual, ceremonial or discipline (as named in the Constitution), but also specifying a range of offences including “unchastity” and conduct which “would be disgraceful if committed by a member of the clergy ... of which if known publicly would be productive of scandal or evil report”.

218. The Offences Canon 1962 [ANG.0048.001.7501] recognises the right of diocesan synods to establish additional charges and in 1983 the Synod of the Diocese of Adelaide passed additional measures in the Clergy Discipline Ordinance 1983 [ANG.0173.001.0158]. This ordinance named “conducting unbecoming the office and work of a priest”, racial abuse or
harassment, and sexual abuse or harassment as matters that might form the basis of a charge before the Diocesan Tribunal.

219. In addition to these legislative measures, the Anglican Church has understood that the office of the Bishop has associated with it intrinsic disciplinary responsibilities and powers. This is articulated in the Ordinal where the Bishop is charged to “administer discipline with mercy” (The Ordination of Bishops, A Prayer Book for Australia 1995 [ANG.0042.001.0461]). The intrinsic powers of the Bishops are recognised in the Constitution of the Diocese of Adelaide (The Constitution of the Anglican Diocese of Adelaide, Chapter II.6 [ANG.9610.01001.0014]).

220. In regard to the selection, examination and ordination of clergy, these intrinsic episcopal powers are often exercised through delegation to Archdeacons and “Examining Chaplains”. The role of the Archdeacon in these respects is recognised in the presentation of candidates within the Ordinal (A Prayer Book for Australia 1995 [ANG.0042.001.0461]). Examining chaplains within the Diocese of Adelaide have, with some variation from bishop to bishop, had the role of individually mentoring candidates for ordination and providing advice to the bishop as to the readiness for ordination. “Selection conferences” for ordination candidates tended to be introduced across the Australian Church during the 1970s and 80s.

221. These were the primary structures and provisions for the selection, ordination and discipline of clergy in the Diocese of Adelaide from the 1970s through to the 1990s, when they were supplemented by a number of measures that included psychological testing of clergy, the early development of professional standards protocols and the introduction of police checks.

222. With regards to matters relating to prevention, disclosure and response, investigation, redress, risk management, information sharing, and inquiries and reviews there were no formal structures or measures in place beyond those as outlined before the 1990s.

223. During the 1990s, and subsequently, existing measures were supplemented by those provision as outlined below.

a) **Officiating as a member of clergy**

224. In September 1990, Synod resolved that the Archbishop be asked to review the processes and procedures for the Selection of Ordained Ministry candidates. These included the criteria for the selection of candidates, consideration of the various processes and selection tools used for selection, the length of the selection process, the composition of the Selection Committee and appropriate training for members of the Selection Criteria. The selection committee was expanded from the Examining Chaplains Committee to a Diocesan Ministry Training Committee. It is not clear how this resolution was implemented.

225. The Diocese of Adelaide introduced revised screening processes for ordinands and newly appointed clergy on 11 July 2001. From this time, and before the Archbishop ordained someone or granted a license within the Diocese, all new clergy were required to agree to
undergo police checks. Existing clergy within the Diocese were required to submit to a police check by March 2003. All clergy have had to comply with a code of conduct since 11 July 2001 (Child Protection Code of Conduct Policy [ANG.0178.001.0012]). The screening processes for clergy and the Code of Conduct have been amended over time, so as to incorporate recommendations of various internal reviews as well as recommendations from General Synod, and various committees and Commissions of General Synod.

226. Before being ordained, ordinands undergo discernment and formation programmes, that assess candidates' suitability for ordained ministry.

227. In 2004 the General Synod made recommendations to all dioceses about further screening processes for people working with children and young people. The Ministry Development Council brought forward proposals to Diocesan Council, which ensured enhanced processes for screening clergy, volunteers and employees.

228. The Archdeacons were to make ongoing enquiries with parishes about their compliance with this requirement.

229. The Archbishop stated in 2003, that in keeping with the action of other dioceses, and where able to do so, he would withdraw the licenses of all clergy and authorised lay ministers who have not completed the police check process.

230. A parish should not confirm the appointment of a staff member/volunteer to a role requiring a police clearance until a satisfactory National Police Certificate has been provided.

b) Participating in activities involving children

231. Prior to 2000, assessment of the suitability for the leaders of children's and youth groups and activities was the responsibility of each parish priest. As far as can be ascertained, no written policies were in place to guide incumbents in making these assessments.

232. On the 13 September 2000, the Diocese of Adelaide commenced taking steps to screen all people who work with children. In September 2000, the Guidelines for the Protection of Children within the Church [ANG.0178.001.0014] was also produced by the Diocese of Adelaide, which included 'Process for Selection and Authorisation of Leaders'. This was an early screening and assessment for leaders working with children within the Church.

233. On 11 July 2001, the Diocese of Adelaide introduced screening processes for all Church workers (lay and ordained) who have access to young people under 18 years old (Protection of Children policies – July 2001 [ANG.0178.001.0115]). All such Church workers had to consent to a police check being conducted, and had to undertake to comply with a Code of Conduct, which stipulates appropriate behaviours and had to give certain undertakings that would assist the Diocese to ensure a safe environment for children.
234. In 2004 the General Synod Child Protection Committee made recommendations to all dioceses about further screening processes for people working with children and young people. The Ministry Development Council brought forward proposals to Diocesan Council that ensured enhanced processes for screening clergy, volunteers and employees.

235. The Professional Standards Commission developed a model system for the selection and accreditation for lay parish Church workers. This model was approved by the General Synod Standing Committee in October 2006. The General Synod published a variety of resource material which the Diocese of Adelaide has adopted, including:

- Model System for Selection and Accreditation of Lay Parish Workers (ANG.0050.003.0749)
- Sample List of Ministry Positions (ANG.0134.005.0001)
- Sample Ministry Position Template (ANG.0134.006.0001)
- Safe Ministry Check - Applicant (ANG.0050.003.0754)
- Safe Ministry Check - Referee (ANG.0134.007.0001)
- Safe Ministry Check – Volunteers (ANG.0134.008.0001)
- Sample Questions Referee Checks (ANG.0134.009.0001)
- Selection Checklist (ANG.0134.010.0001)

236. Based on the above model, the Adelaide Diocese produced its Safe Ministry Check within which an applicant must agree to comply with a Code of Good Practice and apply for permission from the Archbishop to minister to children and young people. The first edition of this form of Safe Ministry Check [ANG.0181.001.0092] was published December 2005. It was revised in January 2006, March 2006, November 2009, September 2011, January 2013, April 2013, August 2013, April 2014, and November 2014 [ANG.0181.001.0058].

237. Attached to the Safe Ministry Check application, an applicant must present their National Police Certificate (original, or a certified copy) within 3 months of it being issued.

238. Once processed, an authorisation or Licence by the Archbishop is valid for a maximum of 3 years, at which point the applicant must reapply, supplying a new National Police Clearance.

239. Additional guiding documents include:

- Anglican Church of Australia, Professional Standards Commission, Model System for the selection and accreditation of lay parish Church workers (dated 6 October 2006) [ANG.0042.001.0230]
- Information sheet – Safer Ministry Accreditation (dated April 2006, amended March 2007) [ANG.0178.001.0093]
- Information sheet – Lay ministry licenses and authorisations, Guidelines for Anglican Diocese of Adelaide Authorised Lay Ministry (dated March 2007) [ANG.0178.001.0089].
c) **Holding positions of authority in relation to the formulation of policy on professional standards matters**

240. With regards to question 26 (c) and (d), on almost every occasion, individuals engaged on professional standards matters, be it policy formulation and or disciplinary procedures, will be screened, educated and accredited because of their primary parish leadership roles, such as being a Warden or clergy. Screening and accreditation is conducted on a rolling basis every three years on the expiry of existing accreditation.

241. As referred to in question 26 (b), a significant proportion of Church workers were subject to screening from 2001. By 2003, all clergy had to be screened, and all Church workers were screened by December 2005.

242. The Lea Report (2014) [ANG.0173.001.0085] (referred to later in this response) found that some members of the Synod’s committees and formal governance bodies who did not hold other parish positions were not required to undergo accreditation or training. It was recommended that all members of these governance bodies undertake Accreditation & Training:

- Diocesan Council
- Diocesan Administration & Resources Executive
- Professional Standards Committee

d) **Presiding over or participating in disciplinary proceedings.**

243. The same requirements detailed in item (b) above apply to the screening and assessment of those holding positions of authority relating to the formulation of policy on professional standards.

244. Members of the panel from which a Professional Standards Board is selected, and members of the Professional Standards Committee must complete Safe Ministry screening, as outlined for clergy above. This includes obtaining a National Police Clearance certificate. The Diocese of Adelaide considers it important to have a balance of skills on the bodies that preside over or participate in disciplinary proceedings, and consequently seeks to ensure that these bodies include persons with experience in law, the ordained Ministry and appropriate professional qualifications in child protection, social work or counselling.

245. Appointment to the Professional Standards Committee and the Professional Standards Board is made on such terms and conditions as may be determined by the Diocesan Council from time to time or in accordance with any Regulations of the Diocesan Council.

246. The Panel, from which the Professional Standards Board is appointed, is presided over by the President or the Deputy President of the Professional Standards Board (Part 12 of the Professional Standards Ordinance 2015 [ANG.0146.001.0530]).
247. The Professional Standards Board is formed on an as-needs basis, whereas the Professional Standards Committee meets regularly and has ongoing delegation over Professional Standards matters.

Q27. Training and educating Church workers and Church members on child sexual abuse and responding to instances of child sexual abuse.

248. Synod set up a task group in 1992 to make recommendations to the 1993 Synod in relation to clergy appointments, in-service training and performance appraisal for Bishops, priests and deacons. Although concrete proposals did not eventuate from this, a Supervised Field Education programme for ordination candidates and a Post Ordination Training programme were developed (from the Diocese’s submission to the Board of Inquiry in 2003).

249. A Child Protection Code of Conduct Policy [ANG.0178.001.0012] was adopted on 10 October 2001. It required people ministering to people under 18 to assent to a code of conduct and to give certain undertakings that would assist the Diocese of Adelaide to ensure a safe environment for children.

250. On 13 February 2002, Diocesan Council approved Two Child-Protection Training Days, attendance at one of which was mandatory for clergy and laity working with children and young people. Prior to this, there are no records of any formal training being required or undertaken.

251. Synod directed the Ministry Development Council in June 2004 to develop and implement appropriate policy and directives that ensure Church workers comply with mandatory notification obligations and to develop and implement education and training programmes for all Church workers. Synod also resolved in June 2004 that education and training activities relating to abuse and to the care of those who have been abused was to be conducted in partnership with relevant external experts.

252. The Diocese of Adelaide continued to place emphasis on the development of training and awareness programmes, as evidenced by the following initiatives:

- In 2003 the Diocesan Response Group was established to look at the Diocese’s continuing education for clergy and lay workers, the Protection of Children resource and the Code of Conduct for every one undertaking ministry with children. This Diocese continued to require those working with children to act as mandated notifiers.
- Yarrow Place and Women’s Health Statewide provided the Anglican Church with a proposal for a comprehensive programme, which included counselling, education and policy development.
- From 2006 to 2012 the training modules Church workers were required to attend included Mandatory Notification training, Recognize and Respond to disclosures of Sexual Violence in the Church training, a Power and Trust seminar, a Safety and Screening seminar, and Ensuring a Safer Church programme.
Since 2012 Church workers have been required to attend *Child Safe Environments – Reporting Child Abuse and Neglect* training and *Ensuring Safer Church Communities* training.

The *Child Safe Environment* programme was designed to meet all the training requirements within the South Australian context for notification of child abuse and neglect consistent with the Children’s Protection Act 1993. The *Reporting Child Abuse and Neglect* programme has been developed and made available by Families SA as an education tool for agencies and individuals. The Families SA Learning and Practice Development team deliver a train-the-trainer programme that is conducted over three days. It is a requirement of using the materials developed for the *Child-Safe Environments (CSE) Reporting Child Abuse and Neglect* programme that the trainer must have completed this train-the-trainer programme. Each trainer must also complete a minimum of 2 sessions per year, and supply the details of these sessions, including the names and contact details of 2 attendees for an annual audit by the Families SA Learning and Practice Development team.

The *Ensuring Safer Church Communities* training was designed by the Diocese of Adelaide to meet the Safe Ministry Training National Benchmarks, approved by the General Synod Standing Committee (November 2011), agreed and developed by the *National Council of Churches in Australia Safe Church Training Agreement* [ANG.0178.001.0111] during 2006 and 2007.

Training is also available to all volunteer Church workers (even when they have no role in working with children). All training is offered free of charge to Church workers. Refer to attached training schedule for various roles (*Training Schedule for Various Roles* [ANG.0146.001.0527]).
Disclosure and response

Q28. Internal reporting processes following a disclosure of child sexual abuse.

254. Before 1992, reports about child abuse were made to the Archbishop and/or Archdeacons.

255. Immediately following Synod in 1992, Archbishop George established the Critical Incidents Task Force (CITF) after the arrest of the Rev'd Raymond Ayles. During the year between the Synods of 1992 and 1993, the CITF met regularly to develop guidelines for the operation of an appropriate diocesan response to complaints of sexual abuse by clergy. The Synod received a report and recommendations from the CITF in September 1994, *Critical Incidents Working Party report to Synod September 1994 – Policy and Procedure for Dealing with Allegations Against the Anglican Clergy of Sexually Abusive Behaviour* [ANG.0181.001.0010], and Synod adopted the first policy and procedures for dealing with allegations against clergy (from the Diocese’s submission to the Board of Inquiry in 2003). In 1994 Synod agreed to the appointment of an independent Sexually Abusive Behaviour Complaints Person (the contact person) to be appointed. A contact person took office in February 1996.

256. The system was promoted in parishes by a flyer and in October 2000, a more substantial document entitled *A Caring Church for All* [ANG.0181.001.0001] was circulated.

257. In 1999, the Guidelines were amended to include complaints against lay office holders and employees.

258. In June 2000, the term 'sexual abuse' was adopted instead of 'sexual misconduct'.

259. In July 2001, changes to bring clarity to reporting obligations to the police and Family and Youth services were introduced.

260. In February 2003, the Synod engaged Yarrow Place Rape and Sexual Assault Service and Women’s Health to coordinate the Anglican Response Line. The *Make a Complaint Brochure* (August 2004) [ANG.0181.001.0055] promoted the Independent Hotline.

261. Yarrow Place also collected and recorded the information from callers and sought permission for the information to be forwarded to the Anglican Church and the South Australian Police Paedophile Task Force. The names of the alleged perpetrators were reported to the Child Abuse Report Line by Yarrow Place in accordance with mandatory notification requirements.

262. The Helpline service with Yarrow Place was terminated in August 2004. The helpline number was diverted to a new service managed by Relationships Australia Adult Childhood Sexual Abuse Service, which ensured complainants had the option of speaking to a service provider unconnected with the Church.

263. The Synod appointed a Professional Standards Director in 2003, and developed policies around professional standards and the handling of complaints in line with the model
professional standards legislation that was then being developed by General Synod. This included the appointment of a Professional Standards Committee and a Professional Standards Board, and these arrangements continued to operate until Synod passed its Professional Standards Ordinance in 2006.

264. The Professional Standards Ordinance and Protocol outline how information should be shared by the Professional Standards Director to the Professional Standards Committee and Archbishop, as well as clergy/representatives of the relevant parish.

Q29. Reporting allegations of child sexual abuse to the police, the Ombudsman and/or any government child protection agencies, including where:

a) a complainant does not consent to such disclosure, and/or
b) the information was disclosed in the context of a ‘confessional’.

265. In South Australia, under sections 11(1) and (2) of the Children’s Protection Act 1993 (SA), certain people are obliged by law to notify the Department for Education and Child Development, Families SA via the Child Abuse Report Line if they suspect on reasonable grounds that a child/young person has been or is being, abused and/or neglected and the suspicion is formed in the course of the person’s work (whether paid or voluntary) or in carrying out official duties. This suspicion can be formed via another person’s disclosure. A mandated notifier is immune from civil liability for reporting a suspicion in good faith (Section 12(a) and (b) of the Children’s Protection Act 1993 (SA)). Furthermore, a person must not threaten or intimidate a mandated notifier, or cause damage, loss or disadvantage to them because they have reported, or propose to report, suspected abuse or neglect (Children’s Protection Act 1993, section 11(6)).

266. Historically, clergy and Church leaders were not included as mandated notifiers. In September 1994 the Diocesan Council’s Critical Incident Task Force recommended that all Church authorities and agencies should consider themselves bound to notify a statutory authority should they become aware of suspected child abuse. This included clergy and parish-based Children’s and Youth Leaders, who at that time did not fall within the legal definition of mandated notifiers under the Children’s Protection Act (SA).

267. The Diocesan Notification of Child Abuse Policy (2001) [ANG.0181.001.0081] stipulated that reports must be made to the Department of Family and Youth Services, who would then take responsibility for the situation. Diocesan Council formed the view that whilst most clergy and Church leaders at the time did not have a legal obligation to make such notifications, they had a ‘moral responsibility’ to do so.

