

Case Review

Jeremy Dowling

A Case Review concerning Jeremy Dowling, his selection and employment within the Diocese of Truro with particular regard to safeguarding issues and lessons to be learnt.

PUBLISHED: 25.5.18
AUTHOR: Dr Andy Thompson



DIOCESE OF TRURO
DISCOVERING GOD'S KINGDOM
GROWING THE CHURCH

"We recognise that many institutions fail catastrophically, but the Church is meant to hold itself to a far, far higher standard and we have failed terribly"

Archbishop of Canterbury, February 2017

"The General Medical Council was an organisation designed to look after doctors, not patients."

Dame Janet Smith, 5th Shipman Enquiry, December 2004.

"I come to the first of my three main points: the features of the culture of the BBC which enabled Savile and Stuart Hall to hide for decades - and for which I must criticise the BBC. There was a culture of not complaining or of raising concerns. BBC staff felt - and were sometimes told - that it was not in their best interests to pursue a complaint. Loyalty to and pride in a programme could hinder the sharing of concerns; there was a reluctance to rock the boat.

"The management structure of the BBC was not only hierarchical but deeply deferential. Staff were reluctant to speak out to their managers because they felt it was not their place to do so. Also there was a culture of separation, competition and even hostility between different parts of the BBC so that concerns arising in one part would not be discussed with another.

"If these cultural factors had not existed, there would have been a real chance of Savile and Stuart Hall being discovered. I do recognise that many of these factors were common in the British workplace and some still are. But these are all matters which the BBC must now address.

"Most important of all, in the 1970s, 80s and 90s, child protection was very low on the BBC's radar. In this, the BBC was far from alone. At that time, our society did not recognise the prevalence of sexual abuse of children; complaints were disbelieved and therefore rarely made. We were not sufficiently shocked by the signs of older men being sexually involved with teenage girls and we were unaware of the damage which such unequal relations could cause. Sexual harassment was not taken seriously.

Dame Janet Smith, BBC Savile Enquiry, February 2016

Contents

Page 4. Introduction

Page 5. Executive summary

Page 6. Methodology

Page 7. Findings: historical child abuse allegations, involvement with the diocese, and employment

Page 16. Findings: current practice development

Page 18. Conclusions

Page 20. Recommendations

Page 21. References and acknowledgements

Page 22. Appendix 1: chronology

Page 23. Appendix 2: comments in relation to the draft review

Page 24. Appendix 3: response by the diocese to the recommendations in the Case Review

Introduction

In June 2015 Jeremy Dowling pleaded guilty at Truro Crown Court to a number of charges of indecent assault of boys over the period 1959-1971. He was sentenced to seven years' custody.

In September 2016 Jeremy Dowling was found guilty, at Truro Crown Court, of indecent assault of one boy over the period 1973-1977. He was sentenced to eight years' custody to be served consecutively with his previous conviction.

In addition, the Crown Prosecution Service has 'left on file' matters concerning 'the possession of pornographic images of children on a computer' as it was not in the public interest to pursue those matters at that time.

Jeremy Dowling was, during these periods, closely involved with his local church, St Michael's Bude, as a server, and the Diocese of Truro as a potential candidate for ordination, member of the Diocesan Synod and the Mission on Cornwall Committee.

From the mid 1970s he extended his involvement with the Diocese of Truro and the national Anglican Church by becoming a member of the Board of Mission and Unity, a Reader, a member of General Synod and its committees, an examining chaplain for the Bishop of Truro, part-time Diocese Communications Officer and then finally, being appointed full time, as Diocesan Communications Officer and Bishop's Research Officer in 2003. From mid 1970 until the 1990s he was considered as a candidate for ordination.

In October 2016 this Case Review was commissioned by the Safeguarding Committee of the Diocese of Truro to consider:

Jeremy Dowling, his selection and employment within Truro Diocese with particular regard to safeguarding issues and lessons to be learnt.

