



REPORT
OF AN INDEPENDENT INQUIRY INTO
INSTITUTIONAL RACISM
WITHIN THE STRUCTURES
OF THE DIOCESE OF
SOUTHWARK

MARCH 2000

CONTENTS

| | |
|---|-----------|
| Foreword, by Sir Herman Ouseley | 5 |
| 1. Introduction | 7 |
| 2. The inquiry | 9 |
| 2.1 The panel | 9 |
| 2.2 Terms of reference | 9 |
| 2.3 Methodology | 9 |
| 3. The Diocese of Southwark | 11 |
| 4. The findings | 13 |
| 4.1 Institutional racism | 13 |
| 4.2 Minority ethnic under-representation and lack of participation | 14 |
| 4.3 Lay participation | 16 |
| 4.4 Ordained ministry | 16 |
| 4.5 Positive action | 18 |
| 4.6 Cultural change | 19 |
| 4.7 Recruitment and training of parish clergy | 20 |
| 4.8 Minority ethnic clergy | 21 |
| 4.9 Ethnic monitoring | 22 |
| 4.10 Racism awareness and anti-racist training | 24 |
| 4.11 Increasing minority ethnic participation | 25 |
| 4.12 Southwark Race Relations Commission | 27 |
| 4.13 Young people | 29 |
| 4.14 Parishes | 30 |
| 4.15 Board of Education | 31 |
| 4.16 Minority ethnic teachers | 33 |
| 4.17 National Curriculum | 34 |

| | | |
|-----------|---|-----------|
| 4.18 | Anti-racist training for governors, headteachers and teachers | 34 |
| 4.19 | Admissions | 35 |
| 4.20 | Exclusions | 36 |
| 4.21 | Governance of schools and colleges | 37 |
| 4.22 | Mission statement | 37 |
| 5. | A strategic approach to equal opportunities and positive action within the Diocese | 39 |
| 5.1 | Leadership and accountability | 39 |
| 5.2 | Personal commitment | 40 |
| 5.3 | Policy development | 40 |
| 5.4 | Action Plan | 41 |
| 5.5 | Equal opportunities training | 41 |
| 5.6 | Managing the equal opportunities programme | 42 |
| | Conclusions and recommendations | 45 |
| | Appendices | |
| 1: | The interviewees | 55 |
| 2. | Race relations work in Southwark, 1969–2000, by The Rt. Revd Dr Wilfred Wood, Bishop of Croydon | 57 |
| 3. | Membership of diocesan bodies | 61 |
| 3a.. | Membership of Deanery Synods | 63 |
| 4. | The Wood-Sheppard Principles | 65 |
| 5. | Stories and snippets from the interviews | 67 |
| 6. | Resources | 71 |
| | Glossary | 75 |

FOREWORD

BY SIR HERMAN OUSELEY

Commitments to promote racial equality and challenge racism are beginning to figure more frequently in the policies of organisations in Britain. That is the good news. The bad news is that they invariably tend to be taken forward in isolation from the main business of the organisation. Plans and arrangements for achieving racial equality are far more likely to succeed if they are approached as an integral part of the business of the organisation, adding value to it and bringing positive benefits, including enhanced performance.

Over the past two decades, the Diocese of Southwark has been acutely conscious of its responsibilities to people of all backgrounds within its area. In particular, it has recognised the role of racism, which has denied black Christians equal treatment, access and full participation in the established church communities. When the diocese set up a Race Relations Commission in the early 1980s, it was hoped that this new body would provide all the answers. It couldn't and didn't. Similar structures in other institutions and organisations have shown that, on their own, one-off, *ad hoc* arrangements cannot achieve the organisational transformation needed to eradicate racism and achieve equality. Taking action for racial equality inevitably becomes someone else's job, a responsibility that is set apart from the organisation's other activities, instead of being central to its work. The Commission in Southwark realised this very quickly. At the same time, we recognise the considerable efforts made by many in both majority and minority ethnic communities to tackle the problem. If our report were to be summed up in a single sentence, it would probably be: 'We must all try even harder'.

The Report of the Stephen Lawrence Inquiry into the police investigation of the murder of a young black teenager highlighted the role played by institutional racism and showed in stark terms how public authorities have failed in their basic duty to provide an equal service for everyone, regardless of race, colour or ethnic origin. The impetus of the Report led the diocese urgently to re-examine its own responsibilities for ensuring fair and equal treatment for everyone in the area. In appointing an independent panel of inquiry to look into the issues of racism, representation and participation within the structures of

the diocese, the Bishop of Southwark was effectively expressing a personal commitment to, and responsibility for, whatever changes were needed to achieve racial equality. Racial equality will not be achieved without such leadership and commitment. It is vital that those in a position to influence the direction and outcome of an organisation's policies and purposes make it their personal mission to take action towards racial equality.

In effect, the Diocese of Southwark has sought an audit of its achievements and performance to date. By having its processes and practices scrutinised, it has invited suggestions for improving its record on equality and achieving its objective of maximising participation by all sections of the community in the work of the church, at parish, deanery and diocesan levels. This is certainly in the interest of the diocese, as the numbers of minority ethnic Anglicans, especially in the north of the diocese, have been growing fairly rapidly in recent years, and there is a wealth of skills and experience among them.

However, the audit is only the first step. An action plan will need to be drawn up, incorporating the recommendations of this report into all areas of the church's work, monitoring implementation and submitting regular progress reports for review by the various Committees, Boards and decision making structures of the diocese.

Once all the arrangements are in place, everyone concerned should understand what the undertaking means, how it will work, who will be responsible for specific tasks, and how and when specific targets will be achieved. Finally, an independent annual audit and inspection will be needed, to ensure objective assessment of progress. Working towards this will require rigorous ongoing evaluation of the action programme and steady commitment to improving performance in all parts of the diocese.

We have not said much about the theological reasons for this Inquiry and for our recommendations. Suffice it to say that Christianity teaches that all are equal in the sight of God, and that when people are not treated as equals, a state of sin exists. Repentance is still needed within our churches and within our hearts, as we seek to overcome the sins of the past and to avoid repeating them in the future. We look forward to a time, not too far from now, when many of the recommendations in this report will become superfluous, because we Christians, in all our diversity – will have begun to treat one another fairly, justly and equally. The contribution of every church member, whatever his or her ethnic origin, will be welcomed with pleasure and gratitude.