268. As amended in 2005, the Children’s Protection Act 1993 (SA) sub-section 11(2)(ga) and (gb) include ‘a minister of religion’ and ‘a person who is an employee of, or volunteer in, an
organisation formed for religious or spiritual purposes' as mandated notifiers. Consequently, the Diocese currently requires all Church workers to complete the Department for Education and Child Development, Child-Safe environments - Reporting Child Abuse and Neglect training. This training is not a legal requirement but is an effective way to educate notifiers to recognise and respond to suspected child abuse or neglect.

269. Both the 2006 and 2015 Professional Standards Ordinances address the reporting of information to child protection authorities.

270. The Professional Standards Protocol 2006 [ANG.0173.001.0020] states at Section 6.1(3), that on receiving a complaint:

- The Director will then keep the matter confidential unless or until –
  - The complainant has provided his or her consent to the further disclosure of the matter; or
  - The complaint discloses criminal conduct that should be reported to the police or conduct constituting child abuse that should be reported to the appropriate State authority.

271. The Professional Standards Director, as the Executive Officer of the Professional Standards Committee, is a mandated notifier of child sexual abuse and, therefore, is legally obliged to report any instances of child abuse to the police and to the Child Abuse Report Line (Department of Education and Child Development).

272. The Professional Standards Ordinance 2006 [ANG.0173.001.0136] and Professional Standards Ordinance 2015 [ANG.0146.001.0530] each prescribes the powers and duties of the Professional Standards Director and Committee to refer any relevant information to a member of law enforcement, prosecution, or child protection authority, to which the information may be relevant.

273. The Professional Standards Ordinance 2015 [ANG.0146.001.0530] further adds that the Professional Standards Director may support a complainant in making a report to the police or child protection authorities.

b) the information was disclosed in the context of a ‘confessional’.

274. Prior to 1994, the 1603 Canons of the Church of England applied. These urged the secrecy of the confessional, but did not make it ultimate. The minister was “admonished” to maintain the seal of the confessional, but an exemption from the duty of secrecy was provided where this duty conflicted with one imposed by the civil power under the penalty of death. This exemption was a marked departure from the pre-Reformation ecclesiastical law on the subject.
275. The Synod of the Diocese of Adelaide adopted the General Synod's *Canon concerning Confessions 1989* [ANG.0173.001.0018] on 18 September 1994. Since that date, clause 2 of the *Canon concerning Confessions 1989* covers this situation:

> ‘If any person confess his or her secret and hidden sins to an ordained minister for the unburdening of conscience and to receive spiritual consolation and ease of mind, such minister shall not at any time reveal or make known any crime or offence or sin so confessed and committed to trust and secrecy by that person without the consent of that person.’

276. The *Children’s Protection Act 1993* (SA) provides that mandatory notification obligations do not apply in certain circumstances:

> ‘This section does not require a priest or other minister of religion to divulge information communicated in the course of a confession made in accordance with the rules and usages of the relevant religion (section 11(4)).’

277. However, in April 2006 the Australian Bishops released a set of pastoral guidelines for private confession called *Private Confession - Pastoral Guidelines with special reference to child sexual abuse* [ANG.0134.015.0001]. It appears that these were first adopted by the Archbishop in September 2010, and the amended Guidelines appear to have been adopted in November 2012. These form part of the Archbishop’s *Pastoral Guidelines for Clergy* [ANG.9610.01001.0350], and are published on the Anglican Diocese of Adelaide website. The guidelines, as amended in March 2011, provide at paragraph 7, that where a priest hears a confession relating to child abuse:

a) The priest must closely question the penitent concerning the nature of the abuse and the frequency of the abuse.

b) The priest must indicate to the penitent the grave nature of the sin and the dire consequence abuse will almost certainly have on the abused person.

c) Before pronouncing absolution, if the priest believes the conduct to be criminal, then apart from exceptional circumstances*, the penitent would be required to report that conduct either to the police or other appropriate authority.

d) The serious consequences of child sexual abuse have already been noted. The experience of the community at large is that great care must be taken where child sexual abuse has occurred. In particular, it is important that people with special training and expertise should handle such matters. It is, therefore, recommended that the granting of absolution in such cases be reserved to priests holding a special licence or authority from the Bishop. This would mean if a priest heard a person making confession involving child sexual abuse that priest (if not an authorised priest) would be bound to say to the penitent, “I am not authorised to pronounce absolution, however, I will facilitate an authorised priest to hear your confession for this purpose”.

*Exceptional circumstances would include a confession made by a person near death.
Guidelines for the Hearing of Confessions and the Granting of Absolution with special reference to Child Sexual Abuse

1) Care must be taken when a penitent comes to confession that the confession is heard and absolution is pronounced according to an authorised rite of the Church.

2) The granting of absolution in confessions involving child sexual abuse is reserved to priests holding a special licence or authority from the bishop.

3) All confessions involving child sexual abuse are to be referred forthwith to a priest holding the bishop’s licence to administer absolution in such cases. In other words the priest (unless specially licensed) must decline to pronounce absolution and refer the matter on.

6) Absolutions must be withheld until the priest is satisfied that there is genuine repentance and, apart from exceptional circumstances, until the penitent has reported the matter to the police or other appropriate authority.

278. As a matter of practice, the Archbishop has nominated one senior member of clergy to hear such confessions. The Archbishop has encouraged members of the clergy to contact him for advice in the event that they have been approached by someone who wants to make a confession in these circumstances.

Q30. Notifying an alleged perpetrator of allegations against him or her.

279. Prior to the adoption of the Professional Standards Ordinance 2006 [ANG.0173.001.0136], no formal guidelines around notifying alleged perpetrators existed. In 1997, Gerard Menses, CEO of Anglicare SA at the time, met with Robert Brandenburg to question him on allegations of his activities with adolescent males. These allegations were denied.

280. According to the Professional Standards Ordinance 2006 [ANG.0173.001.0136], all information concerning instances or allegations of child sexual abuse, must be directed to the Professional Standards Director (PSD). As addressed in Question 29, the PSD is a mandated notifier and is legally obliged to report any instances of child abuse to the police and the Child Abuse Report Line (Department of Education and Child Development). On informing the police, the Professional Standards Director will then take instruction from them on whether or not to advise the alleged perpetrator or not. In some cases where there is a current, open investigation, the police will instruct the PSD not to inform the alleged perpetrator, as doing so could jeopardise any inquiry.

281. Furthermore, the Professional Standards Committee may refrain from further investigation of information if the subject matter is under investigation by ‘some other competent person or body’ or is the subject of legal proceedings, as set out in Professional Standards Ordinance (2006) and Professional Standards Ordinance 2015 [ANG.0146.001.0530].
282. If a church worker has been the subject of a ‘notifiable complaint or notifiable charge’, the details of these allegations/convictions must be added to the Professional Standards National Register ('National Register') by the Professional Standards Director.

283. Provisions of notification of Information in the National Register, to the person to whom the records relate are detailed in Section 9 of the National Register Canon (2007) [ANG.0050.003.2766]:

‘Subject to subsection (5), the General Secretary shall, as soon as practicable, and no later than one month, after the entry of Information in the National Register relating to a member of the clergy or a lay person (other than a changed entry relating to item 4 of each of the First and Second Schedules), notify the member of the clergy or lay person concerned of the entry of that information by letter sent to his or her last known postal or electronic address where that address is known.’

284. This letter advises the recipient that they can complete an Application to Obtain Information about You on the National Register form [ANG.00178.001.0122].

285. Section 9, National Register Canon 2007 (as amended 2014) [ASQ.261.005.0182] provides a mechanism for not notifying the person of a record relating to them, on the advice of the police. It notes:

(2) Where a Director of Professional Standards receives a police request or a withdrawal of the police request and is reasonably satisfied of its authenticity, the Director of Professional Standards shall forthwith:

(a) enter a notation of the police request in the National Register, or remove that notation, as the case may be; and

(b) make a police request record or a withdrawal of the police request record, as the case may be, and provide that record to the General Secretary.

(3) Where the General Secretary receives a police request or a withdrawal of the police request and is reasonably satisfied of its authenticity, the General Secretary shall forthwith:

(a) enter a notation of the police request in the National Register, or remove that notation, as the case may be; and

(b) make a police request record or a withdrawal of the police request record, as the case may be.

(4) The General Secretary shall keep any such police request record or withdrawal of the police request record, as the case may be.

(5) Where the General Secretary receives a police request, or a police request record from a Director of Professional Standards, the General Secretary shall not notify the member of the clergy or lay person of the entry of Information in the National Register relating to that person until the sooner of the expiration of six months after the receipt of the police request or the receipt of a withdrawal of the police request,
or a withdrawal of the police request record from a Director of Professional Standards, as the case may be.

286. Up to this point for the Diocese of Adelaide, it has not been necessary to implement these features of the National Register, as the church members for whom records relate have been convicted of criminal offences.

Q31. Providing pastoral care and counselling to complainants and/or alleged perpetrators following allegations of child sexual abuse.

Providing care/counselling to complainants:

Prior to 2003
287. When the first allegations of child abuse emerged in 1992, the Synod’s approach was to have no contact with the families of complainants, as it was believed that to do so could be seen by the police as interfering with potential witnesses.

288. This approach changed substantially, as seen in the Archbishop’s Statement to Synod 2003. “We will continue to provide assistance and appropriate support to people affected by abuse and their families. We will meet with them and find the appropriate ways to respond to their hurt. We will listen and we will continue to learn.”

From 2003 - 2004
289. In 2003, Yarrow Place was engaged to provide a hotline service taking calls from complainants. These arrangements also involved the provision of counselling support to complainants by Yarrow Place’s professional staff. Yarrow Place provided support and counselling to those who experienced abuse from people who had been in the employ of the Anglican Church. Crisis counselling had been provided to callers when needed, by experienced and skilled staff. Yarrow Place also arranged for the provision of longer term counselling both locally and interstate. Arrangements for the services were made with private therapists located in the callers’ local area. These therapists were experienced in childhood sexual abuse counselling.

290. When callers lived outside of metropolitan Adelaide, a counsellor could be located using the following procedure:

- In country areas, call the local Community Health Centre and request the names of private therapists experienced in child sexual assault counselling.
- Where possible, it is preferable to give every client a choice of two therapists. As most of the victims who have called the line have been male, the choice of a male and female therapist has also been offered.
- Phone the nominated therapists to explain the role of the Response Line and Yarrow Place.
• Negotiate for the therapist to see clients referred by the Response Line and for payment to be made by the Church through Yarrow Place. The client is not to receive a bill.
• Phone the client and give the contact details of two therapists. The client can phone one or both of these therapists for an initial brief discussion to decide whom they will see.
• Clients should identify themselves as being referred by the Response Line to avoid direct billing. The client is responsible for ongoing arrangements for counselling.
• Yarrow Place asked clients to provide general feedback regarding the therapists they have seen, via the Response Line. This was to assist Yarrow Place to continue to provide suitable referrals.

291. When the hotline service arrangement with Yarrow Place came to an end (sometime towards the end of 2004), arrangements were made with Greg Smith (NADA counselling services) to accept referrals for counselling from the Response Line. Clients were to be informed that, if they found they were unable to work with Greg, they could re-contact the Response Line and arrangements could be made for them to see another therapist.

2004 onwards

292. The Synod adopted a Protocol for supporting parishes/organisations following a public allegation of sexual abuse in August 2004 and issued the first edition of Healing Steps – Pastoral support and practical assistance for those who have been sexually abused within the Church, in August 2004.

293. Since 2004, the Professional Standards Director will generally offer an initial 10 sessions of counselling to a complainant. They can recommend counsellors with particular strengths, however, the choice of counsellor rests with the complainant. Counselling costs are borne by the Synod. Further counselling sessions may be arranged as agreed to by the Professional Standards Committee. If a complainant seeks further sessions, the Professional Standards Committee may ask for a report from the psychologist, to note that their client’s issues directly relate to the abuse received, that the counselling is beneficial and that they recommend it continuing. While there are no formal limits to the extent that counselling is provided, the Synod has extended counselling up to a decade from the first request.

294. Protocols and practices that have been implemented since 2004 include:

• Anglican Diocese of Adelaide Protocol for supporting parishes/organisations following a public allegation of sexual abuse August 2004 [ANG.00178.001.0122]
• Standing Committee Resolution 2009/3/037 [ANG.0181.001.0045] that resolved to recommend principles as a resource for dioceses for a system of pastoral care and assistance for those who had been sexually abused.
• Healing Steps – Pastoral support and practical assistance for those who have been sexually abused within the Church booklet (August 2004, updated October 2004, August 2010) [ANG.0050.001.0055]
295. In February 2006, the Diocese produced a document entitled *Counselling Assistance for Sexual Abuse Claimants: Arrangements for people making claims in relation to abuse by Robert Brandenburg* [ANG.9610.01001.0371] to assist these particular claimants and their immediate family members in accessing services.

296. When The Synod seeks to make a financial settlement through Healing Steps, the aim is to include a component for counselling guided by the recommendation of a treating psychiatrist/psychologist or the survivor’s wish. Whilst the Church makes counselling available to all survivors, it is up to the survivor to take up the offer.

Providing care/counselling to alleged perpetrators:

297. The Synod’s Sexual Misconduct Guidelines (adopted in 1999) provided that ‘the Church is committed to support those Church workers who are accused of sexual misconduct’. This was amended in July 2001 to read ‘The Church is also committed to support, seek justice for and promote the welfare of those who are accused of sexual abuse ...’

298. Currently, section 4 of *Professional Standards Protocol 2006* [ANG.0173.001.0020], provides that support persons and carers are available to provide such services as counselling, spiritual direction or preliminary advice to respondents, or other Church workers who may be involved in processes associated with a matter that is the subject of a complaint under the Protocol.

299. Section 8 of the *Professional Standards Protocol 2006* states that the respondent will be offered the assistance of a carer to be present at the meeting, or the respondent may select his/her own carer. A carer or support person may assist the respondent with the process of compiling their written response to a complaint.
**Investigation**

Q32. Investigating allegations of child sexual abuse.

300. In 1992, Archbishop Ian George identified significant gaps in the provisions of the *Clergy Discipline Ordinance 1983* [ANG.0173.001.0158]. The Archbishop recognised the need to:

- have the capacity to suspend a member of the clergy when allegations were made
- provide support to victims
- have proper protocols to handle cases efficiently.

301. This led to the establishment of the Critical Incidents Task Force, the Diocesan Response Group and subsequently the appointment of a Professional Standards Committee and Professional Standards Director.

302. In 1999, the *'Critical Incidents Policy Guidelines for dealing with allegations of sexual misconduct made against member of the Anglican Clergy or against members of the Anglican laity holding positions of responsibility.'* [ANG.0181.001.0178] was implemented. This has also been supported by the *Guidelines for Enabling Facilitation and Settlement of Claims* (Adopted by Diocesan Administration Council 25 February 2004, amended 9 March 2005) [ANG.9610.01033.0298].

303. The *Professional Standards Committee and Director Policy* (approved by Diocesan Council in November 2003, amended 16 June 2004) [ANG.0181.001.0082] and the *Interim Protocols for dealing with Sexual Misconduct by Clergy and Church Workers* [ANG.0178.001.0098] reinforced the investigation process for allegations of any professional misconduct by a Church worker. It states that all allegations will be dealt with promptly and that the Synod will support and cooperate fully with any investigation by civil authorities. The Synod stated its commitment to support, seek justice for and promote the welfare of those who suffer because of sexual abuse, including the informant, members of the informant’s family and close associates, the parish and the wider Church community. It recognised that, while being open and accountable, it was essential that confidentiality be maintained and privacy respected even though these two principles may be in tension with each other.

304. The Interim Policy and Protocols were replaced by the *Professional Standards Ordinance* and the *Professional Standards Protocol* (2006 and 2015).

305. The Professional Standards Director will always report instances of child abuse to the police and the Child Abuse Report Line. The Professional Standards Director will then follow the instruction of the police whether to advise the alleged perpetrator or not, whilst they undertake any investigation.

306. If the police have an open investigation the Professional Standards Committee does not conduct its own investigation (section 27 of 2006 Ordinance).
Q33. Imposing restrictions on an alleged perpetrator's duties or involvement with the Church pending resolution of an investigation.

Perpetrators who are church workers:

307. In 1992, there was a call for the Rev’d Raymond Ayles to be removed from office pending the outcome of the court case, however, there was no canonical provision to facilitate this simply on the basis of a conviction of the Court. The only course of action was a full Diocesan Tribunal process under the Clergy Discipline Ordinance 1983 [ANG.0173.001.0158] and the Constitution of the Anglican Church of Australia with a full investigation of the facts. Archbishop Ian George received legal advice that he should not proceed to a Diocesan Tribunal while the case was before the secular courts. His statement to the 1992 Synod was:

_Clergy, Church employees and sexual offences_

We have all been distressed and concerned that allegations have been made against certain clergy of sexual offences in recent time. There have been some questions about why certain clergy were not suspended from their responsibilities during these proceedings. It is important for members of Synod to know that under the Constitution of the Anglican Church of Australia it is not possible for me or any other diocesan Bishop to suspend a priest unless an official charge has been brought against that priest in an ecclesiastical tribunal. It would obviously be inappropriate (and perhaps in contempt of court) for such a proceeding against a priest or Church employee in the civil courts. It is important for us always to remember that under our system of justice a person is innocent until proved guilty of an offence.