Executive Summary

- There have been historic failings in the diocese in dealing with the allegations of child abuse made against Jeremy Dowling. There is correspondence between the Canon A, Chair of Governors of the school for boys where Jeremy Dowling worked, and Bishop Maurice Key (1); and between Priest B and Bishop Peter Mumford (2) which clearly describes and raises the allegations. Both sets of correspondence refer to the police and Director of Public Prosecutions' (DPP's), involvement in the issue. No action or investigation was undertaken independently by the diocese at any time.
- There was an unacceptable reliance within the diocese on, and probable misunderstanding of, the decision by the DPP not to proceed with a prosecution.
- There was ongoing knowledge of the situation amongst senior figures in the diocese well into the 1980s as there are recorded references to 'a good fat file' (3) and 'a skeleton in the cupboard' (4).
- During interview Bishop Michael Ball stated that when he arrived, in 1990, he was told by his secretary about the allegations and that there was 'a file full of stuff'. He also stated that as the police had taken no further action he 'saw no need to'.
- In line with national policy and requirements the diocese has engaged with developing child protection and safeguarding activities. This began in associated professions in the 1980s, and elsewhere in our society in the early 1990s following the enactment of the Children Act 1989. This has progressed and developed through the decades to the current situation overseen by a Safeguarding Committee/Safeguarding Advisory Panel which has significant external membership.
- Current processes are robust and well thought-out but need continual monitoring and promotion. Senior post-holders in the diocese understand their roles and responsibilities and know how to respond to any allegation of abuse they receive.

Methodology

To undertake this Case Review the reviewer had full access to records held by the diocese concerning Jeremy Dowling. These had already been drawn together for the police investigation. Other documents including the development of child protection and safeguarding were produced on demand. Minutes of governors' meetings and the school register were provided. From this desk-based research and analysis, further enquiries were undertaken.

Face-to-face interviews were held with:

A former vicar of St Michael's Church, Bude - 'Priest A'
Mr Martin Follett, former Diocesan Registrar
Mrs Sheri Sturgess, former Diocesan Secretary
A former Child Protection Officer and Youth Officer
Bishop Bill Ind
Bishop Michael Ball
Mrs Sarah Acraman, Diocesan Safeguarding Officer
Revd Jem Thorold, former Bishop's Chaplain

Telephone interviews were held with:

A former secretary to the Bishops of Truro
A former head teacher of the boys' school
Bishop Tim Thornton
DC Grant Mills, Devon and Cornwall Constabulary
Bishop Richard Llewellyn

The outgoing chair of the Safeguarding Committee, Ms Jane Sloan, made herself available to provide information, signposts to documents and discussion.

External mentoring, support and moderation was provided by Ms Nicola Bunney.

Historical and current legal information was provided by barristers Mr Charles Chruszcz QC and Mr Leighton Hughes.

Findings: historical child abuse allegations, involvement with the diocese and employment.

At a special meeting of the board of governors of the school held on 14th September 1972, allegations of improper behaviour with boys by Jeremy Dowling were discussed and minuted:

The Chairman apologised for the short notice give of the meeting which in the circumstances was unavoidable.

He reported that Mr. Jeremy Dowling had tendered his resignation from the staff after Mr. [REDACTED] (in the presence of Mr. [REDACTED]) had mentioned to him that certain allegations of improper behaviour had been made to him by parents of senior boys.

Mr. Dowling most emphatically denied that anything of a criminal nature had taken place but agreed that his conduct with the boys was not beyond reproach. He tendered his resignation on the ground that he was disillusioned with teaching and had been considering resigning over the past two years or so.

The background to the allegations was discussed.

The parents of the boys concerned were contemplating reporting the matter to the police, and the question then arose as to whether the Governors should do so. The pros and cons of so doing were discussed and in particular the extent of the ensuing investigation and the possible effect at the school during the term on the boys. Mr. [REDACTED] sought the advice of the Police during the discussion.

On 19th September 1972 the Chair of the Board of Governors, Canon A, wrote to Bishop Maurice Key about the allegations. In that letter he states:

"I ought to let you know that Mr Jeremy Dowling, a Master for sixteen years, has terminated his association with the school.

"During the holidays certain parents have alleged that they intend to prosecute him for offences against their boys.