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 The Stephen Lawrence Inquiry Report of the police investigation of the murder of a black teenager in 1993 highlighted the existence of institutional racism within the Metropolitan Police Service, and in society more generally.

1.2 The report defined institutional racism as:

The collective failure of an organisation to provide an appropriate and professional service to people because of their colour, culture or ethnic origin. It can be seen or detected in processes, attitudes and behaviour which amount to discrimination through unwitting prejudice, ignorance, thoughtlessness and racist stereotyping which disadvantages minority ethnic people.

1.3 The report went on to say:

... It is incumbent on every institution to examine their policies and the outcome of their policies and practices, to guard against disadvantaging any section of our communities ...

1.4 The Bishops of the Diocese of Southwark felt impelled to undertake such an examination in order to see whether, and to what degree, institutional racism existed within the interest of the diocese recruitment and selection processes for employment, or within its processes for appointments to Boards and Committees, which take place through election, appointment or co-option. In the event that institutional racism should be identified, the Bishops then wanted to develop ways of dealing with it. Accordingly, the Diocesan Synod meeting on 13 March 1999 agreed to set up an independent inquiry panel to look into the structures and processes of the Diocese of Southwark.

1.5 The purpose of the inquiry was:

- (i) to assess the effectiveness of current arrangements to eliminate racial discrimination
- (ii) to establish whether there were any differences between the various parts of the diocese in their approach to equal opportunities, and the reasons for such variations; to identify the factors influencing the choice of particular methods and approaches; and to determine whether different approaches actually resulted in racial discrimination.

- 1.6 In addition, the panel took evidence on the membership of the Diocesan Synod, Boards and Committees, PCCs, Deanery Synods and Committees. The focus was on current practices, policies and outcomes, and the aim was to understand how they had evolved and to consider ways of widening participation and involvement in the diocese by diverse ethnic groups.
- 1.7 The inquiry has not attempted to address the much more vexed question of whether or not individual officers of the diocese were involved in any acts of racial discrimination. We neither looked for nor found any evidence of intentional individual racial discrimination.
- 1.8 In short, this report consists of a review of current and past practice against the highest racial equality standards. It strongly recommends further reviews and makes suggestions for change. These are highlighted in bold throughout the report and brought together in the final chapter.

2. THE INQUIRY

2.1 THE PANEL

2.1.1 The inquiry panel consisted of Sir Herman Ouseley, Chair of the Commission for Racial Equality (CRE) until 31 January 2000; Mrs Glynne Gordon-Carter, Secretary to the Archbishop's Council's Committee for Minority Ethnic Anglican Concerns; and the Revd David Haslam, former Secretary of the Churches Commission for Racial Justice and now a local Methodist/United Reformed minister in Southwark. A back-up team consisting of Paul Buxton and Andrew Lane from the diocese and Paul Riddell from the CRE supported the panel.

2.2 TERMS OF REFERENCE

2.2.1 The terms of reference for the inquiry were:

- (i) to review the current policies, procedures, practices and structures of the diocese against legal requirements and best racial equality practice, and to make recommendations to the Bishop of Southwark for consideration and implementation
- (ii) to produce a report of the inquiry.

2.3 METHODOLOGY

2.3.1 The inquiry used two principal research methods: a review of documentation, and semi-structured interviews. About 25 individuals, including diocesan staff and local church leaders, were interviewed by various members of the panel and notes were taken for subsequent analysis (see Appendix 1 for a full list of interviewees). The panel was impressed by the interviewees' cooperation and by the openness and frankness of their answers and contributions. Working to a tight timetable, the panel sought to encourage the interviewees to think about alternative institutional practices, so that they would be more comfortable with taking forward changes in whose design they had been involved.

2.3.2 A wide range of documents (available from the Board for Church in Society) was distributed to the panel for review, as well as correspondence received in the course of the inquiry. In addition, statistics were compiled on the ethnic composition of the Diocesan Synod, Deanery Synods, Boards, and subcommittees. Advertisements were placed in *The Bridge* inviting people to write in with their comments and experiences, and the panel also considered these. The panel attended meetings of the Board for Church in Society, the Board of Education, and the Southwark Race Relations Commission.

3. THE DIOCESE OF SOUTHWARK

- 3.1 The Diocese of Southwark represents the Church of England from the Thames to Gatwick airport, and from Kingston to Greenwich. The Bishop of Southwark has overall responsibility for the diocese, which is divided into three episcopal areas, each with its own area Bishop:
- Kingston Episcopal Area, which covers the boroughs of Kingston, Richmond, Wandsworth, Lambeth and Merton
 - Woolwich Episcopal Area, which covers the boroughs of Lewisham, Southwark Greenwich and a small part of Bromley
 - Croydon Episcopal Area, which covers the boroughs of Croydon and Sutton, and the eastern part of the county of Surrey.
- 3.2 The total population of the diocese is over 2.25 million, and over 50,000 people are on the electoral rolls of the 303 parishes. There are 378 places of worship. The population is served by 538 clergy working in the parishes or as chaplains in hospitals, prisons and community health units. The Southwark Diocesan Board of Education is responsible for 107 Church of England schools. Over 120 parishes are designated as Urban Priority Areas and 100 projects in these areas have received nearly £3 million in grants from the Church Urban Fund.
- 3.3 The ten centres of the Diocesan WelCare Service for Parents and Children support over 1,000 families at any one time. The Southwark and London Diocesan Housing Association has developed 100 new homes, mainly on Church of England land, for people on low incomes.
- 3.4 The diocese operates an equal opportunities employment policy, which was introduced following its adoption by the Diocesan Synod in May 1988 and which is probably due for review (see 4.12.5). The policy is supplemented by a code of practice on recruitment, including advertising of posts.

- 3.5 The policy was reviewed by a Working Party of the Board of Church in Society, which reported to the Bishop's Council in 1996. As a result of the review, the Equal Opportunities Development Group was formed with the aim of encouraging and sharing good practice across the diocese, particularly in relation to access to services and decision-making bodies. The review also recommended that part of the role of the Equal Opportunities Development Group should be to monitor levels of minority ethnic (and other) representation in positions of parochial responsibility. An audit is currently under way. It was further recommended that a second Monitoring Group be set up to look at equal opportunities in relation to staff employed by, and under contract to, the diocese. The newly appointed diocesan Personnel Manager has been given the task of gathering data on the ethnic composition of staff in advance of the establishment of the Monitoring Group. At present there is insufficient information for any genuine assessment of minority ethnic representation, either at employee level or in the wider diocese.
- 3.6 Of the nine 'Main Areas of Adviser Expenditure' within the diocese, race relations was the highest. An overview of race relations work in the diocese from 1969–2000, by the Rt. Revd Dr Wilfred Wood, Bishop of Croydon, is included at Appendix 2.