We need to consider carefully more immediate steps that could be taken in these difficult situations. Immediately after this Synod I shall be calling together a group of expert people to develop a protocol to guide us in dealing with matters like this where we have to be very sensitive to the needs of victims, the accused, the families, the Church and the general community. After much agonising over these matters the Bishops of the Province have prepared a public statement about our concern which I will release at an appropriate time.

308. Following his conviction and suspended sentence, the Archbishop required the Rev’d Ayles to resign his office in the Diocese of Adelaide, and at that time all Australian Bishops were advised of the priest’s criminal conviction.

309. The Professional Standards Ordinance 2006 [ANG.0173.001.0136], determines powers of suspension in the event of a pending resolution of an investigation, and sets out considerations to be made by the Professional Standards Committee in putting forth recommendations under this section.

310. Provisions for suspension of Church workers have been further strengthened in the Professional Standards Ordinance 2015 [ANG.0146.001.0530], a suspension order means:

‘...an order suspending a respondent to a complaint from the duties of office or employment by a Church body and may include an order:'
(a) that from a specified date the respondent and his or her immediate family cease to reside in any accommodation provided by the Church body;
(b) restricting or prohibiting the use by the respondent of a motor vehicle and any other property provided by the Church body;
(c) prohibiting the attendance of the respondent at a particular Church or place of worship or within a specified geographical area;
and includes a variation of a suspension order.'

311. The resolution of the General Synod Standing Committee on 16-18 October 2009 recommended the Guidelines for Dioceses Undertaking Risk Assessments relating to Sexual Abuse (October 2009) [ANG.0134.013.0001], which was implemented by the Diocese, as applied through Safer Ministry Screening and Licensing procedures.

Perpetrators who are not church workers:

312. In December 2006, the Professional Standards Commission released the resource entitled Model Guidelines for the Pastoral Supervision and Support of Known and Suspected Sexual Abusers in Parishes [ANG.0134.011.0001] for national use. As well as providing information about sexual abuse and some of the attendant theological issues, this resource addresses the pastoral supervision and support of known and suspected sexual abusers. It also included a template of a Memorandum of Understanding between the person of interest, the parish and the Diocese.

313. As referred to in this Diocese, the ‘Worshipping Agreement’ (Memorandum of Understanding) is a protocol for the involvement of a person in parishes, congregations or Church organisations in the Diocese, who has been convicted of abuse of children or other vulnerable adults by the civil courts, or ecclesiastical tribunals, or who has been charged and is awaiting a court appearance (The Diocese of Adelaide ‘Worshipping Agreement’ (MOU) [ANG.0146.001.0575]).

314. The resolution of the General Synod Standing Committee on 16-18 October 2009 recommended the Guidelines for Parish Safety where there is a risk of Sexual Abuse by a Person of concern (revised October 2009) [ANG.0150.001.5052]. The Diocese adopted this guideline in implementing the ‘Worshipping Agreement’.
Discipline

Q34. Codes of conduct or expected behaviours for Church workers.
315. There are two sources documenting the conduct expected of clergy and Church workers. The first source is found in Codes of Conduct with which clergy and Church workers are required to comply. The second source is found in disciplinary rules.

Codes of Conduct
316. The Synod has adopted several Codes of Conduct since 1990:

- Sexual Misconduct – How to Make a Complaint flyer [ANG.0181.001.0188] – the guidelines applied to clergy, lay workers, vestry members, choir leaders, youth leaders, Sunday School teachers and all others who hold office within the Church and covered: Basic guidelines, the definition of sexual misconduct; how to make a complaint; sexual abuse of children; and other options for reporting abuse (includes the police) (1998).
- Faithfulness in Service [ANG.0006.001.0225] - a national Anglican code for personal behaviour and the practice of pastoral ministry by clergy and pastoral workers. It was adopted by the Synod on 28 October 2006 after revisions had been made by the General Synod earlier in 2006. The Synod has retained the 2006 version.

Disciplinary Rules
317. Before 2006, disciplinary rules were contained in the General Synod's The Offences Canon 1962 [ANG.0048.001.7501], which was adopted by the Synod on 17 September 1983.

318. The Offences Canon 1962 [ANG.0048.001.7501] provides for the following offences in respect of a person licensed by the Bishop:

1. Unchastity.
2. Drunkenness.
3. Habitual and wilful neglect of ministerial duty after written admonition in respect thereof by the Bishop of the Diocese.
4. Wilful failure to pay just debts.
5. Conduct, wherever occurring,
   (a) which would be disgraceful if committed by a member of the clergy, and
(b) which at the time the charge is preferred is productive, or if known publicly would be productive, of scandal or evil report.

6. Any other offence prescribed by an Ordinance of the Synod of the Diocese.

319. Since 2006, standards of unacceptable behaviour have been defined in the Synod’s Professional Standards Ordinances.

320. The Professional Standards Ordinance 2006 [ANG.0173.001.0136] defined misconduct as follows:

"misconduct’ means an activity or deliberate or careless inactivity that –

(a) involves harassment, or causes harm to a person’s physical, spiritual, emotional or financial wellbeing or, in the case of a child, to his or her development; or

(b) is carried out by a person in a position of power or authority over another –

(i) for the inappropriate gratification of that person; or

(ii) for the exploitation of the other; or

(c) involves the exploitation of an office or position within the Church or a Church body; or

(d) brings an office within the Church or a Church body or, if relevant, brings the Church or a Church body more generally into disrepute; or

(e) involves an alleged process failure.’

321. The Professional Standards Ordinance 2015 [ANG.0146.001.0530] defines misconduct in relation to a Church worker as:

‘... an activity or wilful or careless inactivity that –

a) involves harassment, or causes harm to a person’s physical, spiritual, emotional or financial well-being or, in the case of a child, to his or her development; or

b) is carried out by a person in a position of power or authority over another – (i) for the inappropriate gratification of that person; or (ii) for the exploitation of the other; or

c) involves the exploitation of an office or position within the Church or a Church body; or

d) brings an office within the Church or a Church body or, if relevant, brings the Church or a Church body more generally into disrepute; or

e) involves a breach of the standards of sexual conduct prescribed in the Code of Conduct; and includes:

f) wilful or careless failure to comply with an undertaking given to or a direction
imposed by a Church authority under section 104 of this Ordinance;

g) wilful or careless failure to comply with an undertaking given to the Board, the Review Board or the Church authority;

h) wilful or careless failure to comply with the provisions of section 17; and

i) a breach of The Offences Canon 1962 or any Canon amending or replacing that Canon which is in force in and is not excluded from this diocese;

by the Church worker whenever occurring which, if established, would on its face call into question:

(i) the fitness of the Church worker, whether temporarily or permanently, to hold a particular or any office, licence or position of responsibility in the Church or to be or remain in the employment of a Church body, or in Holy Orders; or

(ii) whether, in the exercise of the Church worker's ministry or employment, or in the performance of any duty or function, the Church worker should be subject to any condition;`

Q35. Conducting disciplinary proceedings in respect of Church workers against whom:

a) allegations of child sexual abuse have been made, or

b) allegations have been made in relation to the way a complaint of child sexual abuse has been handled.

a) Allegations of child sexual abuse have been made

322. Prior to 2006, under the Offences Canon 1962 [ANG.0048.001.7501] and the Clergy Discipline Ordinance 1983 [ANG.0173.001.0158], the Diocesan Tribunal was the primary body for undertaking disciplinary proceedings for church workers.

323. The Offences Canon 1962 [ANG.0048.001.7501] provides for the following offences in respect of a person licensed by the Bishop:

‘Conduct, wherever occurring,

(a) which would be disgraceful if committed by a member of the clergy, and

(b) which at the time the charge is preferred is productive, or if known publicly would be productive, of scandal or evil report.’

324. From 2006 – 2015 the Professional Standards Ordinance 2006 [ANG.0173.001.0136], provided an alternative disciplinary procedure for church workers against whom allegations of child sexual abuse have been made, before the Professional Standards Board. The Professional Standards Ordinance 2006 has in December 2015 been replaced with the Professional Standards Ordinance 2015 [ANG.0146.001.0530]. Both documents comprehensively outline
the conduct of disciplinary proceedings in respect of Church workers who have breached the codes of conduct.

325. Since 2006, as addressed in Questions 32 and 33, the Professional Standards Committee will refer any information of child sexual abuse to the relevant state authorities, and will not conduct an investigation pending a criminal investigation. As noted in Question 33, restrictions will be imposed on an alleged perpetrator’s duties and involvement within the Church, pending resolution of an investigation.

326. The Professional Standards Ordinance 2015 [ANG.0146.001.0530] refers to a "Certificate of Conviction", given under or in accordance with sections 42 or 43 of the Evidence Act 1929 (SA) certifying as to the conviction of a Church worker of a criminal offence referred to in Part 3, Divisions 11, 11A or 12 of the Criminal Law Consolidation Act 1935 (SA) or Parts 6 or 7 of the Summary Offences Act 1953 (SA) or any equivalent provision in legislation that repeals or replaces those Acts, or any equivalent provision in any Commonwealth, State or Territory legislation, and states The Professional Standards Board may reach a disciplinary determination whether or not a complaint against the church worker has been referred to the Board.

b) Allegations have been made in relation to the way a complaint of child sexual abuse has been handled.

327. According to The Children’s Protection Act 1993 (SA) as amended in 2005, ‘a minister of religion’ and ‘a person who is an employee of, or volunteer in, an organisation formed for religious or spiritual purposes’ is categorised as a mandated notifier, and failure to notify, is a criminal offence. In line with this legislation, all clergy and church workers are bound by the code of conduct, document Faithfulness in Service (2006) [ANG.0006.001.0225] which states:

5.14 if you know or reasonably suspect that a child is at risk of harm from child abuse, you are to report this to the appropriate civil authorities.

5.15 if you know or reasonably suspect that another member of the clergy or a Church worker has abused a child, you are to report this to the appropriate civil authorities and the Director of Professional Standards.

328. Where there is a failure to follow these rules, it could give rise to disciplinary proceedings. Where it is alleged that a Church member has mishandled a complaint of child sexual abuse, by neglecting to report the known or suspected abuse, the Professional Standards Committee has just reason to investigate this information. Restrictions on the person’s involvement in the Church, as well as disciplinary proceedings through the Professional Standards Board may then proceed, as outlined in the Professional Standards Ordinance 2006 [ANG.0173.001.0136], as replaced by the Professional Standards Ordinance 2015 [ANG.0146.001.0530]. Equally the Offences Canon 1962 [ANG.0048.001.7501] could be invoked on similar grounds as outlined above.
329. The *Professional Standards Ordinance 2006* [ANG.0173.001.0136] provided for misconduct in relation to process failure, which could include not properly handling a complaint of child sexual abuse. This is specifically where there is an allegation of process failure involving child sexual abuse. The Professional Standards Committee can refer to the Professional Standards Board the allegations which then can make recommendations if it is found that there was such a process failure.

330. The *Professional Standards Ordinance 2015* [ANG.0146.001.0530] includes amongst its definitions that can constitute misconduct with regards to process failure. The Ordinance provides to the Professional Standards Committee and the Respondent a full review of the proceedings and determinations made by the Professional Standards Board. This right of review would include allegations that the Professional Standards Board had mishandled a complaint of child sexual abuse.

Q36. Church law offences that apply in your Diocese to matters concerning child sexual abuse and the handling of complaints of child sexual abuse.

331. The General Synod's *The Offences Canon 1962* [ANG.0048.001.7501], which was adopted by the Synod on 17 September 1983 provides that the following church law offences, which could relate to child sexual abuse, can be heard and determined in a diocesan tribunal:

332. ...charges in respect of the following offences alleged to have been committed by a person who, at the time the charge is preferred, is licensed by the bishop of the diocese or is in holy orders resident in the diocese:

1. Unchastity....

5. Conduct, wherever occurring,
   (a) which would be disgraceful if committed by a member of the clergy, and
   (b) which at the time the charge is preferred is productive, or if known publicly would be productive, of scandal or evil report.

333. In answering this question, the provisions of the *Professional Standards Ordinances 2006 and 2015*, which provide mechanisms for removing unfit clergy from office, have not been included.

Q37. The standard of proof applied in your Diocesan disciplinary proceedings relating to child sexual abuse matters

334. Prior to the *Professional Standards Ordinance 2015* [ANG.0146.001.0530], the practice in disciplinary proceedings has been to apply the *Briginshaw* test in making determinations on the balance of probabilities.

335. The *Professional Standards Ordinance 2015* [ANG.0146.001.0530], defines the standard of proof at section 90, as:
(1) The standard of proof to establish an allegation is that of a reasonable satisfaction on the balance of probabilities.

(2) Each of the Board and the Review Board must scrutinise evidence with greater care if there is a serious allegation to be established, or an inherent unlikelihood of an occurrence of a given description or if there are grave consequences that would flow from a particular finding.
Redress

Q38. A brief overview of your Diocesan processes and procedures relating to the resolution of claims for financial compensation, counselling, apologies and other redress by way of mediation, settlement negotiations, and/or civil litigation.

Pre-2004

336. Prior to 2004, the Synod’s approach to redress was primarily defence driven, legalistic and, it would be reasonable to say, not focused on meeting the needs of survivors. This was in part a response to how the insurance providers advised senior leadership in the Diocese to respond to an allegation of abuse when seeking to invoke a claim against a molestation policy. Advice was not to accept legal liability and that the allegation/claim must be defended. This approach drove the Synod’s response to the allegations of sexual abuse up to 2004. No records exist of the Synod making any meaningful redress (financial) prior to the introduction of Healing Steps in 2004. Equally, there is no recorded evidence of the Synod making personal apologies to survivors prior to this date. The the Archbishop, Ian George made a number public apologies, particularly in his 2002 and 2003 Presidential Addresses to Synod.

From 2004

337. The Anglican Diocese of Adelaide put in place its Healing Steps process in August 2004, as part of its response to the Olsson-Chung Board of Inquiry. In June 2004 the Diocesan Synod had agreed to adopt and implement all of the recommendations of the Board of Inquiry.

338. In developing the process, the Diocese sought the assistance of an independent advisor with years of experience working in social welfare and dispute resolution, Ms Fay Marles AM (previously Victoria’s first Commissioner for Equal Opportunity, then Chancellor of the University of Melbourne). At the public launch of Healing Steps, she outlined its underlying philosophy:

'Mediation and facilitation has long been recognized as a process that can help people who have been abused. Healing Steps has been based on models that have been effective in other contexts in Australia and overseas. It is also the model on which conciliation in the Equal Opportunity field is based and which I have used extensively in the past.

Not only can it open possibilities for apology, acknowledgement and allowing those who have been abused to be heard, but it can deliver pastoral, financial and other kinds of support. It is a process for the person who has been damaged by abuse – and in most cases has lived with the consequences for many years, to be vindicated. Importantly, it also holds the perpetrator accountable.

Rarely, as many commentators point out, can these outcomes be delivered through the traditional legal process’.

(Speech in Adelaide August 12 2004.)
339. *Healing Steps* was never seen as rigid process, with ‘steps’ to be followed inflexibly by those who chose to use it. Rather, the name recognised that there were important ‘guiding principles’ of alternative dispute resolution that the Synod needed to embrace as it sought to respond to those who had been abused by those in a position of sacred trust. The 2004 *Healing Steps* booklet [ANG.0048.001.3352 & IND.R-003252.PS.0472] describes the process as ‘an option which approaches claims from a pastoral perspective toward a resolution appropriate to the circumstances of each individual’. It was clear that ‘this alternative is neither part of, nor a substitute for pursuing claims through a legal process’. In essence, *Healing Steps* is a flexible independently mediated resolution process, often involving a personal apology from a Church leader, as well as some pastoral and practical outcomes (often financial) to support a survivor of abuse move towards a more hopeful tomorrow.

A shift in emphasis

340. The adoption of *Healing Steps* represented a major shift in the nature of the Synod’s response to claims related to abuse. Previously, the response of the Synod had been characterised by a significant emphasis on liability. Given the nature of sexual abuse, liability is often hard to establish. The fact that many claims were of an historic nature added to these difficulties. Legal advice to the Synod during this time suggested that in a majority of the critical incidents being considered, legal liability would be difficult to establish. Insurance arrangements added weight to this emphasis on liability.

341. *Healing Steps* did not set aside the need for appropriate investigation of critical incidents, but it did establish an important ‘default’ towards believing those who came forward with claims. Survivors have repeatedly made it clear that ‘being believed’ was a key element in their journey towards some resolution. There were some concerns at the time that this approach opened the Synod to greater financial vulnerability.