"Some of these he has admitted + took the step of offering to resign his post. The H. Master + Governors accepted this + hope that his removal from the staff (+ the district) might satisfy the parents. They insist, however, on prosecuting, + a police enquiry will begin.

"This sordid episode is unfortunate as we had now begun to set our books in order + plans for expansion laid.

"It is also unfortunate since Jeremy has had close associations with St Michael's, Bude which must, of course, make difficulties there, as well as on Diocesan Synod + Mission on Cornwall Committee of which he is a member."

On 26th September 1972 Bishop Maurice Key replied and stated:

"My Dear [REDACTED]

"Thank you very much for writing. I am sure it is quite proper for you to inform me, and I am grateful to you for sharing the problem with me. It is terribly sad that this should have happened, not only because it is a tragedy for Jeremy Dowling, but it can be a real blow for the School and the Church. Jeremy as you know, was at one time an Ordinand. The devil is certainly a master at attacking where he can do most harm.

"I am very sorry you have had this worry, and we shall certainly be remembering you.

"Yours very sincerely"

The Bishop of Truro knew at that time, in September 1972, that Jeremy Dowling, who was a member of Diocesan Synod and held other roles in the Anglican Church in the diocese was under investigation by the police for 'offences against their boys'.

No action was taken by the diocese.

On 16th December 1972 Canon A wrote to Bishop Maurice Key:

“My Lord Bishop

“You will be glad to hear that it has been decided that there is no case to answer in the J.N.Dowling affair.

“What repercussions will follow I do not know.

“One can only hope + pray that it may quickly be allowed to drop.

“Faithfully yours”

On 20th December 1972 Bishop Maurice Key replied to Canon A:

“My Dear [REDACTED]

“Thank you for giving me the latest news of Dowling. I suppose the problem will now be to find him some other work.

“Do keep me in touch

“Yours very sincerely”

It was at this point an error of judgement by the diocese was made. No investigation into the allegations against Jeremy Dowling was undertaken based, it would seem, on being told there was no case to answer.

The chair and the Board of Governors of the school had a better understanding of the situation as the minutes of their meeting of 19th December 1972 show:

Mr. [REDACTED] reported that he had been telephoned by the police on Thursday 14th December and was told that the Director of Public Prosecutions had decided that no proceedings would be brought against Mr. J.N. Dowling as there was insufficient corroborative evidence to support the allegations.

It was pointed out that although no proceedings were to be taken by the police it did not mean that there was no truth in the allegations, it was just that the Director of Public Prosecutions did not consider there was sufficient evidence to secure a conviction.

The background to Mr. Dowling's resignation was discussed and in particular his demeanour when confronted with the allegations by Mr. [REDACTED] immediately before he resigned.

Mr. [REDACTED] was quite satisfied that he had ample justification for dismissing Mr. Dowling, bearing in mind other allegations which had been made and also other information and various incidents of which he had knowledge.

Mr. Dowling was given 24 hours to think the matter over and either offer his resignation or be dismissed. He decided to offer his resignation then and there.

In 1972 the level of corroborative evidence to bring a successful prosecution of sexual abuse against a child was extremely high. As such very few cases, such as this, were progressed to trial by the DPP.

This changed when the requirement of corroboration evidence for sexual offences was removed in February 3rd 1995, when section 32 of the Criminal Justice and Public Order Act 1994 came into force.

However, this did not take away the responsibility of the Diocese of Truro to undertake its own investigation into the allegations and take appropriate action at the time.

No institution or organisation should have relied on a police criminal investigation to make judgements on the conduct of those it employs or engages with. It has its own responsibilities to judge such behaviour. These judgements are not tied to the criminal standard but to the civil standard i.e. 'are events more likely than not to have happened' or 'on the balance of probabilities'.

Knowledge of the allegations still existed amongst the senior clergy of the diocese in 1985, as a letter from the Dean of Truro, to the Venerable G Temple spoke of:

“ a skeleton in the cupboard which he (JD) discussed with me in confidence: my own assessment is that the bones thereof are not likely to experience a resurrection, although I gather that they occasionally rattle in the parochial background.” (4)

The letter was discussing the possibility of Jeremy Dowling progressing towards ordination.