4. THE FINDINGS

4.1. INSTITUTIONAL RACISM

- 4.1.1 The panel used the definition of institutional racism in the Stephen Lawrence Inquiry Report to examine organisational culture in the diocese. However, the term requires further elucidation.
- 4.1.2 Most of the people interviewed during the inquiry felt that institutional racism must exist within the diocese, if only because it exists in society at large. One source of evidence was the marked under-representation of people from minority ethnic communities at all levels within the diocese, particularly its decision-making structures (see Appendices 3 and 3a, which give an ethnic breakdown of the membership of diocesan Boards and Deanery Synods). Concern was also expressed about the effects of 'British/English' history and culture, including vestiges of an imperial and colonial mentality which still survive in certain aspects of the life of the diocese, contributing to a sense of exclusion among minority ethnic communities.
- 4.1.3 It was pointed out on several occasions that, in many parts of Inner London, while congregations were made up largely of people from minority ethnic communities, most of the incumbents and clergy were white. One of the interviewees was not alone in observing that: 'if it were not for people from minority ethnic communities, these churches would be empty'. It was also pointed out that people from minority ethnic communities did not have much chance of being promoted to senior positions, which appeared to be reserved for whites only.
- 4.1.4 The panel was informed that there was also a problem with elections: people from minority ethnic communities tended not to get elected to Deanery Synods. While these do not have much power in themselves, they exercise the significant right to elect representatives to Committees, Boards and the Diocesan Synod, and people from minority ethnic communities are consequently under-represented on these bodies. There is some evidence that bodies that are not elected by Deanery Synods achieve a more representative membership.

- 4.1.5 Another interviewee thought that racism in the church was worse than in business, because, while there was some legal redress in business, the church was not accountable to anyone. One of the examples cited was the situation in a particular deanery, where one third of the members were from minority ethnic communities, but all ten incumbents were white, and only two out of 18 members of the clergy were from minority ethnic communities.
- 4.1.6 The personal testimonies of people from a range of parishes and diocesan institutions, taken together with the statistical evidence (see Appendix 3), suggest that institutional racism does exist within the structures of the diocese. There is little evidence that direct discrimination is a significant factor preventing people from minority ethnic communities from participating in diocesan life. However, the combination of evidence and personal experience conveyed to us by a wide range of people from minority and majority ethnic communities cannot be discounted. If the diocese wants to widen participation and inclusiveness, and to regain its credibility with its minority ethnic communities, it must be seen to be taking action by addressing their under-representation within the structures of the diocese and by positively embracing the spiritual and pastoral needs of all its members.

4.2 MINORITY ETHNIC UNDER-REPRESENTATION AND LACK OF PARTICIPATION

- 4.2.1 Undoubtedly, the single most important concern to emerge during the inquiry was the under-representation of people from minority ethnic communities within the structures of the diocese, particularly on the Boards and Committees and within the ministry, including the Cathedral (see Appendix 3). One minority ethnic interviewee pointedly asked:

Looking at diocesan Boards and Committees, is this the way to celebrate God's diversity? Why are we in this Church?

At one Board meeting, a representative from the diocesan social service organisation WelCare commented that, although many clients were from minority ethnic communities, few committee members were from those groups. Barriers to participation appear to include: times of meetings, a certain 'committee culture', and language (including body language). The panel concluded that some of the reasons for these disparities were to be found at the points of entry into the diocesan structures, including lay participation in the

Parochial Church Councils (PCCs) and vocations to ordained and lay ministries. However, the panel sincerely hopes that, if as a result of this report opportunities do open up, members of minority ethnic communities will come forward and participate more fully in diocesan bodies.

- 4.2.2 **The panel recommends that the Bishop's Council, in consultation with the new Diocesan Committee for Minority Ethnic Anglican Concerns (if approved), take prompt action to deal with the issue of under-representation (see 4.11).**
- 4.2.3 In some parishes, people from minority ethnic communities who attend regularly are not listed on the parish electoral roll and do not vote. Registration is crucial, as membership of the PCCs and involvement in other areas depend on it.
- 4.2.4 **The panel recommends that the diocese consult Operation Black Vote on ways of improving minority ethnic participation.**
- 4.2.5 It is often claimed that there are insufficient minority ethnic Anglicans to serve on diocesan Boards, Councils and Committees and to undertake representation; or that they do not have the necessary experience or skills. In reality, there is little information about the skills and experience available within minority ethnic communities, and a register could provide a vital resource and help to change this situation.
- 4.2.6 **The panel recommends:**
- (i) **the development of a register of people from minority ethnic communities listing details of their experience and skills, so that as positions become vacant, it should be relatively easy to check whether there are suitable candidates and invite them to put themselves forward for consideration or election; Bishops and Archdeacons, as well as the Black Forum, should be involved in compiling the register under the supervision of the new Diocesan Committee for Minority Ethnic Anglican Concerns (if approved)**
 - (ii) **encouraging minority ethnic Anglicans to register on the electoral roll.**

4.3 LAY PARTICIPATION

4.3.1 In the case of lay participation, the route to the Deanery Synod, the Diocesan Synod, Boards, Committees and governing bodies is through the PCC. It was pointed out during the inquiry that PCCs have not elected people from minority ethnic communities to the Deanery Synod, the 'gateway' to the other Synods and Boards, and that with little or no minority ethnic representation on PCCs, the proportion getting through will obviously be insignificant. The panel believes that a more flexible approach to lay appointments should be considered: for example, if a church member is interested in serving on the Board of Education, or any other Board or Committee, and has the requisite skills and experience, there should be no need for the member to have served on a PCC or the Deanery Synod for a specified period – it is not clear how this would make the member a stronger candidate. In addition, the diocese might consider other categories of representation, besides geographical representation.