342. However, in the June 2004 Synod there was strong determination that the diocesan response be informed by ‘Gospel’ principles through which past institutional and individual failures were recognised and that the response to those who had been abused should be based on compassion over liability.

343. Following the principles of compassion, *Healing Steps* was intended to be:

- **Independent** – the Church coordinates the process, but ensures that key elements are undertaken by individuals and bodies independent of the Church. From the beginning, mediations were conducted by an independent facilitator in premises other than Church property. Independent psychological assessments were sought. At a later stage, and following the appointment of Archbishop Jeffrey Driver, the Professional Standards Office was physically removed from the Diocesan office and separate contact details were established.

- **Optional** – the process is one option available and its use does not preclude a survivor seeking redress through other means. People considering pursuing claims against the
Diocese are encouraged to seek legal advice in order to consider all the options available to them.

- **Supported**—at any time during the process those seeking redress from the Diocese were encouraged to access additional support and advice from sources independent of the Church. As the process was developed, the Professional Standards Director was given a standing capacity to make available at an early stage a package of counselling to support people as they came forward and considered how they might develop their claims.

- **Transforming**—the key objective was to enable survivors of abuse to ‘move on in life in a positive way’. The mediation process recognised that the journey of each individual is different as are the steps towards greater healing for those who have been abused or traumatised. There has been almost always a conscious attempt to find a form of acknowledgement, or symbol of healing that the individual can identify as important (a new piano for a musician, support for education for someone whose education was interrupted). The availability of a diocesan leader (usually the Archbishop) to listen and offer an apology is always offered and in something like half the instances over nearly a decade has been taken up. The Archbishop has been careful not to involve himself in other aspects of the mediation, including financial negotiations. It is customary for a mediation to conclude with a Deed of Settlement. The Deed binds the Diocese to confidentiality, but does not similarly bind the survivor of abuse.

**Amendments made to Healing Steps**

344. When *Healing Steps* was put in place in 2004 it was readily recognised that ‘it does not provide a perfect answer’, but would need to be continually developed and adapted. Some of the developments have been noted (e.g., the early availability of a counselling package often preceding the development of a claim). Others have come through intentional review.

345. The development of *Healing Steps* and input from those who had participated in the process over the preceding years led the Professional Standards Committee of the Diocese to recommend some revisions to the information provided to survivors of abuse and other interested parties. All survivors are now provided with an explanatory booklet about *Healing Steps*, which was first issued in October 2004 [IND.R-003252.PS.0472]. An amended booklet (*Healing Steps – Pastoral support and practical assistance for those who have been sexually abused within the Church booklet* [ANG.0050.001.0055]) incorporating the changes recommended by the committee commenced production in August 2010. The amendments better reflected some areas that might have been unclear from the earlier version of the booklet, so that survivors could make fully informed decisions about their involvement in *Healing Steps*.

346. In the revised booklet (*Healing Steps – Pastoral support and practical assistance for those who have been sexually abused within the Church* [ANG.0050.001.0055]), it was reiterated that agreeing to participate in *Healing Steps* did not require survivors to surrender their right to take legal action, if they were dissatisfied with the progress of the matter:
347. *Healing Steps* offers an alternative approach to civil proceedings for resolving claims by those who have been abused. This option approaches claims from a pastoral perspective, toward a resolution appropriate to the circumstances of each individual. Participants were, however, free to opt out and resume civil proceedings at any stage.

348. The revised booklet (*Healing Steps – Pastoral support and practical assistance for those who have been sexually abused within the Church [ANG.0050.001.0055]*) also amended references to the confidentiality of any information received, to make clear that, particularly in situations where there might be some ongoing risk to others, information received as part of *Healing Steps* might be required to be passed on or otherwise acted upon.

349. There have also been ongoing changes in how *Healing Steps* operates in practice within the Diocese. There has been a commitment to ensuring that important information is communicated between the Registry and Archbishop's Office, which have primary responsibility for *Healing Steps*, and the Professional Standards Office, which manages the Synod's response to Church workers accused of misconduct. Survivors unaware of the internal division of these roles were sometimes confused to find that Diocesan staff members were sometimes unaware of information or statements previously provided to the Diocesan staff for some other purpose. They expected with good reason that when they provided information to 'the Church', it was known wherever it might be required. The Synod has taken active efforts to meet that expectation.

350. As part of providing survivors with an easier interface with 'the Church', all their concerns can now be directed to a single point of contact, the Professional Standards Director. Part of the Director's responsibility is to ensure that any queries or concerns are addressed to the right person within the Diocese, without requiring the survivors to know who that person might be.

351. To reinforce the different mindset *Healing Steps* was intended to instill, the Synod also adopted a policy strictly separating those firms that provide legal advice for litigious and commercial matters from those assisting the Synod in considering requests under *Healing Steps*. The firm the Synod uses to advise in *Healing Steps* matters receives no other work from the Synod, to ensure that the focus is always on the pastoral and moral responsibilities to survivors rather than its legal obligations.

352. It is strongly recommended to all survivors participating in *Healing Steps* that they retain solicitors so that they can be assured that their interests are protected throughout the process, and will insist on that occurring before any settlement is finalised. Over time, more and more survivors are expressing a view that they are comfortable with proceeding without representation, at least through the initial stages. This is particularly the case with those survivors who are involved in social networks, where others have previously sought assistance through *Healing Steps*.

353. No process will ever be perfect, or work well in every case. *Healing Steps*, however, has some characteristics that strongly recommend it. It is made clear to survivors from the outset that...
they will not be required to meet onerous standards of proof regarding the abuse they experienced or the impact that it has had in their lives. The Church has learned that, for a number of reasons, survivors typically do not approach the Church in cases of abuse for many years, and often decades. Survivors are assured that they are believed and that the time they have taken to come forward is not unusual. They are offered counselling and pastoral support, whether or not they choose to proceed any further, or even provide any information about what they experienced at all. They are told from the outset that an outcome available to them is the chance to tell their story to a senior representative of the Church and receive a direct apology. Survivors are never required to agree to keep silent about their experience or any settlement the Church might offer them.

354. The flexibility Healing Steps offers means that it can accommodate cases where the Church’s responsibility for the harm suffered by the survivor might be ambiguous or uncertain. All of this is offered without any obligation that a survivor agree to the process.

355. It is only anecdotal, but a number of those survivors in particular have stated that they have confidence in the fairness of the process based on what they have been told by others. This cannot be measured, but is likely the best endorsement of Healing Steps available. Likewise, other survivors who had previously approached the Synod for assistance and had been dissatisfied with its response have revisited their requests in subsequent years, since the adoption of Healing Steps, and have found it a much more positive and pastoral experience.

356. The most significant changes made to Healing Steps as a result of the 2010 review were that the Church was to seek confirmation from an independent investigation for the substance of a claim. The Church would also make an acknowledgement and/or an apology to a claimant for what they had suffered, by arranging for a senior Church leader to be present at the meeting between the claimant and the Church representative. The 2010 version removes the section on confidentiality, but along with the 2004 version, advises that the complainant is not required to give an undertaking of silence as part of a facilitated agreement. The 2010 version states that the Church representative will commit an agreement that may include financial assistance, whereas the earlier version lends no alternative to financial assistance being granted. In defining a Church worker, the 2010 version adds that this definition excludes a Bishop, subject to the jurisdiction of the Special Tribunal of the Church.

### Summary of Settlements through Healing Steps (2006-2015)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Settlement Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>The Synod made 36 payments in 2006 as financial redress to survivors of sexual abuse (totalling $3,421,663). This total comprised 35 payments relating to Brandenburg ($3,388,905) and 1 payment relating to Others ($32,758).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>The Synod made 19 payments in 2007 as financial redress to survivors of sexual abuse (totalling $720,000). This total comprised 1 payment relating to Brandenburg ($75,000) and 18 payments relating to Others ($645,000).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Payments Made</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>The Synod made 9 payments in 2008 as financial redress to survivors of sexual abuse (totalling $522,500). This total comprised 4 payments relating to Brandenburg ($215,000) and 5 payments relating to Others ($307,500).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>The Synod made 3 payments in 2009 as financial redress to survivors of sexual abuse (totalling $143,200). This total comprised 1 payment relating to Brandenburg ($55,000) and 2 payments relating to Others ($88,200).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>The Synod made 1 payment in 2010 as financial redress to a survivor of sexual abuse (totalling $45,620). This total comprised no payments relating to Brandenburg ($0) and 1 payment relating to Others ($45,260).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>The Synod made 10 payments in 2011 as financial redress to survivors of sexual abuse (totalling $1,071,200). This total comprised 2 payments relating to Brandenburg ($50,200) and 8 payments relating to Others ($1,021,000).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>The Synod made 3 payments in 2012 as financial redress to survivors of sexual abuse (totalling $290,780). This total comprised no payments relating to Brandenburg ($0) and 3 payments relating to Others ($290,780).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>The Synod made 1 payment in 2013 as financial redress to a survivor of sexual abuse (totalling $27,200). This total comprised no payments relating to Brandenburg ($0) and 1 payment relating to Others ($27,200).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>The Synod made no financial redress payments in 2014 to survivors of sexual abuse.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>The Synod made no financial redress payments in 2015 to survivors of sexual abuse although four matters are under consideration.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

357. The amounts reported are the final settlement payments made to survivors as at November 2015. To date, the Synod has incurred in the order of an additional $1.5 million of expenses relating to counselling fees for survivors and legal expenses.
Risk management

Q39. Notifying Church members and Church workers of allegations against a particular Church member or Church worker. Where there is such a policy, the level of detail included in any such notification.

358. No records exist of the notification arrangements in place prior to the adoption of the Anglican Diocese of Adelaide Protocol for Supporting Parishes/Organisations following a public allegation of sexual abuse in 2004 [ANG.00178.001.0122]. It can be reasonably assumed, without the support of primary evidence, that the Archbishop or other senior diocesan leader would have advised church members and church workers that an allegation had been made against someone on a need to know basis.

359. Since the adoption of the Protocol, notifications are managed case by case. Information is shared on a need-to-know basis. Some Church workers will play the role of support person for a known or alleged offender who is the subject of a Worshipping Agreement [ANG.0146.001.0575].

Q40. Risk managing known or alleged offenders involved in the Diocese as Church workers or Church members.

Church workers/clergy:

360. Prior to 2001, with the establishment of screening processes for church workers (see Question 26), risk would be assessed by the Archbishop and if deemed acceptable, a person would be allowed to minister usually under some form of supervision. In 1971 a Senior Probation and Parole Officer wrote to the then Archbishop, Thomas Reed recommending Rev'd Wilfred Dennis' return to ministry following his release from gaol. Dennis was granted Permission to Officiate; a form of written authorization from the Bishop, enabling him to minister within a parish under the supervision of a priest.

361. Where a church worker is alleged to have committed an offence the Professional Standards Ordinance 2006 [ANG.0173.001.0136], as replaced by the Professional Standards Ordinance 2015 [ANG.0146.001.0530], determines powers of suspension in the event of a pending resolution of an investigation, and sets out considerations to be made by the Professional Standards Committee in putting forth recommendations under this section. Provisions for suspension of church workers have been further strengthened in the Professional Standards Ordinance 2015.

362. The resolution of the General Synod Standing Committee on 16-18 October 2009 recommended the Guidelines for Dioceses Undertaking Risk Assessments relating to Sexual Abuse (October 2009) [ANG.0134.013.0001], which was implemented by the Diocese, as applied through Safer Ministry Screening and Licensing procedures.
The current situation
363. Known perpetrators of child sexual abuse will not be issued license to undertake any ministry in the Diocese.

Church members (not church workers):
364. In December 2006 the Professional Standards Commission released the resource entitled *Model Guidelines for the Pastoral Supervision and Support of Known and Suspected Sexual Abusers in Parishes* [ANG.0134.011.0001] for national use. As well as providing information about sexual abuse and some of the attendant theological issues, this resource addresses the pastoral supervision and support of known and suspected sexual abusers. It also included a template of a Memorandum of Understanding between the person of interest, the parish and the Diocese.

365. As referred to in this Diocese, the *Worshipping Agreement* [ANG.0146.001.0575] is a protocol for the involvement of a person in parishes, congregations or Church organisations in the Diocese, who has been convicted of abuse of children or other vulnerable adults by the civil/criminal courts, or ecclesiastical tribunals, or who has been charged and is awaiting a court appearance.

366. This *Worshipping Agreement* [ANG.0146.001.0575] is a contract, the conditions agreed to by the parishioner (a known or alleged offender), the parish priest and Archbishop, written in consultation with the PSD. Where a person is subject to a Worshipping Agreement, they will not be issued an Archbishop's license, nor will they be granted a leadership role within a parish. Worshipping Agreements are reviewed annually.

Q41. Identifying any other victims of known or alleged offenders.
367. The Synod encourages survivors to identify alleged offenders and identify, where possible, other survivors. The investigation processes that follow the receipt of information attempts to also identify additional offenders or survivors.

368. Survivors are encouraged to approach the Professional Standards Director themselves. In 2003, there was a significant response from callers following media publicity of the Response Line and ongoing media saturation around issues of sexual abuse in the Anglican Church.

369. During the time when Ian George was Archbishop, particularly towards the end of his episcopacy, statements were made in the media and through Synod reports, for survivors to come forward and make themselves known if they had experienced sexual abuse in the Church. Archbishop Ian, in his statement to the 2003 Annual Session of Synod, said "Please encourage, through your parishes, all victims of sexual abuse in the church to make contact on 8305 9383".
370. The Diocese actively advertised the availability of redress options, particularly, through the media releases and statements made by Archbishop Jeffrey Driver post-October 2005.

371. Following the release of the Mulligan Inquiry in March 2008, Professional Standards Director Peter Caporaso wrote to the Commissioner, The Hon EP Mulligan QC on 3 April 2008. The Professional Standards Director requested that the witnesses who reported abuse in Anglican Church institutions, were made aware of the Church complaints processes and provisions for Healing Steps assistance, which the Church had had in place in recent years.

372. Each of the religious denominations named in the Inquiry agreed to write to the Police jointly with the contact details for each Church should anyone contact them about abuse as a result of the Inquiry Report release.

373. In addition, signs were posted in all parishes, notices were printed in the monthly church newspaper, The Guardian, encouraging survivors to come forward and to report allegations of abuse. This seems to be common from the early 2000s. There is a section on the Diocesan website that assists people to make a complaint or provide information concerning sexual abuse and to seek redress.

Q42. Declaring and managing actual or perceived conflicts of interest among Church workers involved in developing policy, conducting disciplinary proceedings, providing legal advice, giving pastoral care or otherwise responding to child sexual abuse, where they have a long-standing personal or professional relationship with a known or alleged offender.

374. It is practice of Diocesan Council not to appoint people who hold leadership positions elsewhere in the Diocese to the Professional Standards Committee, and vice-versa. Further, the solicitors engaged by the synod to assist with Healing Steps, Colin Biggers and Paisley, are not engaged by the Synod on any other matter. The approach to use solicitors not engaged for any other purpose or connected to the church, appears to have commenced from 2004. Prior to this, it was common for solicitors engaged by the Synod to have multiple briefs and/or hold leadership positions elsewhere in the Diocese. The practice now, is for legal advice relating to Healing Steps to be very separate to other advice sources.

375. The Curriculum for Training of Members of Professional Standards, Committees and Boards [ANG.0181.001.0018], as approved by the General Synod Standing Committee, May 2014 (SC2014/1/28) addresses the issue of managing conflicts of interest, and has been fully adopted by the Diocese in training seminars for the PSC and PSB.

376. The Professional Standards Protocol 2006 [ANG.0173.001.0020] gives provision for the appointment of a support person and/or carer for the respondent. These persons may provide counselling, explanations of any process, assistance in providing written documents and pastoral support to the alleged offender. A support person/carer must act only for one person in respect to a particular matter and in the best interests of the person in relations to whom an appointment has been made. Furthermore, a support person must be independent of
diocesan organisations and structures and must not hold any other office established by the Church, to further manage any perceived conflicts of interest.

377. With regard to legal advice, the Professional Standards Ordinance 2015 [ANG.0146.001.0530] determines that the respondent is able to choose and appoint their own representative who, at the respondent's expense, can assist in the investigation/disciplinary process.

Professional Standards Committee
378. Although there are no provisions as set out in the Professional Standards Ordinance 2006 [ANG.0173.001.0136] or the Professional Standards Ordinance 2015 [ANG.0146.001.0530], as a matter of practice, a member of the PSC will declare a conflict of interest, and leave the meeting during discussions of a matter where a conflict of interest exists.

Professional Standards Board
379. Professional Standards Ordinance 2006 (section 42) [ANG.0173.001.0136] addressed guidelines for instances of a board member's personal interest in a matter before the Board.

380. Professional Standards Ordinance 2015 [ANG.0146.001.0530] further specifies in section 92:

(1) Where a member of the Board or the Review Board has a personal interest in a matter before it the member shall be disqualified from participating in the matter.

(2) The opinion of the presiding member of the Board or the Review Board, as the case may be, as to whether any other member of the Board or the Review Board has a personal interest in a matter shall be conclusive.