More significantly, shortly afterwards, Priest B, replying to a request for his opinion of Jeremy Dowling, was clear and candid in describing to Bishop Peter Mumford the nature of the allegations from 1972 (2).

This letter is clear in putting allegations of sexual abuse of young boys before the Bishop of Truro by a clergyman with direct knowledge of the incidents.

Re. Mr. J.N. Dowling

It is about two years ago that you asked my opinion of Jeremy Dowling, as you found him an enigma and felt something was not right about him. I recollect saying that I neither liked nor trusted him in any way. The fiasco over making an appointment to the St. Gennys and Jacobstow Group has brought me to echoing Margaret Thatcher's saying of "Enough is enough!"

The time has now come to be a lot more explicit about Mr. Dowling, whom a number of us, both Clergy and Layfolk, hold to be unfit for holding any office in the Church. This is a serious accusation indeed and one that has to be justified. In doing this it seems reasonable to set out the points in order.

Past behaviour

You may know that some 20 years ago Jeremy Dowling was employed as a teacher at [REDACTED] School in [REDACTED]. He was responsible mostly for teaching English, of which his command is very good although he has no qualifications, either in the subject or indeed as a teacher.

Whilst there his sadistic behaviour ensured that the young boys would do anything for him rather than offend him in any way. This included sexual practices which although accepted as part of boarding school life does not include masters participating, let alone instigating. In the end this resulted in his dismissal and a police file being sent to the Director of Public Prosecutions, who was unable to bring proceedings because a number of parents did not want the attendant publicity. Needless to say a number of young lives have been adversely affected.

Once more nothing was done.

In his reply to Priest B on 18th December 1986, of which only one page remains in the diocesan archives, Bishop Peter Mumford states:

"I am grateful for your long and careful letter of 4th December which nevertheless gives me some distress. Whatever may have been Jeremy's 'past' or his 'playing God' in the present he is a remarkable person who has strong leadership and pastoral gifts combined with a very real commitment to the Gospel and Christian Ministry of one sort or another."

These are not the words of someone about to begin an investigation into the allegations of sexual abuse of children by someone who is by this time Examining Chaplain for the Bishop and part-time Communications Officer for the diocese. This lack of personal attention to the issue is confirmed in later correspondence.

Less than one year later on 5th October 1987 Bishop Peter Mumford wrote to the then Director of Ordinands concerning Jeremy Dowling's possible ordination:

“There is a good fat file about Jeremy in my office, and you may have some stuff about him yourself. There is no need to read it all, and I have myself deliberately refrained from reading up the complicated story of what is alleged to have happened some years ago when he was a schoolmaster. + Richard has done so, and is quite satisfied that whatever happened was, at worst, a kind of indiscretion, and is much best forgotten, even though, unhappily, one or two people like George Temple himself, still have hesitations about Jeremy.”

It would seem at least the records of events were reviewed during this time by Bishop Richard Lewellin, the Bishop of St Germans, but a conclusion that the matter “is much best forgotten” completely abdicates responsibility and was a missed opportunity.

When interviewed Bishop Richard Llewelin stated he had no recollection of the files or ever reading them, but cannot deny it may have happened. He has no knowledge of any allegations of child abuse against Jeremy Dowling dating from the 1970s. He proffered the view that at that time if the police or DPP thought there was no case to answer then there was no case to answer and no need for any further investigation*.

This is very difficult to balance with the criminal case heard at the Crown Court in Truro in July 2015. After a safeguarding review by the diocese and referral to the police, during sentencing, Judge Cottle said Dowling:

“... had taken advantage of his position and committed serious sexual abuse at the top end of seriousness.”

“In 1972 there was some sort of police investigation which went nowhere, and so you got away with what you did and now it has caught up with you.”

* See Appendix 3 for Bishop Llewelin's subsequent thoughts.

By 1990 Bishop Michael Ball had been installed. When interviewed by the reviewer he stated that he had been informed of the allegations and the police not taking further action. As such he saw no need to himself. Neither did he view the file of information on Jeremy Dowling that he had been referred to by his secretary.