4.3.2 **The panel recommends that the diocese consider the following:**

- (i) new measures that actively encourage minority ethnic representatives to serve on PCCs**
- (ii) in the short term, co-opting minority ethnic representatives with the requisite skills and experience on to Boards, Committees and other bodies, and giving them the support they need to succeed, including proper induction to the work of the relevant Board or Committee and the role of members**
- (iii) a more flexible and open approach to appointing lay persons to Boards and Committees, including the introduction of non-geographical forms of representation. Appointment or co-option of at least two minority ethnic representative would help to avoid isolation and reluctance to contribute.**

4.4 ORDAINED MINISTRY

4.4.1. Entry to ordained ministry is through the vocation process. At present, parish priests and higher education chaplains are

responsible for identifying people for vocations. Only a small number of people from minority ethnic groups are commended by parish priests, and even fewer go on to National Selection Conferences. The panel was informed that minority ethnic Anglicans feel they have to work up to three times as hard as their white counterparts to succeed by this process, and that, by and large, young people from minority ethnic communities do not see ministry as a vocation for them.

4.4.2 It is the panel's view that the diocese needs to see ordained ministry as a form of 'public service', with the spiritual, social and pastoral needs of churches and communities being of paramount concern.

4.4.3 Ordained ministry includes many aspects of public, personal and community service, including:

- (i) worship
- (ii) pastoral care and counselling
- (iii) community work
- (iv) training and development of laity for lay ministries and, possibly, for ordained ministry
- (v) theological training for the clergy and laity
- (vi) contribution to social policy in fields such as education, social services, criminal justice, prisons, and health.

4.4.4 The Church needs to encourage and support indigenous members, rather than adopting the easy option of looking to the wider Anglican Church to provide leaders. This reinforces the notion that people from minority ethnic communities are 'foreign' and transitory. Every effort should be made to increase the number of minority ethnic clergy entering ordained ministry. In the case of Southwark, the diocese is very fortunate, in that it has a culturally diverse population from which to develop some 'home grown' clergy. What the diocese needs is a ministry that is more representative of all the communities it serves, and services that meet their various needs.

4.4.5 **The panel recommends that:**

- (i) parish clergy, further and higher education chaplains and Bishops, too, should play a much**

more active role in identifying, supporting and encouraging minority ethnic Anglicans for vocation

- (ii) achievable and measurable targets should be set by the diocese as a means of increasing the proportion of minority ethnic Anglicans entering ministry**
- (iii) the diocese should commission periodic surveys of the parishes, involving relevant bodies such as the Black Forum and the Race Relations Commission (or any successor body), in order to appreciate and take on board the views and concerns of all the communities that are part of the diocese.**

4.5 POSITIVE ACTION

4.5.1 The panel received a number of suggestions on ways of addressing the under-representation of people from ethnic minority groups within the structures of the diocese. In particular, it was felt that structures based on geographical representation, such as the new Area Councils, would necessarily result in predominantly white groups. The panel also debated the use of the term 'positive action', which has a somewhat narrow legal meaning under the 1976 Race Relations Act as well as a wider meaning referring to the processes, mechanisms and culture within an organisation committed to ensuring that everyone is treated equally, and to assisting people from minority ethnic groups to overcome the historical discrimination they have experienced and to participate fully. For example, Area Councils could consider using a pool system for electing at least one minority ethnic representative. The following suggestions are offered in the spirit of this wider meaning rather than in the more restrictive sense of the 1976 Act.

4.5.2 **The panel recommends that:**

- (i) all deaneries should consider factors that have inhibited minority ethnic people in the past, and take action to remove any unjustified barriers**
- (ii) the diocese should consider drawing up a 'menu' of core skills, experiences and backgrounds**

required for particular appointments, and, if necessary, provide training in those skills

- (iii) the diocese should consider introducing electoral arrangements that offer the widest possible opportunity for electing minority ethnic candidates**
- (iv) consideration should be given to having more co-options, although this, too, should only be a short-term solution.**

4.5.3 Positive action initiatives, such as those suggested above, are sometimes used by organisations on a short to medium term basis to correct persistent historical disparities in representation that might have been caused by discrimination. They also serve as a sign that an organisation is committed to changing the cultural assumptions on which it operates by persuading its existing members of the benefits of such change.

4.6 CULTURAL CHANGE

4.6.1 As well as expressing concerns about the structures of the diocese, a number of interviewees thought that the atmosphere and ethos of the diocese was not welcoming of diverse cultures and that this was possibly due to a lack of understanding of different cultures. In particular, several people referred to 'white middle class culture' as being especially daunting to people from minority ethnic communities. The panel also heard that, while people from different ethnic backgrounds did attend a particular church, they were not always able to relate to it wholeheartedly. One interviewee thought an increase in attendance by people from minority ethnic communities had sometimes led to a decrease in majority ethnic attendance, a point also made in a submission by a group of minority ethnic young people.

4.6.2 In the panel's view, the existing culture of the diocese does not readily lend itself to effective equal opportunities activity.

The panel recommends that the diocese should review its present equal opportunities policy and consider introducing and implementing a new programme aimed at influencing and ultimately changing the culture of the diocese into one where greater participation and involvement by people from

widely different ethnic, cultural and social backgrounds becomes the norm.

4.7 RECRUITMENT AND TRAINING OF PARISH CLERGY

- 4.7.1 Recruitment of clergy to fill parish vacancies is covered by procedures laid down in national Church of England legislation. Recruitment has in the past been organised through internal process rather than open external competition, but happily, this is now changing. The current process includes two parish representatives in addition to the Patron, the Archdeacon, and Bishops. Following discussions within this group, a decision is made as to whether the vacancy should be advertised, or who should be interviewed. The parish representatives have a veto and, if they exercise it, say, against an minority ethnic candidate, they must explain their reasons. One barrier facing minority ethnic candidates may be that, like the police, the parish clergy, too, have an 'occupational culture'. In the words of one interviewee: 'They are in it 24 hours a day; even their leisure time is spent with other clergy.'
- 4.7.2 **The panel recommends that job descriptions and person profiles for clergy appointments should contain standard diocesan requirements on the qualities and proven abilities needed for effective service to the wider community. Parishes may then add their own particular requirements.**
- 4.7.3 **The panel is conscious that the Church is exempt from the Race Relations Act 1976. However, in its view, the traditional recruitment process may work against equality of opportunity and the creation of a positive multicultural, multi-ethnic environment. Consideration should be given to introducing a procedure for recruiting clergy that is consistent with the principle of racial equality and the highest standards of equal opportunities practice. The panel also suggests that consideration should be given to the following questions:**
- (i) **should the Church remain exempt from the Race Relations Act 1976?**
 - (ii) **should the government be petitioned for change in the legislation?**
 - (iii) **should the system of patronage be changed?**