Archbishop
381. The Professional Standards Protocol 2006 [ANG.0173.001.0020] states the Archbishop cannot contact clergy if they are the respondent to a complaint, unless advised by the Professional Standards Committee/Professional Standards Director.
Information-sharing and record-keeping

Q43. Record-keeping in relation to allegations and complaints of child sexual abuse in the Diocese, parishes, para-Church youth groups, and Church institutions, including the:

a) form of the records (for example, excel database or paper-based case files)

b) nature of the information contained in the records, including what information, if any, is routinely recorded, and how consistently the information is represented across all records

c) maintenance and archiving of records.

382. Prior to the early 2000's, records concerning allegations and complaints of child sexual abuse are scarce. As far as can be determined, many of the records kept by the Archbishop(s) and other senior leaders before this time are incomplete.

383. The Professional Standards Office is not located within the Diocesan Office. It is deliberately located elsewhere in order to maintain an arms-length separation from Church administration. This separate location affords the capacity to house records and files confidentially and independently from general Church records and archives.

384. The Standing Committee by Resolution 2009/3/037 noted and resolved that the Professional Standards Directors' Network has approved and agreed to use a standardised form for recording child sexual abuse information.

385. Physical files are kept and indexed according to the respondent and complainant. These physical files are indexed, and the location of each, recorded on an excel spreadsheet. Records of respondents or known persons of concern from other Dioceses/institutions are also recorded in this workbook.

386. Electronic folders are stored on a restricted drive with access limited to nominated individuals. Folders are arranged by respondent and complainants. A working list of current cases, is stored electronically in the restricted drive.

387. The Registrar also maintains records specifically relating to redress, which has restricted access.

b) nature of the information contained in the records, including what information, if any, is routinely recorded, and how consistently the information is represented across all records

388. Part of the Church's efforts in Safer Ministry Accreditation and Responding to Complaints of Abuse is the creation and maintenance of a National Professional Standards Register of clergy and lay persons.
389. The National Register Canon, along with relevant protocols, outlines what information should be entered onto the register and who can access/amend this information.

390. In regards to clergy and lay persons, relevant information will be entered onto the register where:

- A notifiable complaint/charge has been made
- There has been a deposition from Holy Orders arising out of sexual misconduct/child abuse
- If a person has made an adverse admission/subject of adverse findings
- There has been an adverse working with children/criminal history/Safe Ministry check
- A person has not been ordained/issued with licence because of adverse risk assessment

391. The register is maintained by the General Secretary, and is accessible only by authorised persons. Usually the Professional Standards Director, who is responsible for entering information electronically on the National Register. Applications are to be submitted to General Synod to amend information on the register. Currently all clergy and lay persons applying for, or renewing, a Level 1 license are subject to a National Register Check.

392. Documentation filed in physical and electronic files, includes but is not limited to:

- All original documents gathered in the course of the investigation, including the letter of complaint, any correspondence to and from the Professional Standards Committee/Professional Standards Director, written statements presented to the PSC
- Copies of pastoral strategy – counselling invoices
- Records created by the Professional Standards Director – emails, letters and other correspondence in/out, case notes, records of telephone contact, meeting notes
- Records created by the Professional Standards Committee in the course of the investigation eg. Chronological record of activities that details meetings, phone contact etc. records of interviews.
- Signed copy of the determination.

393. The Excel workbook of current cases has a record of the complainant, respondent, counselling dates, and whether the complainant is seeking to apply for Healing Steps.

c) Maintenance and archiving of records

394. Records of allegations and complaints of child sexual abuse in the Diocese of Adelaide occur principally in the Professional Standards Office. Records would also be created by the Registrar and by the Archbishop in relation to such matters.

395. Dr Sarah Black has occupied the role of archivist since October 2014.
396. There has never, to her knowledge, been an overarching archives policy operating in the Diocese of Adelaide or with respect to any of its affiliated entities.

397. The Archives office has existed, in one form or another, since the late 1990s. The inaugural archivist, Mrs Robin Radford, saw the importance of preserving records of the various groups and activities of the Church. During her tenure, the Archives received records of para-Church youth groups, notably CEBS, and Church institutions such as the children's homes. However, the Archives Office’s principal function for many years has been to preserve records emanating from within the central parts of the Church administration - Church Office and to a lesser extent the Archbishop’s office. In recent months, the Archives Office has also begun to receive some permanent records for storage from the Professional Standards Office.

398. Parish records are cared for by parishes themselves until such time as, at the parish’s discretion, they are lodged with the State Library of South Australia. The Archives Office has never collected parish records, but has advised many parishes on management of their archives, and has taken possession of some parish archival records – for example, when parishes have closed down. Generally speaking, these records are processed in the Archives Office and as many as possible are sent to the State Library of South Australia.

399. The Archives Office’s role in relation to allegations of child sexual abuse in the Diocese has been twofold:

- to provide, to relevant parties, appropriate access to documents held by the archives;
- to provide storage for Church Office’s permanent records pertaining to such matters. Records of this nature that have been sent to the Archives are classified as confidential and kept in a locked compactus. A listing is maintained on the diocesan server.

400. All records stored by the Archives Office are hard copy.

Q44. Information-sharing about or related to instances and allegations of child sexual abuse between your Diocese and:

a) other Anglican dioceses in Australia
b) other Anglican dioceses outside of Australia
c) the General Synod
d) other faith-based institutions
e) government and non-government institutions or statutory authorities (to the extent these are not addressed in paragraph 29).

401. Records prior to 2004 do not indicate how information was shared across the Church and other churches and institutions. It is understood that the Bishops would regularly communicate with each other and share information about persons who they would not wish to see given a licence.

Anglican Diocese of Adelaide Response (V2.0 – 20 January 2016)
a) other Anglican dioceses in Australia

402. The Anglican Diocese of Adelaide shares information about instances and allegations of sexual abuse via the National Register. The National Professional Standards Register ("National Register") established under the National Register Canon (2004, repealed and replaced in 2007) commenced operation on 1 June 2009. The National Register is an aid in the management of risks arising in relation to the appointment and management of personnel to Dioceses.

403. All those seeking positions or licenses in the Diocese are subject to a National Register check.

404. From time to time, the Professional Standards Director seeks to obtain and provide information about persons of interest on a regular basis from the Professional Standards Directors Network.

b) other Anglican dioceses outside of Australia

405. Reference checks are conducted for clergy applying for positions from Diocese outside of Australia. Recently, Child Safety Officers from overseas Dioceses have shared information to this Diocese.

c) the General Synod

406. The National Register is managed and administered by the General Secretary within the General Synod Office from records provided by the Dioceses. Information on the National Register is lodged, amended and accessed as prescribed by the National Register Canon 2007 (as amended by Canon 13, 2010 and Canon 09, 2014) [ASQ.261.005.0182] and its Protocols.

d) other faith-based institutions

407. The Professional Standards Director will share information if advised that a known offender has applied to another faith-based institution. They will advice the institution of the concerns/adverse information in regards to the individual and invite staff to contact them for further details.

408. As mentioned in section (a) of this question, should the Professional Standards Director receive adverse information about a Church worker from another faith-based institution, a record is kept of the person’s name and from what institution and state the concerns stem.

e) government and non-government institutions or statutory authorities (to the extent these are not addressed in paragraph 29).

409. As above. If advised that a known offender has applied with an outside agency, the Professional Standards Director will notify the agency and offer to discuss any relevant details further.

Anglican Diocese of Adelaide Response (V2.0 – 20 January 2016)
410. According to the Children’s Protection Act 1993 (SA), Church workers are mandated notifiers and therefore must report all instances/suspicions of child abuse to the Families SA Child Abuse Report Line (Department of Education and Child Development).

411. Faithfulness in Service [ANG.0006.001.0225] outlines information sharing by Church workers:

5.13 Before you allow a person who is currently charged with or convicted of an offence against a child to participate in activities involving children, you are to:
   - Consult the Director of Professional Standards
   - Ensure that a risk assessment is undertaken; and
   - Be satisfied that no child will be at an increased risk of harm

5.14 If you know or reasonably suspect that a child is at risk of harm from child abuse, you are to report this to the appropriate civil authorities

5.15 If you know or reasonably suspect that another member of the clergy or a Church worker has abused a child, you are to report this to the appropriate civil authorities and the Director of Professional Standards

Screening and selection of personnel:

5.20 Consult the Director of Professional Standards as to whether a risk assessment is required before you appoint someone who has:
   - Been acquitted of a charge of an offence against a child;
   - Had a charge of an offence against a child not proceed;
   - Had a prohibited status under applicable child protection legislation lifted; or
   - Been the subject of Church disciplinary proceedings involving child abuse

412. The Professional Standards Director is the central contact between Diocesan institutions. Any information concerning instances or allegations of child sexual abuse, must be directed to the PSD.

413. Where a Church worker also holds a position in a school or other institution (eg. School/hospital chaplain) information for screening is shared between the Institution and the Professional Standards Director. Where there are concerns regarding a person’s suitability, the Professional Standards Director will liaise with the person’s supervisor.

414. Between the Diocese and other Church Institutions, information is shared on a need-to-know basis. Where a person of concern is subject to a Worshipping Agreement [ANG.0146.001.0575], information is shared between the person of interest, the Diocese and the parish. Where a parishioner subject to a Worshipping Agreement moves to another parish,
the Professional Standards Director will consult with the Church leaders and will arrange a new Agreement to be entered into.
Inquiries and reviews

Q46. Details of any past inquiries into instances and allegations of child sexual abuse in the Diocese, including the:
   a) reason the inquiry was established
   b) determination of the scope of the inquiry
   c) process by which those presiding over the inquiry were selected
   d) report and recommendations of the inquiry
   e) extent to which the inquiry's recommendations were implemented

415. The Anglican Diocese of Adelaide has commissioned four significant reviews investigating instances and allegations of child sexual abuse in the Diocese, protocols and procedures to support the investigation, and the outcomes of earlier reports:

- *Report of the Board of Inquiry into the handling of claims of sexual abuse and misconduct within the Anglican Diocese of Adelaide* (The Honourable Trevor Olsson and Dr Donna Chung, 26 May 2004) (known at the Board of Inquiry Report or the Olsson Report) [ANG.0044.001.0068]

- *Reporting of the Abuse of Children and Young People and Responding to Adult Sexual Assault: A study into the attitudes and behaviours of clergy and Church-workers in the Anglican Diocese of Adelaide when dealing with the abuse of children and sexual assault of adults* (Dr Zoe Morrison, 15 February 2005) (known as the ‘Morrison Report’) [ANG.0044.001.0001]


416. In addition, the Anglican Diocese of Adelaide has contributed to the:

- *Study of Reported Child Sexual Abuse in the Anglican Church.* (Professor Patrick Parkinson, Emeritus Professor Kim Oates, Ms Amanda Jayakody, May 2009, commissioned by the Anglican Church of Australia) [ANG.0050.001.0406]

- *South Australian Commission of Inquiry into Children in State Care.* (Commissioner Ted Mullighan, 31 March 2008) [ANG.0044.001.0170]

417. The Archbishop and Diocesan Council encouraged the Society of the Sacred Mission to commission an inquiry:
Summary of each Review

418. Please note that each report has a response to the original sub-questions (a), (b), (c), (d) and (e). Only the key recommendations have been provided in the table. Refer to reports for further information.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>a) reasons for the inquiry.</th>
<th>The Board of Inquiry was established when the Diocese became aware of the extent of abuse that had occurred in the Diocese, via the independent Sexual Abuse Helpline that had been set up in 2003.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>b) determination of the scope of the inquiry.</td>
<td>The scope of the inquiry was determined by a working group of Synod who consulted with victims and knowledgeable people in the field of child sexual abuse and law. The working group proposed the terms of reference for the inquiry and identified suitably qualified people to comprise the Board.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The scope of the inquiry was determined by a working group of Synod who consulted with victims and knowledgeable people in the field of child sexual abuse and law. The working group proposed the terms of reference for the inquiry and identified suitably qualified people to comprise the Board.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) process by which those presiding over the inquiry were selected.</td>
<td>The Board of Inquiry Working Party considered a number of names of persons suitable for appointment to the Board and selected two persons. Their names and respective curricula vitae were provided to Diocesan Council for confirmation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Honourable Trevor Olsson was selected because of his expertise in law, which included his experience as a Judge of the Supreme Court of South Australia, President of the Industrial Court &amp; Commission of South Australia, President of the Australian Institute of Judicial Administration, and Chairman of the Childhood Services Council.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dr Donna Chung was selected because of her experience in social work education and research in the areas of male violence against women, gender and sexuality, and social policy as a Senior Lecturer at the University of South Australia.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) report and recommendations of the inquiry</td>
<td>The Report was handed down on 26 May 2004 and made 14 recommendations. The Board specifically recommended that:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Documentation and Records Management</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
|                           | 29. Urgent attention be given to implementing administrative arrangements to ensure that proper and adequate files and records
relating to all information received concerning possible sexual abuse or misconduct by a Church worker are established and maintained in each case, including the development of requisite pro forma documentation.

### Reporting of Complaints

30. Urgent steps be taken within Church bodies to ensure that all responsible personnel understand the importance of making immediate reports of information received with regard to alleged sexual abuse by Church workers. These should be made to the Department of Family and Youth Services and/or the police without any prior intermeddling in the situation. Clear and unequivocal policy directives should be promulgated to that effect and implemented.

31. To the extent that this has not already been done, detailed protocols related to the processing of complaints against employees and disciplinary processes related to them be developed for promulgation to and implementation by all Church bodies. These should be based upon established industrial principle and best practice and steps ought to be taken to ensure that managers are conversant with them.

### Complainant Rights

32. The Church ought to take as its commencement point a charter of fundamental rights of complainants of sexual abuse akin to those recommended by the Uniting Church in Australia Commission on Women and Men, 1992. That Commission pointed out that it was important, inter alia, to respect the following rights –

1. To be taken seriously
2. To be treated with dignity, respect, sensitivity and understanding
3. To be given information
4. To retain complete control of their personal situation
5. To have privacy and confidentiality
6. To be provided with a proper standard of medical treatment
7. To seek justice through the legal system where appropriate
8. To be provided with appropriate pastoral help and support

### Composition of Professional Standards Committee

33. The current composition of the PSC be reviewed and that the Director of Professional Standards not be a member of it. An independent, part-time supervisory office of Independent Ombudsman ought to be created, with the particular responsibility for auditing the activities of the Director and the PSC in manner referred to in paragraph 254.

### Protocols

34. Protocols be put in place to mandate that:

1. Any member of the clergy, employee of a Church body or other Church worker who receives information that suggests a
real possibility that a criminal offence of the nature of sexual abuse may have been committed shall forthwith report that information to the Director of Professional Standards;

(2) Forthwith upon the receipt of such information, the Director must report it to the police and FAYS; and that

(3) The Director also will ensure that necessary steps are taken to ascertain whether there are other victims (past or present) who have been sexually abused by the same alleged perpetrator.

Resources

35. Measures be taken (including the provision of adequate resources) to ensure that the PSC is in a position to consider and report on all matters coming before it with due expedition, having regard to the need to observe the dictates of principles of natural justice and for cooperation with the police.

Licence Conditions

36. Consideration be given to the insertion into all future licences of appropriate reservations of rights of suspension and at least temporary redeployment in appropriate cases; and that, as a matter of policy, further unqualified licences be not granted.

Personnel Files

37. In future, professionally designed and maintained personnel files be established in respect of all members of the clergy and other Church workers and that these include details of reports of all ‘information’, as and when received, and the outcomes of any investigations or convictions in relation to them.

Education and Training Role of the Professional Standards Director

38. The education and training activities of the Professional Standards Director be conducted in partnership with relevant external experts to ensure best practice is promoted within the Church and that it shares with the broader community a common concern with ameliorating sexual abuse and its negative effects.

Proposals of the National Sexual Abuse Working Group

39. The following identified weaknesses of the National Sexual Abuse Working Group’s Protocols be addressed in its future implementation:

(1) A fundamental deficiency in the scheme envisaged by the draft Ordinance is a lack of transparency that, in reality, can only be provided by some independent oversight of the overall process.

(2) Whilst the draft Ordinance envisages that one member of the PSC shall be a person who is not a member of the Church, in practical terms, such a member could only have a very limited role to play in satisfying the obvious intention of the infusion of an element of independence and transparency into the process.
(3) He or she would not have any oversight of the total process. That person would be bound by committee confidentiality and become very much part and parcel of the committee itself. The role would necessarily be limited to the initial adjudication of examinable conduct and information, with a view to recommendation to a relevant Church authority or reference to the proposed Professional Standards Board pursuant to Clause 54.

Publication of Report

40. The contents of this report ought to be released into the public domain. Whilst this is essentially a matter of policy for decision by the Archbishop and the Diocesan Council, it is the recommendation of the Board that the whole of the report be so released. However, the Board recommends that the names of the various persons who are referred to by code in the body of the report be not so released, for the very reason that a code was employed in the first instance. There is no obvious requirement to release those names; to do so would be to constitute a breach of faith to many witnesses who appeared before the Board. The publishing of their names would simply add to an already great hurt occasioned to many of them.