This was the last acknowledged reference to the allegations about Jeremy Dowling. Bishop Bill Ind (1997-2008) stated during interview with the reviewer that he had no knowledge of the allegations and had never seen a file about the allegations in his office. This was even though he recalls an audit of the files being undertaken under the direction of the Diocesan Registrar, Martin Follett.

In 1986 Jeremy Dowling became the part-time Diocesan Communications Officer for which he was paid an honorarium. Bishops Richard Llewelin, Michael Ball and Bill Ind speak highly of his work.

He was at that time a member of General Synod, Lay Chair of Truro Diocesan Synod, Home Committee of General Synod and served on most of the diocesan boards and committees.

He continued to serve as a Reader but ceased his association with St Genny's in 1987. By 2004 he was still serving as a Reader but there was uncertainty as to his status and activity as he was not attached to a parish and had limited contact with the Warden of Readers. He continued in this manner until 2013.

Human Resources files began to be developed in the diocesan office from approximately 2000 onwards and these did include Jeremy Dowling. He was eventually appointed to the full-time post of Diocesan Communications Officer and Bishop's Research Officer in 2003 working to a well structured contract. He was line-managed by Bishop Bill Ind who had a close working relationship with him. There appear to be no records of appraisals or reviews or references for the new post or for his former, part-time position. He retired from these positions in 2009.

A file, which was located in an unusual place, was eventually discovered at Lis Escop (the bishop's residence and office) in 2013 during an audit of files by the Bishop's Advisor on Safeguarding. This and other evidence was passed to the police and formed a significant part of their case that led to a prosecution in 2015

Findings: current practice development

Following the enactment of the 1989 Children Act the Anglican Church and the Diocese of Truro began to develop policies and processes to ensure child protection and eventually broader safeguarding. Bishop Michael Ball commented that nothing existed when he arrived in 1990.

By 1993 the Child Protection Committee and Child Protection Working Group had been instituted in the Diocese of Truro. A part-time youth officer was employed in 1993 and with the committee developed the first Child Protection Policy in 1995. This has been reviewed and developed since in 1997, 1999, 2002, 2006, 2009, and 2010. These are well structured and formulated in line with the House of Bishops' guidelines.

In addition, training and awareness programmes were developed and implemented. Initially this was for clergy only but was soon extended to the wider church community of churchwardens, PCCs, youth leaders etc. By 1995/1996 all PCCs were obliged to nominate a 'Person Responsible for Child Protection'. A review of PCC minutes showed this was happening. The training was not always well received, particularly by the clergy, which perhaps reflects the lack of understanding of safeguarding even in the mid-1990s.

By 1998 structures to deal with allegations were in place. These had been developed by the Child Protection Working Group and included trained 'advisors' who received allegations and who then followed a clearly-defined reporting system including external agencies and the bishop. These systems are the foundations of the current practice. The process had been tested in dealing with real allegations in 1998. There was by then a specific role of Bishop's Advisor on Child Protection/Safeguarding.

The part-time Child Protection Officer was continually trained and updated, attending national and regional conferences in addition to networking events with other denominations. Her feeling was at the time Child Protection was well supported by the diocese and Bishop Bill Ind.

The diocese has been fully compliant with Criminal Records Bureau procedures from their inception in 2002. Jeremy Dowling was checked in 2005 and 2012 due to his role as a Reader. The CRB document states: "On the basis of the information contained there is nothing to hinder his continuing to be licensed as a Reader in the Diocese."

This sadly is not a surprise as there are no computer or written police records of the investigation, that took place in 1972, concerning the allegations against Jeremy Dowling whilst he was a master at the school.

Currently the safeguarding in the diocese is overseen by the Safeguarding Committee/Safeguarding Advisory Panel. Staff members operating from Church House are a Diocesan Safeguarding Officer and a Safeguarding Administrator. The Safeguarding Officer advises the bishop on the safety of vulnerable people in the diocese and organises the training of the church community. The training follows the requirements of the National Safeguarding Training Framework which has been in place in its current version since 2016. This has training suitable for all levels of personnel associated with the Anglican Church. Audits are undertaken of the efficacy of training and Parish and central safeguarding activities.