- 4.7.4 The panel received several comments suggesting that parish clergy in multi-ethnic parishes might benefit from further training. Evidently, some parishes were operating much more effectively than others, which led to a suggestion for an informal ‘twinning’ of effective, multi-ethnic parishes with others that are less so.
- 4.7.5 **The panel recommends that both parish clergy and those in other ministries should receive special training in racism awareness and cultural diversity as part of their post-ordination, in-service and lay training. The panel further recommends that consideration should be given to providing a short course on these issues for clergy arriving in multicultural parishes for the first time.**

4.8 MINORITY ETHNIC CLERGY

- 4.8.1 There is a shortage of clergy in society generally, so it is not entirely surprising that there are few minority ethnic clergy as well. Having said that, the number of people from minority ethnic groups within the diocese is increasing and one would therefore expect this increase to be reflected in the number of minority ethnic clergy. This would seem an ideal opportunity for the diocese to look to minority ethnic congregations for its future clergy.
- 4.8.2 The panel learned during the inquiry that an increasing number of people from minority ethnic communities have been coming forward recently for Ordained Local Ministry (OLM) training. This has not been the case for stipendiary ministry training, however. One interviewee observed that:

The OLM criteria seem to meet real equal opportunities practices in recruitment and training. The procedures in the Church for recruiting and assessing ordination candidates raise questions.

The question of whether ‘white, male, middle-class culture’ is alienating minority ethnic candidates was also raised, as well as the problem of following good practice models when, as in the case of stipendiary ministry, the final decisions are taken externally. It was suggested that Vocations Guidance Units could do more to encourage people from minority ethnic communities into stipendiary ministry. The 1994 Black Anglican Celebration for the Decade of Evangelism was an affirming experience for many minority ethnic Anglicans – Southwark had the largest delegation. This event resulted in a

number of people coming forward for lay and ordained ministries from across the church, including the Diocese of Southwark.

- 4.8.3 Attention was drawn to the small number of minority ethnic representatives in the national selection process; however, in the Diocese of Southwark, the panel learned that two of its twelve selectors were from minority ethnic communities, a larger proportion than in almost any other diocese.
- 4.8.4 In response to the ongoing debate about the best use of minority ethnic clergy, some interviewees were concerned that sending minority ethnic clergy to other parishes resulted in a dilution of their numbers in inner city areas, which tend to have large minority ethnic populations. While the panel appreciates the importance of the needs of minority ethnic congregations, it does not support the view that minority ethnic clergy should serve only in areas with sizable minority ethnic populations. What this issue actually highlights is the problem caused by the under-representation of minority ethnic clergy within the diocese as a whole.
- 4.8.5 The panel recommends that, with respect to vocations, the diocese should set up a robust programme of strategies to encourage minority ethnic Anglicans to explore ordained ministry. This should involve parish clergy, Diocesan Directors of Ordinands, Vocations Advisers, Vocations Guidance Units and the Urban Ministry Adviser, and could be initiated by the new Diocesan Committee for Minority Ethnic Anglican Concerns (if approved).**
- 4.8.6 The panel also recommends that the diocese should raise at national level the question of setting a target for a suitable number of minority ethnic selectors.**

4.9 ETHNIC MONITORING

- 4.9.1 Ethnic monitoring is vital in order to have basic information about the involvement, participation and representation of minority ethnic communities within the structures of the diocese.
- 4.9.2 In 1996, a report from a working party of the Board for Church in Society recommended setting up two groups: one responsible for ethnic monitoring, and the other for development. The group for development was established, but not

the one for monitoring, possibly because it was not clear who was responsible for convening the group.

4.9.3 In November 1997, the Southwark Diocesan Synod passed with a large majority the following motion, which arose out of a pilot in the Battersea Deanery:

That this Synod:

- (a) recognises the advantages of showing that the Church of England is a multi-ethnic church with multi-ethnic leadership at all levels; and
- (b) calls upon the Archbishops' Council to organise the collection of statistics at the time of the next general revision of church electoral rolls (2002) on the ethnic origin of members on electoral rolls, members of church Councils, churchwardens, Deanery Synod representatives and clergy throughout all the Diocese of the Church of England.

4.9.4 In November 1999, the General Synod debated the following motion, which was approved with an additional proviso:

- (c) [that this Synod] calls further upon the Archbishops' Council to arrange the collection of the statistics by the procedure suggested in the Background Paper from the Diocese of Southwark.

4.9.5 Questions on the ethnic composition of congregations, PCCs, etc., have been included in the Archdeacons' Articles of Enquiry for 2000, at the panel's request. It is noted that the diocesan Personnel Manager has now been given responsibility for equal opportunities policy and practice.

4.9.6 **The panel supports these initiatives and recommends that every effort should be made to ensure that a system for collecting ethnic origin data is in place before 2002, and that reports are submitted annually on it thereafter. The monitoring information obtained should then be considered, initially, by the new Diocesan Committee for Minority Ethnic Concerns (if approved) before being passed on to the decision-making bodies in the diocese for regular review and appropriate action.**

4.9.7 On the wider matter of equal opportunities and ethnic monitoring, the panel found support within the diocese for the Wood-Sheppard Principles for racial equality in employment (see Appendix 4), named after one of the interest of the diocese Bishops, the Rt Revd Dr Wilfred Wood, and drawn up by the Churches' Commission for Racial Justice. Once the Principles have been endorsed, a Church body can encourage

companies in which it invests, or with which it does business, also to endorse the Principles and use them more widely to encourage commitment to racial equality in employment.

- 4.9.8 **The panel recommends that the diocese endorse the Wood-Sheppard Principles, include them in its action plan and actively encourage companies in which the diocese invests, and with which it has purchasing, construction or other contracts, also to endorse the Principles and put them into practice.**

4.10 RACISM AWARENESS AND ANTI-RACIST TRAINING

- 4.10.1. One of the proposals made to the panel was that there should be a meaningful training course on the history of minority ethnic communities in Britain and the contributions they have made to the country and to the Church, and that the training should be an essential requirement for everyone undertaking ministry.
- 4.10.2 The diocese already has a wide array of training courses and there is a danger of ‘training for training’s sake’. Consideration should therefore be given to the question of building equal opportunities training into existing training courses.
- 4.10.3 **The panel recommends that the diocese should consider what kind of training is needed in this field and when. Training needs should be identified and incorporated within the interest of the diocese equal opportunities programme. This means that different kinds of equality training will be needed at different stages and for different groups of people. Most importantly, all training should be tailored to its purpose: namely, to enable the course participants to undertake their responsibilities efficiently, effectively and with absolute fairness.**
- 4.10.4 **Some dioceses have developed very useful resource packs for clergy on minority ethnic issues as well as interfaith matters. The panel recommends that resource packs could be developed for the diocese by the Continuing Ministerial Education and Post Ordination Training Unit in collaboration with the**

Race Relations Advisers and the new Diocesan Committee for Minority Ethnic Anglican Concerns (if approved).