41. All files and transcript relating to the Board of Inquiry's proceedings will be placed in sealed boxes as a permanent record of its activities and delivered to the Adelaide Church Office. It recommends that access be not permitted to this confidential material other than with the express approval of the Archbishop and Diocesan Council. Further, it is recommended that should such approval be granted, persons given access to the material ought to be required to enter into a confidentiality agreement with the Church. The Board is of the view that, if any files related to class action litigants are proposed to be accessed, then, as a matter of proper protocol, due notice of the proposal ought to be given to the solicitors for any litigants concerned. This will enable them to make such representations as they deem appropriate.

e) extent to which the inquiry recommendations were implemented

The recommendations have generally been implemented. The Lea Report (see below) consisted of a review of the implementation of the Board's recommendations.

Reporting of the Abuse of Children and Young People and Responding to Adult Sexual Assault: A study into the attitudes and behaviours of clergy and Church-workers in the Anglican Diocese of Adelaide when dealing with the abuse of children and sexual assault of adults (Morrison, 2005)
[ANG.0044.001.0001]

a) reasons for the inquiry.

The Morrison inquiry was established to provide a report on the findings of a mostly qualitative study into behaviour and attitudes of clergy. It reported in February 2005.

b) determination of the scope of the inquiry.

The scope of the Morrison Inquiry was established:
- to assess the knowledge, understanding and commitment by clergy and lay Church workers to make immediate reports of information received with regard to all alleged abuse of children or young people by Church
workers to the Department of Family and Youth Services and/or the police without any prior intermeddling in the situation, and
- to assess knowledge understanding and attitudes of clergy and Church workers in relation to the need to appropriately respond to claims of sexual assault of adults.

c) process by which those presiding over the inquiry were selected.

Dr Morrison was selected because of her expertise in the area of Sexual Assault. She was the Coordinator of the Australian Centre for the Study of Sexual Assault, and sat on the Statewide Steering Committee to Reduce Sexual Assault and the National Council for the Prevention of Violence Against Women and their Children.

d) report and recommendations of the inquiry

The report made 17 recommendations:

a) That the mandatory notification training ...be made compulsory for all active clergy and Church workers.

b) That a refresher course on mandatory notification and other aspects of child protection be provided for clergy as part of ongoing education

c) That the Diocese consider mandatory notification responsibilities of clergy when working in situations where they are dealing with victims/survivors of abuse ...

d) That the Diocese consider policy and verbatim requirements that clergy immediately report all matters of abuse, regardless of the victims/survivors intentions...

e) That the Diocese clarifies whether abuse reported within a formal confessional is reportable.

f) That the above recommendations about considering reporting legislation and requirements take into account the views of clergy and Church workers

g) That the Diocese acknowledge and apologise for the distress experienced by some clergy who attempted to report abuse in the past and were silenced, bullied and/or threatened

h) That Church workers are encouraged to report child abuse to authorities themselves

i) That all Church workers are directly sent materials about child protections education run by the Diocese

j) That clergy and Church workers are educated about the rights of and appropriate responses towards victims/survivors of sexual assault

k) That establishing education and awareness raising programmes about sexual assault for clergy and Church workers be an immediate priority for the Diocese

l) That a broad based education and awareness process is established that includes issues of bullying and harassment. That such a programme should be available for use in parishes

m) That the Diocese recognise and address violence against women within the Church as a matter of urgency...

n) That the Diocese seriously consider clergy criticisms of 'Faithfulness in Service' in relation to whether it is fully adopted

o) That the issues of independence and autonomy of the Professional Standards Committee from the Diocese and Church is resolved

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>a) reasons for the inquiry.</th>
<th>The Professional Standards Review Task Group was established by the Diocesan Council of the Synod of Adelaide in February 2005 to undertake a review of the present protocol and processes of the Director and Professional Standards Committee in light of the proposed Professional Standards Ordinance and the recommendations contained in the Board of Inquiry Report. It reported in August 2005.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>b) determination of the scope of the inquiry.</td>
<td>The scope was set so as to review the matters listed in a) above, and also to review a range of issues identified by the Professional Standards Committee relating to the implementation of the Synod's current policies and protocols.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) process by which those presiding over the inquiry were selected.</td>
<td>The composition of the Task Group was chosen so as to reflect a balance of relevant skills and experience, including legal expertise and knowledge of the Church and its processes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) report and recommendations of the inquiry</td>
<td>The Report contained 51 recommendations.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Recommendations

PART 3 – A FUNDAMENTAL ISSUE – THE REQUIRED CULTURE

1. The Task Group recommends that the Diocesan Council appoint a steering committee of five members to develop and implement a well-considered and robust cultural change strategy. The membership of this committee should comprise at least two members of clergy and two members of the laity.

2. The Task Group recommends that the first task of this committee should be to develop a set of Guiding Principles to be adopted and applied by the Church in exercising any function in relation to professional standards, and to be incorporated into all relevant professional standards documentation.

3. The Task Group further recommends that this work be undertaken in consultation with the MDC and, as part of this process, that a series of workshops then be conducted to reinforce the Church's Vision, Mission and Values and to seek to give effect to the cultural change that needs to occur in order to achieve an effective and appropriate professional standards scheme for our Church.
4. The Task Group recommends the development and implementation of rigorous selection and appointment processes for members of the clergy and Church workers that take into account the principles that underpin the professional standards of the Church.

5. The Task Group recommends that the Diocesan Council ensure that an apology is made in accordance with the recommendation of the Morrison Report.

PART 4 – PROFESSIONAL STANDARDS - STRUCTURES THAT ARE RELEVANT TO THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE PROCESSES AND PROTOCOLS

6. The Task Group recommends that the definition of ‘information’ in the Policy should be expanded to include other forms of behaviour that amount to physical, emotional or sexual abuse, bullying or abuse of a position of power or influence over another person.

7. The Task Group recommends that key terms within the Policy and Protocols should be reviewed and defined, as appropriate.

8. The Task Group recommends that the proposal that the PSC be given ‘jurisdiction’ to investigate breaches of a Code of Conduct be taken into account when such a code is being developed within the Diocese.

9. The Task Group recommends that the PSC and Church Office should work together to ensure that clear procedures are in place to assist a person if a complaint made to the PSC about a Church worker is outside the scope of the Policy.

10. The Task Group recommends as follows:

   (1) That the PSC should be constituted by 6 or 9 members (as determined by the Diocesan Council).

   (2) That the term of office for a member should be 3 years, subject to the appointment of the first members of the PSC under these new arrangements for staggered periods so that 3 retire at the end of the first year, 3 at the end of the second year, and 3 at the end of the third year.

   (3) That a member of the PSC should be eligible for reappointment but not so as to be able to serve as a member of the PSC for more than 6 years in total.

   (4) That the provisions of clause 7 of the Policy (being clause 10(2) of the Model Ordinance) as to qualifications and experience be retained.

   (5) That the Policy provide that not more than 2 members of the PSC be members of the clergy, and that a policy be adopted that gives a strong preference to appointing retired members of clergy.

   (6) That a lay member of the PSC should not hold any office within the structures of the Synod, other than at parish level (and may hold office at the General Synod level).

   (7) That the Chair of the PSC should not be a member of the clergy, or be married to a member of the clergy.
(8) That the members of the PSC should be appointed by the Diocesan Council on conditions determined by the Diocesan Council. (The Task Group confirms the current position that the Diocesan Council should nominate the person to act as the presiding member of the PSC.)

The Task Group endorses the recommendation of the Board of Inquiry Report that the PSD should not be a member of the PSC (see especially pages 83 to 86 of that report and Resolution 111 passed by Synod in June 2004).

11. The Task Group recommends as follows:

(1) That a person be subject to a formal screening process before being appointed as a member of the PSC. The screening process should also be used to ensure that a person appointed to the PSC is able to apply the principles and values of the Church, especially the Guiding Principles.

(2) That each member of the PSC be required to sign a confidentiality agreement and the Policy should adopt Clause 15 of the National Model as to the issue of confidentiality.

(3) That it be a requirement that a member of the PSC must declare any conflict of interest that may arise in a particular matter and not participate in any discussion or decision in which he or she may have an interest.

(4) That the PSC should adopt a Code of Conduct for its members.

(5) That the Policy should specifically provide that the PSC must keep minutes of its proceedings.

12. The Task Group recommends that the processes of the PSC/PSD be reviewed to ensure that all complaints within the scope of the Policy are reported to the PSC via the PSD under clearly defined arrangements, and that the PSC is then kept up-to-date on what is happening with each complaint.

13. The Task Group recommends that clause 19 of the Policy be redrafted by deleting paragraph (1) of the clause and substituting a provision that allows a delegate to sub-delegate a power or function that has been delegated to him or her if the instrument of delegation so allows.

14. The Task Group recommends that all existing delegations of the PSC be reviewed so as to ensure consistency with other relevant recommendations within this report, and to ensure that they are all workable and effective in the context of the professional standards processes of the Diocese.

15. The Task Group recommends that the attached draft Job Description for the position of Professional Standards Director be considered by the Diocesan Council.

16. The Task Group recommends that the person holding the position of PSD (1) be independent of the Church administration and structures, other than at parish level; (2) not be a member of the clergy or married to a member of the clergy; and (3) be located at a site that is...
not located within the Church Office building, or any other building used by the Church, and not be located in a place of residence.

17. The Task Group recommends that the PSC have a Post Office box that is independent of Church Office and that the PSC ensures that it maintains a reasonable degree of independence in relation to its operations under the Policy and Protocols.

18. The Task Group considers that the relationship between Church Office and the PSC/PSD needs to be further explored and resolved through a distinct process and, in this regard, recommends that a workshop involving the relevant personnel should be conducted as a matter of urgency. Furthermore, the Diocesan Council should consider a review of the resources within Church Office to ensure that staff are not being expected to bear unreasonable workloads due to professional standards activities.

19. The Task Group recommends that members of the PSC, together with the PSD, meet with members of the Reconciliation Committee as a matter of urgency to discuss any issues where their activities may ‘overlap’, and to establish a set of formal procedures to ensure greater levels of co-operation between the two committees. These procedures need to include protocols with respect to the format and content of any information that is kept in relation to each matter, and with respect to the provision and exchange of information between the two committees (insofar as may be deemed appropriate).

20. The Task Group also recommends that the members of the Reconciliation Committee, and other advisers, including legal advisers acting on behalf of the Church, be asked to apply the Guiding Principles to their activities on behalf of the Diocese.

21. The Task Group recommends that the Diocesan Council engage a person to review the data collection and recording processes associated with professional standards and to make recommendations with respect to the adoption of systems and practices of the highest quality.

22. The Task Group recommends that files remain located in a central area at all times.

23. The Task Group recommends that a series of check lists be developed to cover each step of the professional standards process so as to standardise all reporting processes.

24. The Task Group recommends that a Data Collection and Storage Policy be developed to ensure that issues of natural justice, ethics and trust are maintained in relation of information management. The policy should address issues such as the collection of information, the use of information, access, confidentiality, and the right to have inaccurate information corrected or incorrect information deleted.

25. The Task Group recommends that the Diocesan Council considers engaging a person with claims management experience to review the issue of claims management, risk and liability assessment and actuarial review. The review should also look at processes for closure of any cases that might still remain in the system.
PART 5 – PROFESSIONAL STANDARDS – PROCESSES FOR THE HANDLING AND RESOLUTION OF COMPLAINTS

26. The Task Group recommends that a plan needs to be developed for other bodies to be brought within the ambit of the Policy, and that negotiations be entered into with key Anglican bodies as a matter of priority.

27. The Task Group recommends that the Protocols should provide more detail on the options and steps that are available if contact is made, especially taking into account the steps set out in the report of the Sexual Abuse Working Group.

28. The Task Group recommends that terms and conditions to guide the Independent Helpline in its activities and to facilitate the provision of fundamental information in a coded form should be developed.

29. The Task Group recommends that all members of the clergy be required to sign documentation that they have read the Policy and Protocols and agree to abide by them. This should also be addressed through the conditions of a licence.

30. The Task Group recommends that investigators must be subjected to a rigorous selection process.

31. The Task Group recommends the adoption of an approach to complaints that incorporates the following principles.

When a complaint is made (being a matter assessed to be within the scope of the Policy), the matter should be considered to be confidential in nature unless or until:

(a) the PSC has the informed consent of the complainant to report the matter to the appropriate Church authorities (including the Archbishop); or

(b) the complaint discloses criminal conduct, or child abuse that should be reported to the appropriate State authorities; or

(c) the complainant lodges a formal complaint against a Church worker; or

(d) the PSC is satisfied that the grounds alleged in the complaint are valid.

At this time, the PSD should inform the respondent of the complaint and the relevant Church authority (being, in the case of a member of the clergy, the Archbishop). In the case of the clergy, the Archbishop should personally meet with the respondent if the allegation leads to the suspension of the respondent (in order to explain the situation and to provide an act of pastoral oversight). It is also important that the principles of natural justice be applied if a suspension is under consideration. Clause 4.7 of the Protocol should be altered accordingly.

In the case of a member of the clergy, the Archbishop should then not have contact with the respondent while the complaint is being processed through the PSC. Rather, consistent with clauses 3.12.4...
and 3.12.5 of the report of the Sexual Abuse Working Group, a separate person should be appointed to keep contact with the respondent. The Protocols should then reflect the scheme recommended by the Sexual Abuse Working Group in clause 3.12.5 of its report.

At the same time, the right of the Archbishop or other Church authority to seek some form of progress report should not be excluded. (However, it is noted that such a right needs to be exercised with due caution given that this person or body may then play a critical role in subsequent disciplinary or other proceedings. It may also be the case that the Archbishop can become involved during the processes if the PSC considers that such a course of action may assist to resolve a matter (without derogating from any of the fundamental principles underlying the scheme).)

The respondent should also be given a copy of a simple document that explains his or her position and the processes that should be followed. This document should also include a statement of the Guiding Principles.

The respondent should be asked to provide a written response to the matters that have been raised in the complaint within a time specified by the PSC (see clause 29(1) of the policy). Depending on the response (which may include a case where the respondent does not respond), consideration should then be given to the appointment of an investigator. The need to appoint an investigator may also depend on the seriousness of the matters raised in the complaint. The greater the degree of disputation, or the greater the seriousness of the relevant matters, the greater the need to appoint an investigator.

The Protocols should specifically provide that an investigator cannot be the PSD or a member of the PSC. An investigator should act in accordance with the Guiding Principles.

These processes should also recognise that a formal investigation should only occur if the PSC has determined that the subject matter of the information constitutes examinable conduct - see clause 28 of the policy (and other relevant provisions in that clause).

32. The Task Group recommends as follows:

- At the time of a complaint, a report is prepared for the Church body and the insurer that outlines the circumstances but does not include any identifying information. Codes can be used to distinguish each claim; the PSD would hold the confidential information.
- If a claim for compensation is made, then the insurer should be provided with all relevant details.
- If necessary or appropriate, a meeting involving the PSD, the Executive Officer of the Church body and the insurer (and any
relevant advisers) should then be held to determine how the
claim is to be managed from the perspective of the insurer.

- The level of involvement of the insurer would be expected to
depend on the amount of the claim and the level of any excess.

33. The Task Group recommends that the PSC should have sufficient
latitude to provide such support to a complainant as the PSC thinks fit
(subject to ensuring an appropriate level of pastoral care, financial
reporting and management), and that it be reinforced that the
 provision of support and services does not constitute an admission of
liability (but is within the nature of empathic pastoral care).

34. The Task Group recommends that the Protocols should set out
processes for resolving matters by reconciliation and mediation and
should also set out clear processes for ensuring co-ordination
between the activities of the PSC and the activities of the
‘Reconciliation Committee’ that has been established by the Diocese.

35. The Task Group recommends that the Policy and the Protocols should
recognise that the PSC may provide a report to the Archbishop or
other Church authority containing advice about the appropriate
course of action that should be taken against the respondent. The
current clauses in the Policy (clause 30) and the Protocols (clause
4.15) need to be reviewed.

A specific checklist should be developed for the use of the PSC when it
is making a report or recommendation to the Archbishop or other
Church authority. This would be provided to the Archbishop or other
Church authority and should assist in ensuring that the Archbishop or
Church authority has the confidence to deal with a matter
expeditiously.

A response from the Archbishop/Church authority to the
recommendations of the PSC must be provided to the PSC in due
course. The Protocols need to be redrafted to reflect this.

36. The Task Group recommends that an Appeals Process be included in
the Policy and Protocols.

37. The Task Group recommends that Resolution 124 of Synod in June
2004 be addressed and reported on to the Diocesan Council as a
matter of priority.

38. The Task Group recommends that Diocesan Council refers the matter
of the licensing and suspension of parish clergy to the Legal
Committee for resolution.