Clear information and signposts are available, by telephone, online and in printed form, for those wishing to raise an issue or make a complaint or allegation. Signposts known within parishes are currently being measured but levels of the knowledge of these signposts is as yet unknown.

An allegation may trigger a response that initiates a Serious Safeguarding Situation. This can be characterised by: Inform, Suspend, Investigate. The bishop and external bodies are informed. Appropriate action is taken to remove any further risk, and the incident(s) investigated. The bishop becomes separated from any investigation. Currently, unlike in 1972, the clergy have a published code of conduct, The Guidelines for Professional Conduct of Clergy, against which their conduct can be measured. Support for victims is via the parish priest and/or Authorised Listener Service. Support for alleged perpetrators is available in parishes through joint working with statutory agencies. All of this follows the national policy document, Responding to Serious Safeguarding Situations.

All safeguarding records are kept and are open to independent scrutiny when required. Records are overseen by members of the Safeguarding Committee/ Safeguarding Advisory Panel. There is a will in the diocese to be transparent about its activities.

The National Safeguarding Team of the Church of England has commissioned an independent audit of safeguarding processes in each

diocese. This is the precursor of a regular external audit system to help ensure standards.

Senior postholders are clear what action is required in the event of an allegation of abuse being reported to them.

It is worthy to note that Devon and Cornwall Constabulary are highly complimentary of the way the safeguarding team acted in respect of the Jeremy Dowling case. “They were brilliant,” and “unlocked the investigation”.

Conclusions

There is no doubt that there were a number of missed opportunities for the Diocese of Truro to undertake its own investigations into the allegations, made in 1972, against Jeremy Dowling. The allegations were of child abuse of boys at the school whilst he was associated with St Michael's Church Bude, a member of Diocesan Synod and the Mission Cornwall Committee.

The reviewer concludes that in 1972 Bishop Maurice Key placed too much reliance on the information from the chairman of the school governors that "there is no case to answer" following the decision of the DPP not to proceed. The diocese did not explore or analyse this further, nor did they seek to interview Jeremy Dowling themselves concerning the matter. The Incumbent at St Michael's Church was given no guidance by the diocese as to how to act. The information he received from the school gave him the idea it was a false allegation, so he welcomed Jeremy Dowling back into his roles at the church.

In 1986 Bishop Peter Mumford was informed/reminded of the allegations in the letter from Priest B. His reply to Priest B appears to discount past activities and focuses on his perceptions of Jeremy Dowling's current value to the church. The diocese did not investigate the allegations of child abuse of boys at the school.

In 1990 Bishop Michael Ball was informed by his secretary of the allegations and that the police took no further action. He therefore saw no reason to take any action or initiate a diocesan investigation into the allegations of child abuse of boys at the school.

The Diocese of Truro did not understand the difference between criminal and civil standards of law, nor the requirements of corroborative evidence. Legal advice could have been sought.

Jeremy Dowling's roles as Reader and part-time Communications Officer working from home were poorly monitored in the 1970s, 1980s and 1990s. This allowed him to create an air of independence that made challenge difficult.

There was poor practice in terms of management review and appraisal during the 1970s, 1980s and 1990s. This in itself does not contribute to the lack of action in initiating any investigations into allegations of child abuse but would have made any investigations difficult to evidence and authenticate.

Child protection and subsequent safeguarding processes were methodically introduced by the diocese from the early 1990s. This went in step with national timescales and practice. The diocese understood its responsibilities and created structures that were fit for purpose. Staff were well trained. Training of clergy and lay members of the diocese was undertaken. There was some resistance to this that reflected society's views at the time.

Current practice and processes in the diocese are sound. They are well understood by senior figures in the diocese and openly discussed. Internal and external audit is undertaken.

Safeguarding literature is not always available in church buildings.

Whilst undertaking this review and in discussion both inside and outside the diocese, the reviewer has come across views of 'historic acceptance'. These views acknowledge that inappropriate sexual behaviour took place in the 1970s, 1980s and 1990s but that it was 'what happened' and was accepted. These views should be challenged as anyone in the church community, i.e. as a PCC member, may be faced with a safeguarding issue and must have a clear, open mind in order to deal with it correctly.