4.11 INCREASING MINORITY ETHNIC PARTICIPATION WITHIN THE DIOCESE

- 4.11.1 As reported earlier, many of the interviewees mentioned the large numbers of minority ethnic Anglicans in some inner city congregations. Minority ethnic worshippers make up about 50 per cent of the congregations in most churches in the Borough of Southwark, and in some churches, the figure is closer to 90 per cent. However, comparatively few minority ethnic Anglicans are involved in the day-to-day running of the diocese. One interviewee said that in the last ten years there had been an amazing increase in people from minority ethnic communities attending churches in the Borough of Southwark and other inner city boroughs within the diocese. Most of the interviewees felt that minority ethnic Anglicans should be included in every aspect of the interest of the diocese work; the Cathedral, with its especially visible role, could play a particularly effective part in this process. It was suggested to us that training, previously undertaken by the Race Relations Commission (among others), should be continued and supported by the diocese.
- 4.11.2 Such training used to be known as ‘empowerment training’. Since this is a term that some minority ethnic communities have questioned as implying that they do not have power, the panel wishes to emphasise that it uses the term to mean training by – or organised by – minority ethnic communities for minority ethnic communities, with the purpose of understanding better the power structures of the institutions in which they are involved, and how best they might seek to position themselves within those structures.
- 4.11.4 Another means of increasing participation is through ‘mentoring’, whereby an minority ethnic member of the Church with the potential and desire for more exacting service can follow and learn from another, possibly also from a minority ethnic community, who already has a more responsible role. Whatever names they may be given, such training programmes are extremely valuable in enabling full participation by minority ethnic communities in the institutional life of their country.

- 4.11.5 One area of lively discussion between the panel and members of the diocese centred around the legitimacy of setting targets for vocations, and whether this was not in fact interference in the work of the Holy Spirit. The panel found it difficult to believe that the Holy Spirit was not calling for more people from minority ethnic communities to serve the church, both as clergy and more widely in the tasks and opportunities that service in the Church offers, and took the view that targets should be understood as part of the Spirit's guidance. The panel concluded therefore that it was appropriate for the Church to set targets, and that it was reasonable, under the guidance of the Holy Spirit, to expect that over a period of, say, five years, the number of candidates for Deanery Synods, Diocesan Boards and Synods, the Bishop's Council, local ministry and stipendiary ministry should be more or less proportional to their representation in the population served by the diocese.
- 4.11.6 **The panel recommends that the diocese should set targets for the recruitment of clergy and any other calling in the service of the Church.**
- 4.11.7 The role of the Urban Ministry Development Adviser could be further developed to include the encouragement of greater participation by minority ethnic Anglicans within the diocese. At present, the adviser responds to requests from individual parishes to work with their congregations to ensure that everyone takes full part in the life of the Church. The Adviser also runs an annual Urban Priority Area conference, as well as occasional conferences and training events, which are advertised through flyers and by word of mouth.
- 4.11.8 **The panel recommends that:**
- (i) **Bishops and other diocesan leaders should themselves undertake anti-racist training as they prepare to encourage others to do the same**
 - (ii) **the Black Forum, in conjunction with Area Race Relations Advisers and the new Committee for Minority Ethnic Anglican Concerns (if approved; see 4.12.5) should further develop 'empowerment training' and mentoring for minority ethnic communities in the diocese**

- (iii) **the Committee for Minority Ethnic Anglican Concerns should begin setting targets for various aspects of diocesan life (where this is appropriate), including the recruitment of clergy**
- (iv) **the role of the Urban Ministry Development Adviser should be reviewed, to complement his excellent work with more overt responsibility for encouraging participation in leadership by people from minority ethnic communities.**

4.12 SOUTHWARK RACE RELATIONS COMMISSION

- 4.12.1 At the time of writing, it is not clear whether the Race Relations Commission still exists (see Appendix 2 for a history of the Commission by the Rt Revd Dr Wilfred Wood, Bishop of Croydon). The panel spent a substantial portion of its time listening to members and staff of the Commission, who felt alienated and unsupported. The panel also attended a meeting of the Commission, which is listed in the Diocese of Southwark Diocesan Directory 1999 as a subdivision of the Board for Church in Society. Yet, there is an overwhelming perception that the Commission has no real standing, and both members of the Commission and Race Relations Advisers are dispirited. This situation cannot continue, and must be addressed by the diocese. The Commission when it was formed was far ahead of its time. Under the leadership of the Rt. Revd Dr Wilfred Wood, Bishop of Croydon, it did some excellent work in the areas of training local parishes and schools and encouraging Black empowerment through its youth programme, and through the Black Forum. But it has not been as successful as it might have wished in ensuring that equal opportunities, positive action and racism awareness are built into the structures and processes of the diocese.
- 4.12.2 The panel's major concerns were: the lack of a properly defined role for the Commission in the diocesan structures; the uncertainty created by the restructuring; and the lack of adequate secretarial resources. All this has contributed to a lack of confidence, and has meant that race relations work is not being tackled by the Commission as vigorously as before.
- 4.12.3 The reorganisation of diocesan structures which followed from the recommendations of the report on the Southwark

Race Relations Commission, *Working Together*, meant that the 'Race Relations Commission lost its independent status under the Bishop's Council and became an interest group under the enormous Board for Church in Society' (Race Relations Commission paper).

4.12.4 The pressing question now is how to renew the Commission, so that the diocese can respond effectively to the Stephen Lawrence Inquiry Report and work to combat institutional racism within the structures of the diocese. The panel would prefer an integrated approach, with Boards, Councils and Committees discussing and taking responsibility for relevant areas of work as a means of following up this report as well as the Stephen Lawrence Inquiry Report. Bishop John Sentamu's paper 'Towards an Agenda for Action for the Church of England' should be a useful tool in this process. The panel firmly believes that the programme of empowering people from minority ethnic communities is one of the Commission's strengths and should be continued.