39. The Task Group suggests specific recommendations relating to the
Policy and Protocols (5.11)

Professional Standards Committee and Director Policy

1. Scope
   This item should make reference to the forms of conduct that
   are covered by the policy.

   This item should not refer to the various bodies currently listed
due to the fact that the PSC cannot effectively receive
complaints about a non Synod body until a Memorandum of
Understanding is in place.
2. Definition of ‘information’
   The definition should be expanded to cover other abuses of power.

3. Term of office
   Clause 5 should provide for a maximum term of office for each member of the PSC.

4. Clause 13(e)
   It should be made clear that the restriction on the disclosure of information does not prevent a relevant person from disclosing information to a member of the Church Office, to a person in relation to whom the Church has a duty of disclosure (including an insurer), or to any other person who has a proper interest in the matter, in accordance with clear and published policies.

5. Clause 17
   This clause should not apply if the complaint has been made in relation to the Archbishop.

6. Clause 19(1)
   Clause 19 should be redrafted by deleting paragraph (1) and substituting a provision that allows a person to delegate a power or function that has been delegated to him or her if the instrument of delegation so allows.

7. Clause 26
   The referral of information by a Church authority should be subject to the operation of a Memorandum of Understanding or other arrangement - otherwise, it is difficult to see how a referral can be required.

   Clause 27 needs to be included as sub clause (2) of clause 26.

8. Clause 30 (or a new clause) should make it clear as to what action or recommendations the PSC may make at the conclusion of its investigation and consideration of a complaint. The matter should not be left to the protocol (see clause 4.15 of the Interim Protocol).

   The recommendations that the PSC can make are relatively limited and consideration should be given to wider powers.

---

**The Interim Protocols**

9. Clause 1.1
   This clause is misleading. The protocol is established to support the Policy. The document in itself does not ‘establish an interim body’. The body that has been established under the Policy is the interim ‘Professional Standards Committee’.

10. Clause 2.1
   See the comments above concerning the scope of the Policy as to the conduct that should be covered and the bodies to which the policy applies.
11. **Clause 3.1**
The wording needs to be consistent with the other clauses about 'scope'. The word 'independent' should be removed.

**Clause 3.2**
The term 'sexual abuse response service' is not consistent with clause 3.1.

**Clause 3.5.2**
The 'Sexual Abuse Helpline' should not liaise between the persons and bodies mentioned in this provision. The 'Helpline' should be a place where complaints can be received. The management of a complaint should then be a matter for the PSC and the PSD.

12. **Clause 4.1**
This clause should be deleted because it is too vague (by referring to 'anyone in the Diocese...'), and because it duplicates clause 26 of the Policy.

13. **Clause 4.2**
It should be the responsibility of the Director to be the initial person to offer to appoint a support person and to arrange initial counselling. The words 'and all necessary support' should be removed as they are too vague.

14. **Clause 4.4**
The reference to the keeping of a record is redundant in view of the requirement under clause 20(k) of the Policy.

15. **Clause 4.5**
The reference to 'civic authorities' should be revised to refer to any Public Service department or body. A consequential amendment needs to be made to the last sentence of this clause.

16. **Clause 4.6**
The reference to 'Statutory Authority' should be more specific.

17. **Clause 4.7**
This clause needs to be redrafted taking into account the discussion above. The issue of the appointment of a support person should be dealt with in a separate clause.

18. **Clause 4.8**
These needs to be redrafted in view of clause 28 of the Policy and the recommendations that have been made above. The fact that the PSC is not required to appoint an investigator under the Policy should be stated at this point rather than under clause 4.14.

19. **Clause 4.9**
It would be better to express these matters as things that an investigator may do in order to avoid a challenge to the process if an investigator fails to do one of the listed items.

20. **Clause 4.15**
The taking of action should not rely on the receipt of a report.
from an investigator.

See the earlier comments in relation to clause 30 of the Policy.

The report may not necessarily be to the Archbishop if the Church worker is not a member of the clergy.

The PSC may wish to take further action after it has received a report and before it acts. Clause 4.15 appears to rule this out.

In the event that the PSC, or any other body or committee, feels that there is a need to depart from the Protocols, approval should be sought in advance from the Archbishop, and unless the matter is confidential, the Diocesan Council should be advised in due course. Any request to depart from Protocols should be accompanied by a detailed explanation.

Guidelines for Enabling Facilitation and Settlement of Claims

It is recommended that these guidelines are incorporated into the Policy and Protocol documents, and that the following specific comments are taken into account:

21. Clause 2
   The definitions should be consistent with the Policy and protocol

22. Clause 3
   The passage ‘or in association with an activity coordinated for or on behalf of the Diocese of Adelaide’ does not reflect the fact that the Church worker may have worked for another Church body.

23. Clause 9.6 and clause 11
   The issue about the extent to which the PSC can act to settle a matter, including a claim, needs to be resolved.

40. The Task Group recommends that the Diocesan Council appoint a Drafting Task Group comprising three members to incorporate the Guiding Principles, and any relevant recommendations contained in this report that are adopted by the Diocesan Council, into the Professional Standards Policy and Protocols. The aim should be to make the processes as clear and as open as possible, while keeping the documentation as simple as possible.

41. The Task Group recommends that Healing Steps be reviewed by the Drafting Task Group in light of the concerns that have been raised and the other work that must be undertaken in relation to other relevant documentation and policies.

42. The Task Group recommends that the Drafting Task Group take into account any relevant issue raised within the Church with respect to the Model Ordinance as part of its work. Consultation should occur with the Professional Standards Commission if the Diocese is proposing a significant change from the national model.

43. The Task Group recommends that the Drafting Task Group, as part of its work, consult with the Legal Committee in order to ensure that a comprehensive legislative scheme with respect to professional standards is established within the Diocese.

44. The Task Group recommends as follows:
<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1) That a Professional Standard Audit and Review Committee be established as a permanent committee of the Diocesan Council.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(2) That the Audit and Review Committee should be constituted by three members [who may, but need not be, members of the Diocesan Council].</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(3) That the functions of the Audit and Review Committee include:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• To conduct an annual audit of the procedures and processes of the PSC/PSD.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• To provide a mechanism where complaints concerning professional standards procedures and processes can be received and considered [without reviewing the merits of any decision of the PSC/PSD, the Archbishop or any other relevant Church authority].</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• To review the annual report of the PSC on behalf of the Diocesan Council.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• To provide a point of reconciliation between the PSC and any other body with respect to the operation of the professional standards procedures and policies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45.</td>
<td>The Task Group recommends that both the PSC and the PSD undertake a self-assessment process (recommended by the Audit and Review Committee) on an annual basis, and that these assessments be reviewed as part of the annual audit of the PSC/PSD procedures by the Audit and Review Committee.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46.</td>
<td>The Task Group recommends that a mechanism be established so that the PSC is able to obtain independent legal advice as it considers necessary, subject to the establishment of an appropriate budget.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PART 6 – EDUCATION AND TRAINING**

47. The Task Group recommends that the PSD have input into all education and training relating to professional standards matters within the Diocese, but that the PSD does not have a direct role in providing education and training.

48. The Task Group recommends that the Diocesan Council explores the possibility of education and training issues being included within any Memorandum of Understanding between the Church and other Church bodies.

49. The Task Group recommends that the MDC be asked to develop and implement an education programme on the re-drafted Professional Standards Policies and Protocols. The education programme should include education on resulting changes to systems, processes, procedures and other elements.

**PART 7 – IMPLEMENTATION AND REVIEW**

50. The Task Group recommends that the Diocesan Council appoint small enacting committees with membership drawn from the Diocesan Council (or such other persons as Diocesan Council thinks fit) to
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>e) extent to which the inquiry recommendations were implemented</th>
<th>These have generally been implemented</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

51. The Task Group recommends that the professional standards area be reviewed again in 2008. Such a review should include an assessment of the need to appoint an Independent Ombudsman.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The Lea Report (Lea, 2014)</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>a) reasons for the inquiry.</strong></td>
<td>The Report of the Board of inquiry was a seminal document that influenced much of the policies and procedures concerning safer ministry in the Anglican Diocese of Adelaide. The Synod invited Mr Alastair Lea to undertake a review of the Report of the Board of Inquiry to determine the extent to which Synod had responded to the Report. The review was primarily an audit of the Report of the Board of Inquiry recommendations that examined to what extent Synod had responded to the report. The Lea Report [ANG.0173.001.0085] identified areas where additional action was required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>b) determination of the scope of the inquiry.</strong></td>
<td>The scope of the inquiry was, in part, to ensure that the recommendations of the Board of Inquiry had been implemented.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>c) process by which those presiding over the inquiry were selected.</strong></td>
<td>Mr Alastair Lea was invited to conduct the review. He was selected because of his significant knowledge of the subject matter of the proposed review, as a former Chair of the Professional Standards Review Task Group and as a former member of the Professional Standards Committee.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **d) report and recommendations of the inquiry** | Overall the Lea Report concluded that the greater majority of the Board of Inquiry’s report had been actioned and relevant policies and procedures established within the Diocese. There were two key areas recommended by the Report of the Board of Inquiry that Synod had either not responded to, or had not responded to an extent necessary enough to appropriately address the matter. These areas were:  
- Accreditation of staff in parishes and the Synod  
- Accreditation of Church Workers  
- Establishment of a Professional Standards Ombudsman.  

The Report concluded that there was a need to review and amend the Accreditation and Training requirements for Church Workers and others. It also resolved that the recommendations contained in the review be conveyed to the Professional Standards Ordinance Review Committee. |
| **e) extent to which the inquiry recommendations were implemented** | The Accreditation and Training Requirements were implemented during 2014 and the Professional Standards Ordinance 2015 has addressed many of the other recommendations of the review. While the establishment of a Professional Standards Ombudsman was deemed to have merit, the review ascertained that it was not relevant in the context of an operating and functioning Professional Standards infrastructure in the Diocese. The capacity for reviews, regular reporting and the arm’s length nature of the Professional Standards process afforded a high degree of confidence and impartiality in the system. Experience had also shown that non-church 'independent' reviews of professional standards findings had usually resulted in excessive delays and a general lack of understanding of the content and problems of the subject matter. |
Q47. Details of any reviews of, or legal challenges to, your Diocese’s professional framework or processes

419. The Anglican Diocese of Adelaide has commissioned or participated in these reviews and/or legal challenges of the professional framework or standards:

Reviews of the professional framework or processes

- *A Comparison of Diocesan Protocols on Sexual Misconduct* (Judi Long, Research Officer, General Synod of the Anglican Church of Australia, 10 December 1998) [ANG.9310.01001.0008]


- *Healing Steps Review.* (Professional Standards Committee, May 2008) [ANG.0181.001.0053]


Legal challenges of the professional framework or processes

- Challenge to the Constitutionality of the Diocese’s Professional Standards Framework – Harrington & Ors v Coote & Anor (2013) [ANG.0178.001.0040]

Summary of the reviews/legal challenges


420. The Long Report [ANG.9310.01001.0008] was instigated by the Anglican Church of Australia following a request from the Bishop’s Conference in April 1998. It was agreed that each Diocesan Bishop would send:

- Its appropriate protocols in relation to sexual misconduct
- Any Canons or Ordinances of the Diocese which relate to such matters, and
- Also clergy codes of conduct, if available.

421. The Anglican Diocese of Adelaide provided:

- *Policy and Procedure for Dealing with Allegations Against the Anglican Clergy of Sexually Abusive Behaviour*
• Guidelines for Dealing with Allegations Against Members of the Anglican Laiety of Sexually Abusive Behaviour (draft)
• The Clergy Discipline Ordinance 1983 [ANG.0173.001.0158]

422. The General Secretary, through the Research Officer, examined common practices, distinctive elements, and made recommendations with regard to protocols relating to sexual misconduct.

423. Diocesan Council established a Task Group to examine and report on the Professional Standards Policy (adopted by the Diocesan Council in November 2003 and revised in June 2004), governing the Professional Standards Committee and Director, together with the complementary Protocols and Practices, in response to the recommendations of the Board of Inquiry report, the proposed [at that time] National Professional Standards Ordinance, and representations made by the interim Professional Standards Committee. Diocesan Council considered the need to examine and perhaps alter where appropriate, the existing Policy, Protocols and Practices based on the experience and lessons learned since 2003. These were to be considered in light of the resolutions of Synod adopted in June 2004, following receipt of the Report of the Board of Inquiry. The recommendations from this report are detailed in [ANG.9610.01001.0211].

424. The Professional Standards Committee reviewed the Healing Steps booklet in 2008 [ANG.0181.001.0053] and made a number of recommendations to Diocesan Council. The booklet was developed prior to the adoption of the Professional Standards Ordinance 2006 [ANG.0173.001.0136] and the Professional Standards Protocol 2006 [ANG.0173.001.0020], and it was appropriate to update the contents to reflect current practice. The review recommended updates to: the booklet and website; activating an investigation; replacing the confidentiality section with 'confirming the agreement'; clarified Healing Steps as an alternative to pursuing a civil claim; and other minor changes to text. In addition, it was proposed that Diocesan Council consider broadening the definition of 'misconduct'. Diocesan Council received the report and undertook to ensure that the Healing Steps information was updated (9 December 2009).

Lea Report (2014)
425. As a result of the Royal Commission into Institutional Responses to Sexual Abuse, the Anglican Diocese of Adelaide initiated a review of the policies and procedures that relate to the care and protection of children and the vulnerable in the Diocese. The seminal Report of the Board of Inquiry by The Honourable Trevor Olsson and Dr Donna Chung influenced much of the policies and procedures concerning Safer Ministry in the Diocese. The Archbishop Dr Jeffrey Driver invited Mr Alastair Lea, former Chair of the Review of Professional Standards Ordinances and Protocols Committee 2005 and member of the Professional Standards Committee 2006-2012, to undertake a review of the Report of the Board of Inquiry to determine, in part, the extent to which the Diocese responded to the Report.
426. Mr Lea, the Archbishop, Diocesan Registrar and Professional Standards Director examined the Report of the Board of Inquiry recommendations and the extent of the Diocesan response. It was determined that there were two key areas where the Report had identified that an action be taken and where the Diocese either had not responded or had not responded to an extent necessary enough to appropriately address the matter. The areas are:

- Accreditation of staff in parishes and the Synod
- Accreditation of Church Workers
- Establishment of a Professional Standards Ombudsman

Accreditation of staff in parishes and the Synod

427. Not all employees, either Synod employees or those working in a Parish, were being accredited. As a result, it was recommended that Level 2 Accreditation and Training be compulsory for all employees of the Synod and in parishes, with the exception of the Registrar & Secretary of Synod, Deputy Registrar, and Professional Standards Director and, as appropriate, staff engaged in Safer Ministry, licensing and professional standards areas who would undertake Level 1 Accreditation and Training.

Accreditation of Church Workers

428. It was found that while wardens, treasurers, secretaries, parish council members and lay members of Synod were expected to undertake Level 2 Accreditation and Training it needed to be more rigorously enforced. Many of the Synod’s committees and formal governance bodies did not require accreditation or training. It was recommended that all members of these governance bodies undertake Level 2 Accreditation & Training:

- Diocesan Council
- Diocesan Administration & Resources Executive
- Cathedral Chapter
- Professional Standards Committee and Professional Standards Panel
- Anglican Funds South Australia
- St Barnabas Theological College
- Trusts of the See; and
- Other formal committees and bodies established by Diocesan Council or by Ordinance that have governance responsibilities connected to the Synod.

Establishment of a Professional Standards Ombudsman

429. It was determined that while the establishment of an Professional Standards Ombudsman had merit, it was not relevant in the context of an operating and functioning Professional Standards infrastructure in the Diocese. The capacity for reviews, regular reporting and the arm’s length nature of the Professional Standards process afforded a high degree of confidence and impartiality in the system. Experience had shown that when non-Church ‘independent’ reviews of professional standards findings had occurred there were usually
excessive delays and a general lack of understanding of the content and problems of the subject matter.

430. **Challenge to the Constitutionality of the Diocese’s Professional Standards Framework – Harrington & Ors v Coote & Anor (2013) [ANG.0178.001.0040]**

In 2012, a member of Clergy from the Diocese of The Murray brought proceedings by way of counterclaim, in the Full Court of the Supreme Court of South Australia to challenge the validity of the Diocese of The Murray’s Professional Standards Ordinance 2007, that Ordinance being, in all material respects, identical to that of the Adelaide Synod’s Professional Standards Ordinance of 2006. The basis of the challenge was an alleged inconsistency between the Diocese of The Murray’s Professional Standards Ordinance 2007 and Chapter IX of the Constitution of the Anglican Church of Australia [ANG.0160.001.0620], which provided for matters of Clergy discipline to be regulated by Diocesan Tribunals. It was claimed that to the extent that the Professional Standards Ordinance 2007 sought to deal with matters of Clergy discipline, it was invalid, the National Constitution covering the field in relation to this subject matter. The Full Court of the Supreme Court of South Australia rejected that argument and upheld the validity of the Professional Standards Ordinance 2007. Central to the Full Court’s decision was the finding that Diocesan Tribunals, as constituted under the National Constitution, dealt with matters of ‘discipline’, whereas the Professional Standards Ordinance 2007 (and by implication, other Professional Standards Ordinances across the Australian Dioceses) dealt with the question of fitness to exercise ministry, the former looking specifically at past conduct and the latter examining the fitness of Clergy, and other Church workers, moving forward. The decision in Harrington v Coote, which is reported in the South Australian State Reports as Harrington v Coote (2013) 119 SASR 152, was a significant decision in affirming the Anglican Church’s Professional Standards regime across Australia.
Research into prevalence of child sexual abuse

Q48. Your processes and procedures, if any, in relation to recording statistical data on child sexual abuse in your Diocese

431. The Professional Standards Office records information on cases of child sexual abuse with intake sheets for each case. The Professional Standards Office also manages a file index for all Professional Standards matters, including cases of child sexual abuse.

