

**CONFIDENTIAL**

**Notes from meeting with Sheryl Kent, Diocesan Safeguarding Adviser, London re: [AN-A4]**

**Present:** Ian Elliott/Jane Dodds

1. The case started when Andrew Evans - local vicar - wrote to +Paul in July 2014. +Paul sent letter to Sheryl - she acknowledged that she was available for support to [AN-A4]. He shared this with Sheryl in London. +Paul met with [AN-A4] - Sheryl did not receive much feedback from +Paul, apart from that [AN-A4] wanted to do some digging. Initial meeting with +Paul was good and positive, but no response meant that [AN-A4] was unhappy
2. Contact between Sheryl and [AN-A4] started in January 2015. [AN-A4] has told Sheryl she has been the person with her hand in the small of his back which has allowed him to carry on.
3. Sheryl described the situation as being difficult as +Paul was leading, but +Paul was busy and so [AN-A4]'s questions were not answered. +Paul should have handed it over entirely. He did not have the time to do it. When Sheryl had contact with [AN-A4], she recommended MACSAS, NAPA, etc., to him, as she does to all survivors. It is likely that [AN-A4] made a settlement claim through that route.
4. When the insurance company, EIG, became involved in March 2014, they informed everyone involved in the case that they were not to have contact with [AN-A4], and were not to comment to him. Sheryl argued and stated that it was not acceptable. Sheryl has a regret about this - she could have challenged but she did not. She wished she had pushed more. Sheryl contacted the National Church - emailed Jill Sandham about the EIG position - Acknowledged but no action.
5. Sheryl recalled that Paula Jefferson from the legal company, BLM, came to Sheryl's office to review the files for [AN-F15] - Paula said to Sheryl that she felt Sheryl wanted a settlement for [AN-A4]. Sheryl described that there was a feeling that [AN-A4] was being silenced about the settlement
6. Sheryl is very sympathetic to [AN-A4] about the fact that people state they have forgotten that he talked with them about the abuse; most sympathetic with [AN-A4] concerning the + Truro - he was a personal friend and the fact that +Truro has forgotten is very hard. [AN-A4]'s belief is that there was a conspiracy against him. Everyone below a bishop remembers his abuse, all those above, no one at bishop level not.
7. Ian wondered if investigations had taken place with regards to the perpetrators' history - were there any other victims. Sheryl commented that she had heard informally that people said about [AN-F15] "We knew not to send young men to him"
8. Sheryl believes there has not been an apology letter to [AN-A4], but there has been a letter apologising for the delay in dealing with his issues.

9. In relation to [AN-A4] there has been a referral to the police in relation to the headteacher - No discussion with the LADO. [AN-A4] believes that [AN-F15] knew the headteacher. There is one - [AN-F14] - where it is not clear what action has been taken. Sheryl will review this.
10. Bishop of London: says the right things, has no interaction. Line manager is Director of HR - Sheryl meets with her, who reports in to the Bishop. Sheryl went to National Church as escalating an issue. Acknowledgement but not clear of action
11. In summary, the Report will go to Independent Bishop (Bishop Sarah), then to [AN-A4] Bishop of London, National Safeguarding Team. [AN-A4] will probably put it in the public domain.
12. In relation to filing, file is under perpetrators name - referenced in that way. Survivors are under perpetrator. Only the Diocesan safeguarding team can access the files, which are secured under secure electronic files - access is via It system and permissions.
13. People can access their records through Subject Access Requests, and there are Blue files - confidential information within them concerning clergy. For [AN-A4] apology from + Paul, weekly counselling funded to end of review.

Jane Dodds  
(notes)  
V.1 - 03.12.15