4.12.5 **To take forward the work of the Commission, the panel recommends the establishment of a diocesan Committee for Minority Ethnic Anglican Concerns, for an initial three-year term, subject to review after 27 months. The Committee should have clear and focused terms of reference, to be set by the Bishop's Council in consultation with the retiring Race Relations Commission. It should report to the Bishop's Council and be adequately resourced. The terms of reference should include the following:**

- (i) **to work with and influence the diocesan structures at all levels, promote racial justice concerns and ensure that the programme for 'empowerment' of minority ethnic communities and educational work with schools and parishes continues**
- (ii) **to monitor an action plan drawn up on the basis of the panel's report**
- (iii) **to implement relevant points from 'Towards an Agenda for Action for the Church of England'**
- (iv) **to organise an ongoing programme of 'sensitivity meetings' between the leadership team, senior clergy and minority ethnic representatives, including young people**

- (v) **to review the diocesan equal opportunities policy and practice, and consider drawing up a new policy.**

The Committee should be chaired by a Bishop and its membership should include at least two area Race Relations Advisers, the Diocesan Secretary, the Personnel Manager, and representation from the old Race Relations Commission, the Black Forum Organising Committee and key areas in the diocesan structures. Two of its members should be under 25 years old. To be effective, the Committee would need an office and a full-time executive officer.

4.13 YOUNG PEOPLE

4.13.1 It is widely believed that young people from all ethnic groups are increasingly abandoning mainstream churches because they have nothing to offer them. The young people whom the panel interviewed emphasised that the diocese is failing to attract minority ethnic young people into the Church of England. One group reported that their idea of a Youth Minister for their parish was derided and dismissed by the local PCC, even though funding was not the major problem. The diocese needs to examine the relevance of Christianity to the lives of young people and to focus on the issues that affect them morally, socially and spiritually. We reproduce below some of the comments made by young people during the inquiry:

- As young people born in this country our faith is important to us. We want to express our faith alongside other Christians in a Church which feels positive about being multi-cultural and multi-ethnic.
- All of us have grown in our faith and confidence of being young Black men and women through the Youth Conferences, the Black Forum and our parish priests. They have been there for us and listened.
- The Anglican Church does not seem to be able to handle Black culture. Urban youth like our friends and us are not sure how the situation will change, except in parishes like ours where we have been trained for leadership.
- We see that unless Black people of all ages get on these Committees the structures will remain places where racism exists.

4.13.2 **The panel did not examine the role of young people in sufficient detail. However, given the under-**

representation of minority ethnic Anglicans within the structures of the diocese, it is the view of the panel that particular attention should be given to finding ways of attracting minority ethnic young people in the diocese into the Church. If having local Youth Ministers, (where these can be afforded) would help to achieve this, then serious consideration should be given to the idea. If not, it is crucial to consider what other appropriate action should be taken. The Race Relations Commission has developed an impressive programme of work with young people and should be consulted.

4.14 PARISHES

- 4.14.1 Several interviewees made the point that local clergy have a crucial role to play in encouraging minority ethnic Anglicans to get involved in Committees and go forward for ministry. One interviewee commented: 'The Church needs to look very positively at the enormous potential of the Black and minority communities coming to church in increasing numbers in urban areas'. Parish audits are one way forward, and material is available to assist with these. Involving a member of the Black Forum or the successor body to the Race Relations Commission in the three-yearly Archdeacon's visitation is another possibility. Furthermore, consideration should be given to improving minority ethnic representation on PCCs, Deanery Synods and other Boards and Committees. We understand that the Archdeacon of Croydon is already seeking to address minority ethnic issues during his visitations. Marking Racial Justice Sunday every September can serve as a further reminder of the issue, especially in 'almost-white' parishes. As *Seeds of Hope: Report of a survey on combating racism in the Church of England* (see Appendix 6) emphasises:

Racial justice issues should not be considered relevant only in areas where there is a concentration of people from the minority ethnic communities. These matters are just as relevant in areas where policy and decision makers live ... to live in white rural areas does not relieve us all of our obligations to members of communities we rarely, if ever, meet. The connection between worship on a Sunday and how people work through their faith in the week must be made, as policy makers make decisions which affect minority ethnic communities.

4.14.2 The panel recommends that:

- (i) local clergy should find ways of encouraging minority ethnic Anglicans to explore a wide range of ministries
- (ii) parishes should undertake audits every three years, to check on the progress they have made in the area of race relations and minority ethnic representation and participation in lay representation and ministry; the *Seeds of Hope in the Parish* study pack is a useful tool in undertaking this exercise, as it offers parishes and PCCs, whatever the size of their minority ethnic Anglican population, strategies for discussion and action, both in the parish and in the wider community
- (iii) the Archdeacons should consider involving minority ethnic representatives in their regular visitations
- (iv) all parishes should observe Racial Justice Sunday every September.

4.15 BOARD OF EDUCATION

4.15.1 There are 107 Church schools in the diocese, of which 94 are primary and 13 secondary schools. The diocese is also involved in five higher education institutions, and is seeking to establish chaplaincies in the 13 further education colleges where there are none. The constitution and membership of the Diocesan Board of Education (DBE) are in accordance with the Diocesan Boards of Education Measure 1991 and have been agreed by the Synod and the Secretary of State for Education and Employment.

4.15.2 In May 1994, the Board published *Colour and Spice*, its guidance on combating racism in Church schools. The Chief Education Officer for the London Borough of Southwark ordered copies for all schools in the borough, irrespective of status. The guidance was also in great demand from other dioceses and was widely distributed to them. The guide is currently being revised in conjunction with the London Diocese, as part of the Board's response to the recommendations in the Stephen Lawrence Inquiry Report. The Board intends to promote the new guide nationally to all Church schools.