432. The Diocese has contributed to various studies and inquiries into child sexual abuse, including the Study of Reported Child Sexual Abuse in the Anglican Church, conducted by Professor Patrick Parkinson, Emeritus Professor Kim Oates and Ms Amanda Jayakody, as commissioned by the Anglican Church of Australia, May 2009 [ANG.0050.001.0406]. For this study, and others alike, information is manually collated, and data supplied is de-identified before being disseminated.

433. The Registrar of the Diocese collates data regarding redress in a Summary of Claims Excel spreadsheet. This information is recorded purely for the purpose of responding to survivors, and is not aggregated for any other particular purpose.

Q49. Your involvement in any research or study on sexual offending against children in your Diocese, and the results of any such research

434. The documents below demonstrate the involvement of the Diocese of Adelaide in recognising and responding to sexual offending against children in the Diocese. In order to sufficiently address the issue of sexual offending against children, the Diocese of Adelaide has been involved in research and study of historical sexual offending, the ways in which claims have been handled and recommendations for handling such claims in the future. This also involves the implementation of policies and procedures.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Research/Study</th>
<th>Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>May 2003</td>
<td>The decision to establish the Board of Inquiry was made by Synod of the Diocese of Adelaide in May 2003. The movement was carried unanimously on 29 May 2003, that:</td>
<td>Results of the BOI were delivered through the report produced 26 May 2004.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• There should be a two-person Board of Inquiry</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• A Synod working group comprising the Rev’d Don Owens, the Rev’d Andrew King,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mr John Harley, Mrs Helen Carrig and Mrs Dianne Bradley should consult with victims</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>and knowledgeable people in the fields of child sexual abuse and law and promptly propose to the Archbishop and Diocesan Council:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Research/Study</td>
<td>Results</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| May 2004  | **Report of the Board of Inquiry into the handling of claims of sexual abuse and misconduct within the Anglican Diocese of Adelaide** (The Honourable Trevor Olsson and Dr Donna Chung, 26 May 2004) (known as the 'Board of Inquiry Report' or the 'Olsson Report'). [ANG.0044.001.0068] | - Sexual abuse within the Diocese of Adelaide is not new, however, there was limited knowledge about child sexual abuse and not much was known amongst parishes and Church organisations until recent times and this prevented abuse from being identified and an appropriate response implemented.  
- A professed lack of knowledge about child sexual abuse [in the 1990's] cannot be accepted in light of then prevailing community knowledge.  
- No formal structure in place for dealing with claims of sexual abuse.  
- A serious complaint against a priest in 1992, plus a subsequent complaint resulted in a number of initiatives to improve Diocese response to complaints of sexual abuse.  
- The effectiveness of the Diocese’s responses to complaints of sexual abuse did not significantly improve until the latter half of 2003 when the Professional Standards Committee was established. Prior to that time, the Diocese handled complaints of sexual abuse in a cumbersome and inefficient manner.  

**Recommendations**  
- Urgent attention needed to be given to documentation and records management in relation to all information received concerning possible sexual abuse or misconduct, including the development of pro forma documentation. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Research/Study</th>
<th>Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| March 2005 | Reporting of the Abuse of Children and Young People and Responding to Adult Sexual Assault: A study into the attitudes and behaviours of clergy and Church-workers in the Anglican Diocese of Adelaide when dealing with the abuse of children and sexual assault of adults (Dr Zoe Morrison, 15 February 2005) [known as the 'Morrison Report']) [ANG.0044.001.0001] | - Urgent steps to be taken to ensure all responsible personnel understand importance of immediate reports of information received with regard to alleged sexual abuse by Church workers. Clear policy directives should be implemented.  
- Detailed protocols related to the processing of complaints against employees and disciplinary processes should be developed and implemented.  
- Review the composition of the Professional Standards Committee and appoint an independent supervisory office of Independent Ombudsman with particular responsibility for auditing activities of the Director and PSC.  
- Consider the insertion into all future licences, appropriate reservations of rights of suspension and at least temporary redeployment in appropriate cases and further unqualified licences not be granted.  
- Professionally maintained personnel files be established of all clergy and other Church workers. These to include details of reports of all information as and when received and the outcomes of any investigations or convictions in relation to them.  
- Education and training activities of the Professional Standards Director be conducted in partnership with relevant external experts to ensure best practice and shares a common concern with ameliorating sexual abuse and its negative effects.  
- Recommends that the Diocese clarifies whether abuse reported within a formal confession is reportable.  
- Concerns that mandatory reporting training or refresher training is not compulsory for clergy.  
- The Interim Protocol requires that 'a member of the Clergy and a Church authority in the Diocese should as soon as possible refer any information [on examinable conduct] in his her or its possession or knowledge to the Director [Professional Standards Office]' |
### Date Research/Study Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Research/Study</th>
<th>Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| February 2014 | Responses by the Diocese of Adelaide to Recommendations of the Report of the Board of Inquiry (Mr Alastair Lea, February 2014) (known as the 'Lea Report') [ANG.0173.001.0085]. | The Report examined the Report of the Board of inquiry recommendations and the extent of the Diocesan response. There were two key areas where the Report had identified that an action needed to be taken and where the Diocese either had not responded or had not responded to an extent necessary enough to appropriately address the matter. The areas are:  
- Accreditation of staff in parishes and the Synod  
- Accreditation of Church Workers  
- Establishment of a Professional Standards Ombudsman  

The Lea Report, initiated by the Diocese of Adelaide as a result of the Royal Commission into Institutional Responses to Sexual Abuse, is a review of the policies and procedures that relate to the care and protection of children and the vulnerable in the Diocese. |

In addition, the Anglican Diocese of Adelaide has contributed to:

| May 2009     | Study of Reported Child Sexual Abuse in the Anglican Church. (Professor Patrick Parkinson, Emeritus Professor Kim Oates, Ms Amanda Jayakody, May 2009, commissioned by the Anglican Church of Australia) [ANG.0050.001.0406] | The aims of this research study were to:  
- Understand the characteristics of accused persons and complainants and the circumstances of the offence.  
- Ascertain patterns of abuse in relation to similarities or differences in gender and age of the child complainants.  
- Inform the Church on what steps could be taken towards better prevention of sexual abuse within Church communities.  

**Key findings:**  
- Unlike the patterns of abuse in the general population, three quarters of complainants were male and most were between the ages of 10 to 15 at the time of abuse.  
- Most accused persons were either clergy or were involved in some form of voluntary or paid youth work.  
- There were 27 accused persons with more than 1 allegation in the sample. These 27 people accounted for 43% of all cases.  
- Ongoing abuse lasting 3 years or more was significantly more common amongst male complainants.  
- Most of the alleged abuse episodes occurred in the accused person's home or on Church premises. Almost a |
quarter of the episodes of abuse of girls occurred in the girl’s own home, compared with 7% of male cases.

- There were long delays in reporting offences to the Church by the complainants, with an average delay of 23 years.
- Just over half of the cases were treated as substantiated by the Church and a third as inconclusive, with erroneous allegations by child complainants being rare.

(Extract from Executive Summary, pp 4-5)
Challenges and reform

Q50. Any dialogue you have sought or engaged in with government for changes to civil or criminal law affecting professional standards matters

435. In 2009, the Archbishop The Most Rev'd Dr Jeffrey Driver met with the South Australian Attorney-General, The Hon Michael Atkinson MP, to discuss the South Australian Government's response to claims for compensation from victims of abuse when they were children in State Care.

436. In response to this discussion, the Archbishop was informed of Cabinet's endorsement of a new approach for dealing with these claims to ensure a compassionate but appropriate Government response. Please refer to 'Correspondence from South Australian Attorney-General, The Hon Michael Atkinson MP to Archbishop Jeffrey Driver, regarding the Claims of Victims of Abuse in State Care (dated 22 October 2009).' [ANG.0146.001.0579]

437. The Government would:

- improve management of claims from alleged victims of abuse in State care by combining a compassionate approach to litigation with an alternative option of applying for ex gratia payments under the Victims of Crime Act 2001 (the Act).
- direct $7 million in additional resources to administer this approach to claims.
- take an especially compassionate approach to this litigation in the hope that claims can be dealt with quickly and appropriately, rather than treat these common law claims in the same way as other litigation, and include a sympathetic approach to applications by victims for extension of time where the State would not suffer insurmountable prejudice as a result.
- allow claimants who, through no fault of their own are unable to bring a claim in court (including those who are statute barred), to apply for an ex gratia payment under the Act. The Act gives the Attorney-General discretion to authorise ex gratia payments up to $50,000 to eligible claimants, if it will help a victim of crime to recover from the effects of crime or advance their interests in other ways. The amounts awarded will depend on the level of serious and lasting harm suffered as a result of the abuse.

438. The Attorney-General advised that, rather than a dedicated compensation scheme, the Government believed a two-pronged approach of compassionate litigation or an ex gratia payment from the Victims of Crime Fund to be the most appropriate method for dealing with claims of victims of abuse in State care in South Australia.

439. In addition to monetary compensation, the Government had:

- Offered a Government and Church apology to victim-survivors of sexual abuse in State care on 17 June 2008 (Joint State and Church Apology [ANG.9610.01001.0120]). The Archbishop was a signatory to this apology.
• Responded to all the Commission’s recommendations in June 2008.
• Allocated an additional $2.24 million in funding to the Office of the Director of Public Prosecutions to prosecute alleged perpetrators of child sexual abuse, coming out of the Children in State Care Commission of Inquiry
• Established Post Care Services to provide information, advocacy, referral and support to adults previously under the Guardianship of the Minister, secure orders or in institutional care in Children’s homes or orphanages.

440. The Attorney-General agreed with the Archbishop that the Premier desired a genuinely healing outcome for survivors and took the horror of abuse of victims very seriously. He stated that the Government had been careful in its deliberation on how to respond.

441. The Archbishop was advised that:

• He or claimants who approached the Anglican Diocese of Adelaide could contact the Commission for Victims' Rights for South Australia for more information about applying for an ex gratia payment under the Victims of Crime Act 2001.
• Victims who decided to pursue a claim for compensation, either through litigation or by an application for an ex gratia payment would have their cases handled confidentially, expeditiously and with sensitivity.

Q51. Your understanding of any historical or current challenges facing your Diocese in relation to any of the above matters

442. The Diocese of Adelaide was amongst the earliest in the Anglican Church of Australia to face massive public scrutiny around issues of abuse. The disclosure of the extent of abuse by Robert Brandenburg, along with other cases at the time, along with the subsequent resignation of Archbishop Ian George, profoundly affected the diocesan community.

Secondary Effects

443. Without in any way detracting from the tragic personal trauma that those who are abused inevitably experience, I came increasingly to understand the effects on the diocesan community as the secondary effects of abuse. In some cases, there have been multiple instances of abuse within the one parish community and the effects of that experience have continued for years. The grooming of the community through the time of abuse ensures that when the abuse is disclosed, the associated trauma, grief and even guilt is profound. Within these communities, individual leaders, clergy and lay, have not uncommonly suffered severe and disabling stress.

444. The effects of disclosures extended to clergy morale and well-being, the capacity to retain staffing, and the levels of stress among key leaders. Even the administrative systems of the Diocese suffered as people struggled to deal with a crisis they felt ill equipped to handle.
445. While maintaining its appropriate primary focus on the immediate victims of abuse, recognition by the Royal Commission of the profound secondary effects of abuse on communities and often dedicated leaders, might make a contribution to healing and closure for them.

Cultural Change
446. In the time preceding my installation in October 2005, I recognise that the Diocese of Adelaide put into place some very important measures to address both its pastoral response to critical incidents as well as the broader culture that may have previously impeded a response being made in a timely manner. The underlying cultural issues were well addressed by the 2004 Report, *For the Sake of the Gospel: A review of the Professional Standards Policy, Protocols and Practices of the Diocese of Adelaide.* (Diocesan Task Group, August 2005) [known as ‘For the Sake of the Gospel’] [ANG.9610.01001.0211]. It speaks about an ‘old’ culture that endorsed ‘a defensive and somewhat adversarial approach’. After the events of 2004, the Diocese consciously shifted towards what I would describe as a ‘survivor focused’ approach to critical incidents. This approach was strongly endorsed by the Synods of 2004 and 2005 and underpinned our dealing with something like 60 redress claims in 2005 and 2006. Cultural shift in an organisation as long-standing and complex as the Church is inevitably gradual and multi-facetted. My sense is that further reflection in this area would greatly assist further endeavours to ensure the best environment of child protection within the Church.

447. Early in my episcopate, I made it clear that an appropriate response to the survivors of abuse was a matter of the Gospel of Christ, and could not be regarded as a ‘secondary’ matter for the Church. In the first Synod after my installation (May 2006), I pledged that I would do all I could to ensure that claims from the survivors of abuse were dealt with appropriately and in a timely manner. In the early years of my episcopate in Adelaide much of my time was spent in this area; working with diocesan leadership to provide redress in a pastorally caring way to survivors of abuse and instituting *Healing Steps* to deliver redress, implementing policies and procedures to minimise the risk of the occurrence of abuse, and seeking to deal with the loss of public trust in the church around the public disclosures of abuse.

Continuous Improvement and Fatigue
448. Dealing with these challenges has included an unqualified acknowledgement of the betrayal of trust by some clergy and church workers, and a determination, by action, to make the church a safe place for all. It has involved a significant process of listening and learning. In those first years in Adelaide, I was aware that in some of the matters we were dealing with there was little experience elsewhere in the Anglican Church of Australia to draw upon. Some of the survivors of abuse have taught me much and I also deliberately sought out others with expertise in the field of abuse and trauma. As a Diocese we have continued to review our processes to ensure that we continue to listen and learn. However, in this I have also been aware of a certain ‘professional standards fatigue’, with the amount of process change,
educational requirements, and associated reporting producing a level of weariness and sometimes resentment within a largely voluntary constituency. This has had to be closely monitored.

**Ongoing Concerns About Insurance**

449. As it seeks to make a timely and pastoral response to the survivors of abuse, one of the ongoing concerns felt within the Diocese of Adelaide is the place of insurance. The capacity to seek some relief for survivors through insurance was complicated by the collapse of one of Australia’s major insurance companies (HIH), which was the Diocesan insurer.

450. In any event, however, it was also clear that the approach of insurance companies was that if there was a probability of liability then it would, nevertheless, be defended; if there was little possibility of establishing liability, then it would be denied. It is of the nature of sexual abuse that liability is difficult to establish. Recognising this, and recognising that the vast majority of complaints in this area have substance (even when proving that is difficult), the Synod of the Diocese of Adelaide chose to take a pastoral approach that emphasised a timely response and allowed for the provision of financial assistance. In terms of insurance claims, this significantly disadvantaged the Diocese, in moving ahead of the processes expected by insurers.

451. In recent conversations with insurers, the Diocese of Adelaide has raised the possibility of making payments up to an agreed limit without prejudicing possible insurance claims. It may be that the Royal Commission might wish to pursue these possibilities more widely, perhaps via a Royal Commission round table with insurers on the subject. In the end, it is in the interests of all involved if a timely response can be made to the survivors of abuse that does not prejudice insurance cover.

452. Another area of learning and reflection within the Diocese of Adelaide has been around the secondary effects of abuse. Without in any way detracting from the tragic personal trauma that those who are abused inevitably experience, the Diocese has had cause to reflect upon the secondary effects of abuse on communities where the abuse is perpetrated (sometimes after careful and skillful grooming). In some cases there have been multiple instances of abuse within the one parish community and the effects of that experience have continued for years. The grooming of the community through the time of abuse ensures that when the abuse is disclosed, the associated trauma, grief and even guilt is profound. Within these communities, individual leaders, clergy and lay, have not uncommonly suffered severe and disabling stress. As I have now come to understand, after the extensive revelations of abuse associated with Robert Brandenburg, that when I came to the Diocese of Adelaide, it was to a community suffering many of the effects of secondary trauma. This extended to clergy morale and well-being, the capacity to retain staffing, and the levels of stress among key leaders. Even the administrative systems of the Diocese suffered as people struggled to deal with a crisis they felt ill equipped to handle.
453. While maintaining its appropriate primary focus on the immediate victims of abuse, recognition by the Royal Commission of the profound secondary effects of abuse on communities and often dedicated leaders, might make a contribution to healing and closure for them.