Recommendations

1. Safeguarding training and development must continue for all members of the diocese. Its scope may need to be widened.
2. Promotion of safeguarding must continue and the effectiveness measured. This will address any gap in understanding between Lis Escop, Church House, the parishes and the community.
3. Audits of safeguarding processes and cases need to be maintained and measured against national standards.
4. To facilitate this the safeguarding function should be expanded as a model for other dioceses.
5. The diocese should produce a set of regulations/code of conduct for all its lay members based on The Guidelines for Professional Conduct of Clergy.
6. The diocese needs to look backwards with caution and prepare for further litigation concerning behaviours that were not acceptable in the 1970s, 1980s or 1990s. In doing so this may educate, develop and help the church community to challenge these past behaviours and some currently held views.

“We recognise that many institutions fail catastrophically, but the Church is meant to hold itself to a far, far higher standard and we have failed terribly.”

Archbishop of Canterbury, February 2017

References (held in Lis Escop Archive)

1. Letters between Canon A and Bishop Maurice Key: 19/9/72, 26/9/72, 16/12/72, and 20/12/72.
2. Letters between Priest B and Bishop Peter Mumford: 4/12/86 and 18/12/86
3. Letter from Bishop Peter Mumford to former Director of Ordinands: 5/10/87
4. Letter from the Dean of Truro to Ven G. Temple: 25/2/85

Acknowledgements

May I thank all those who have given me information, understanding and support.

Dr Andy Thompson

Appendix 1: Chronology

1938	Born – Brought up in Bucks and educated at Claymore public school
1952	Father died
1956	Mother died
1957	Left school. Started teaching at school. Lived on school premises
1958-9	French and English teacher
1959-66	Assistant Master
1959-68	Lived at [REDACTED] with the [REDACTED] family
1966	Senior Master
1967	ACCM conference, initially not recommended because he could not start for 3 years
1968	Decision to allow him to undertake part-time training which was started
25/7/69	Married
1971	Bishop Key agreed that he should not be ordained at this point – the problem was whether he should be full-time or part-time to continue teaching which he wished to do
1971	By this time he was a member of Diocesan Synod and Mission and closely associated with St. Michael's Bude
19/8/72	Resigned from school as a result of allegations which he partially admitted. Bought a small farm and became increasingly involved in life of Diocese
1973	Bishop Leonard asked him to take over the overseas work of the Board of Mission and Unity
1975	Reader attached to St Michael's Bude
1977	Member of General Synod
1979	Reader attached to St Genny's Church
1983	Part time work as researcher and then presenter for ITV S.W. Interviewer and commentator
1985	Examining chaplain for Bishop Of Truro
1986	Part time Diocese Communication Officer – Paid Honorarium £1,000
1987	Incumbent appointed to St. Genny's, after 6 months withdraws as unable to work together.
10/87	Offers himself for ordination. By this time he is still a member of General Synod, Lay chair of Truro Diocesan Synod; Home Committee of General Synod and serves on most of Diocesan Boards and Committees. Did not proceed with ordination
2003	Appointed full time Diocesan Communication Officer and Bishop's Research Officer
2004	Uncertainty as to his status as a Reader – not attached to a Parish but with widespread permission
7/2008	Retirement postponed for a year
31/12/09	Retired as Communication Officer
11/2012	No longer undertaking duties as Reader
	Subsequently retired as Reader.

Appendix 2: comments in relation to the draft review

The following comments were received when the draft report was circulated to all those who had contributed.

Priest A: “... I am left feeling that a lot of people were badly let down by what I would describe as a very active ‘old boys’ network’ whose sole concern was to brush it all under the carpet and carry on as if nothing serious had happened. I feel too in some way responsible for what happened, but can only say that I was deliberately kept ‘out of the loop’ and influenced, as we all were, by the prevailing attitudes at the time.”

Bishop Richard Llewelin: “... I am aware that our capacity for self-delusion is enormous, and I would not be being honest with you if I did not say that, perhaps, at the time I was aware of more than I now remember, and decided - as an errant creature of the culture of the time - that if the police had decided that there was no case to answer, then indeed there was no case to answer, and that was the end of the matter. If I failed in my duty to the victims of Jeremy’s abuse, to the Church of England and indeed to Jeremy himself, then I humbly apologise.”

