



acceptance of abusive behaviour⁷. Significant attention has been given to ensuring that structures and arrangements are in place that discourage or prevent the challenge and reporting of such behaviours by any person at Ampleforth, whether a school pupil, monk, employee, volunteer or visiting adult or child.

As noted earlier in the report, our review took place following a significant amount of strategic change in relation to safeguarding at Ampleforth, substantially due to the work of the Interim Manager, the trustees of Ampleforth Abbey Trust and St Laurence Education Trust, and Ampleforth's Director of Governance. This change was confirmed during a meeting between representatives of the NCSC and CSAS, with the Interim Manager, the Prior Administrator, a trustee, the Director of Governance and the Safeguarding Coordinator during July 2019.

The quality assurance exercise undertaken by CSAS has not reviewed the training provided to monks at Ampleforth, but it will be necessary for the newly appointed Safeguarding Coordinator to review what has been provided and arrange for the national training modules to be delivered, or appropriate refresher training if the national modules have been delivered. Equally, tailored training for the religious which is to be developed by the NCSC/CSAS in co-operation with the Conference of Religious' Safeguarding Committee will, in due course, supplement the training provision available to Ampleforth and will assist in addressing the cultural issues that have arisen in the safeguarding context.

It is reassuring that cases about whom there are concerns have been reviewed by statutory partners and professional challenge has been given. However, it is concerning that the recommendations by statutory partners to commission risk assessments and review Safeguarding Plans have not yet been fully implemented. At a meeting with statutory partners in June 2018, it was highlighted that there was known risk information which was not included in Safeguarding Plans. I understand from the Ampleforth Safeguarding Coordinator that this related to one case where the subject had given different information to people which was not known by the Safeguarding Office and could not therefore have been used to inform the Safeguarding Plan. A review of all Safeguarding Plans must be a priority, informed by assessment of individuals in their current circumstances.

The scrutiny of case files by statutory authorities and then by CSAS, revealed that Safeguarding Plans had not been reviewed in a timely way and that management of individuals was not always effective, resulting in refusals to comply with restrictions and in breaches of plans. The responsibility for arranging reviews of Safeguarding Plans rested with the previous Safeguarding Coordinator. There is little in the way of sanctions being applied to those that do not comply with the restrictions that are applied to protect people and consideration must be given to whether dispensation from vows or laicisation should be applied for in specific cases (and as already identified in case specific recommendations above). The trustees must give consideration to the sanctions that they can apply, in addition to any canonical penalties to be applied.

It is anticipated that the recent appointment of a Safeguarding Coordinator and the role of Director of Safeguarding with oversight of safeguarding in the school, monastery and across the rest of the site will provide the needed capacity to fulfil the range of recommendations arising from the scrutiny by the

⁷ p. iv, para 1, IICSA, Ampleforth and Downside (English Benedictine Congregation) Investigation Report August 2018