As a result of these further thoughts, **Bishop Llewelin** would have liked the paragraph recording his views in the report to have read: “When interviewed Bishop Richard Llewelin stated that he had no recollection of the files or ever having read them but realises it was a long time ago and wishes to accept that he might have done, particularly as this is stated in a letter written in October 1987 by Bishop Peter Mumford. He knows that Jeremy Dowling resigned from the school where he had a problem but saw no reason at the time to enquire further.”

Former Diocesan Protection Officer: “... it correctly states that in the 1990s our training was not always well received particularly by the clergy. This is true but I would add that by the very early 2000 that attitudes had changed and everyone much better understood the need for child protection/safeguarding and the training was well received.”

Former Director of Ordinands: “... I see from my diary I met Jeremy for lunch in 1987. The bishop’s views of Jeremy’s past were based on files to which I did not have access; I had no good reason at the time to doubt his judgement, though now his failure to give weight to Priest B’s letter on that file is difficult to understand.”

Appendix 3: response by the diocese to the recommendations in the Serious Case Review

The recommendations should be viewed in the terms of Jeremy Dowling's selection and employment with the diocese. This covered a period of more than 40 years.

In addition, the report was completed in draft form some months ago and considerable progress has since been made.

1. Safeguarding training and development must continue for all members of the diocese. Its scope may need to be widened.

The diocese has adopted the national training programme. Since adoption in 2015 and expansion in 2017, safeguarding training has been provided for all ordained and lay members of the diocese, whether employed or volunteer. It has been extended to include members of our congregations. It also includes training in Safer Recruitment. While uptake has been good, there are still some gaps and an improved system to monitor this is being planned at the moment to ensure the highest possible adherence.

2. Promotion of safeguarding must continue and the effectiveness measured. This will address any gap in the understanding between Lis Escop, Church House, the parishes and the community

Lis Escop staff and the diocesan safeguarding team have started working together to build joint support processes and improved statistical collection. As part of this, the membership of the audit group has been added to in order to ensure that training is comprehensive, coordinated across the whole church community, and regularly monitored for quality. The Safeguarding Advisory Panel is also looking towards ways of improving the effectiveness of current systems through cooperation with partner statutory agencies. This will be addressed further in the bishop's conferences on safeguarding planned for the summer and based on discussion about the recent SCIE audit.

3. Audits of safeguarding processes and cases need to be maintained and measured against standards.

The Safeguarding Advisory Panel was in total agreement with this recommendation.

4. To facilitate this the safeguarding function should be expanded as a model for other dioceses.

The Safeguarding Advisory Panel noted that “we all learn from good practice”. The South West Forum for Diocesan Safeguarding Advisors meets to exchange ideas and examples of good practice, as does the South West Forum for chairs of safeguarding panels. The Safeguarding Advisory Panel supports the widest possible trawl of best practice, wherever it is available.

5. The diocese should produce a set of regulations/code of conduct for all its lay members based on The Guidelines for Professional Conduct of Clergy.

While it is believed that the nature of being fully part of the church family entails the promotion of values and good conduct, it was agreed that it would be useful to produce an A4 sheet summarising national advice which could be made available to parishes, to assist PCCs in members’ duty of respect to each other.

6. The diocese needs to look backward with caution and prepare for further litigation concerning behaviours that were not acceptable in the 1970s, 1980s, or 1990s. In doing so this may educate, develop and help the church community to challenge these past behaviours and some currently held views.

Panel members agreed with this recommendation and that we need to continue to look very critically at ourselves, acknowledging and challenging behaviour both in the present and in the past that is unacceptable.

In this process it is important to continue to listen to the voices of survivors and ensure that there is a safe place where they can be heard.

The Safeguarding Advisory Panel members also noted that they wished to add to the recommendations to the Bishop's Diocesan Council a further matter:

That consideration should be given by the diocese to the availability of a "safe place" for those who have been subject to abuse.