- 4.15.3 **The panel recommends that the new guide should consider incorporating the advice on auditing and action planning in *Learning for All: Racial equality standards for schools*, which was published by the Commission for Racial Equality in February 2000.**
- 4.15.4 Minority ethnic representation on the four Committees of the DBE are as follows:
- (i) Schools Committee – one (vice-chair).
 - (ii) Finance and General Purposes Committee – none.
 - (iii) Further Education – two.
 - (iv) Higher Education – two.
- 4.15.5 Membership of the Board has remained the same since 1998, when it was reconstituted following the Synodical elections. The Board will be newly constituted in 2001. In the past, induction of new members consisted of an explanation of the nature and purpose of the Board's work, its staff, its mission statement, and its equal opportunities policy; this was accompanied by an information pack. The Board is to be commended on the fact that its membership includes a few people with minority ethnic backgrounds.
- 4.15.6 **The panel recommends that consideration should be given to developing a positive action initiative to recruit more minority ethnic Board members. Given the ethnic make-up of diocesan schools, co-option may be the best solution, at least initially. All Board members, new and old, should receive thorough equal opportunities training.**
- 4.15.7 The Board of Education adopted an equal opportunities policy in employment in 1992. It was revised in 1994 and the newly appointed diocesan Personnel Manager has been charged with its further revision (see also 4.9.5).
- 4.15.8 In May 1999, in response to the Stephen Lawrence Inquiry Report, the Schools Committee of the Board agreed to second a minority ethnic teacher for one year to:
- (i) consider models for monitoring the ethnicity of school governing bodies and staff
 - (ii) advise on ways of improving curriculum opportunity
 - (iii) consider strategies and identify good practice in preventing and combating racism

- (iv) liaise with the Teacher Training Agency and other bodies on the recruitment of minority ethnic staff
- (v) explore ways of recruiting and training minority ethnic governors.

Unfortunately, although this initiative has been approved, the secondment has not yet started, due to lack of funds.

4.15.9 The panel wishes to endorse this initiative by the Board of Education and recommends that funds be actively sought for it as a matter of priority, possibly through sponsorship. The panel also proposes that the recommendations arising from this initiative should be implemented in all the diocesan schools. The panel further recommends that the DBE should address the issues raised in the Stephen Lawrence Inquiry Report and consider its implications for education in Southwark's Church schools. The paper 'Towards an Agenda for Action for the Church of England' would be helpful as a reference.

4.16 MINORITY ETHNIC TEACHERS

4.16.1 Schools in the diocese are currently experiencing an acute shortage of teachers, especially minority ethnic teachers, and male minority ethnic teachers most of all. At present, there are only eight minority ethnic headteachers in diocesan schools. The Board had previously developed an access course in a cooperative venture with Southwark College to recruit minority ethnic women. Recruits were guaranteed a place at Roehampton College for training and then the opportunity to be considered for appointment at an Anglican school. It was reported to the panel during the inquiry that numbers had fallen, possibly due to the fees. A new member of the Board from Lambeth College is keen to renew the project, this time using a variety of higher education institutions. Also this year, at the Archdeacon of Lambeth's charge, an opportunity was given to promote teacher recruitment, using materials from the Teacher Training Agency. The Church Wardens present were asked to raise this in their separate churches and to promote the idea of teaching as a vocation, especially among minority ethnic communities. However, it was felt that minority ethnic families had different professional career aspirations for their children: trainee teachers often ended up

with large student loans and teachers' salaries were not considered to be as attractive as those in the medical and legal professions.

- 4.16.2 **The panel recommends that urgent consideration be given to launching a positive action project to increase the number of minority ethnic teachers in the diocese.**

4.17 NATIONAL CURRICULUM

- 4.17.1. The National Curriculum has recently been revised and, although not ideal (some areas still have to be finalised), gives more recognition to the interests and experiences of pupils, parents and members of minority ethnic communities. The Stephen Lawrence Inquiry Report noted the failure of the National Curriculum to reflect adequately the needs of a multicultural and multi-ethnic society, and the disproportionately high number of Black, Asian and other minority ethnic pupils excluded from schools. The Inquiry Report recommended that the National Curriculum should be amended to give greater priority to citizenship education as a means of improving understanding and appreciation of the diverse cultures present in Britain today.
- 4.17.3 **The panel recommends that curriculum planning take account of the ethnicity, background, and language needs of students in all schools and colleges. The panel also recommends that good practice should be identified and shared with all staff and schools within the diocese and that the Church nationally should take up the issue of the content of the National Curriculum with the government.**

4.18 ANTI-RACIST TRAINING FOR GOVERNORS, HEADTEACHERS AND TEACHERS

- 4.18.1 The following quotations from the Stephen Lawrence Inquiry Report seemed to the panel to have particular relevance:

In his evidence during Part 2 of our Inquiry, Chief Constable Burden (South Wales Police) rightly impressed upon us that racism exists within all organisations and institutions, and that it infiltrates the community and starts amongst the very young. Recent research in Cardiff showed that 50% of the racist incidents considered by the Race Equality Council involved young people under 16 years old, and 25% of these incidents involved children between the ages of six and ten years. The problem is thus deeply

ingrained. Radical thinking and sustained action are needed in order to tackle it head on, not just in the Police Service of our country, but in all organisation and in particular in the fields of education and family life (Stephen Lawrence Inquiry Report, paragraph 2.19).

- 4.18.2 Racism, institutional or otherwise is not the prerogative of the Police Service. It is clear that other agencies, including those dealing with housing and education, also suffer from the disease. If racism is to be eradicated there must be specific and co-ordinated action, both within the agencies themselves and by society at large, particularly through the educational system, from pre-primary school upwards and onwards (Stephen Lawrence Inquiry Report, paragraph 6.54).
- 4.18.3 The government accepted that all schools should adopt strategies specifically to prevent racist incidents, including bullying; that teachers should be trained to deal with racist incidents; and that all incidents should be monitored and reported to parents, governors and the local education authority.
- 4.18.4 The government is currently reviewing the training of head-teachers and teachers to ensure that they are aware of cultural differences and are able to respond to the needs of minority ethnic children.
- 4.18.5 **The panel recommends that:**
- (i) **all governors, school board members, teachers, and administrative and ancillary staff undertake anti-racist and cultural awareness training; in the case of teaching staff, this should be done during their Inset training on a regular and 'on going' basis**
 - (ii) **all diocesan schools should be encouraged to adopt clearly stated equal opportunities, anti-racism, anti-racial harassment and anti-bullying policies which have been agreed with staff.**

4.19 ADMISSIONS

- 4.19.1 The Board recommends a twin-track approach to admissions, with places for local children and places for children of Church families. Primary schools tend to be community-based, but there is a lot of pressure on secondary schools for places. The panel was informed that the admissions policy works fairly well. However, the pressure on secondary schools for places could lead to unfair, occasionally discriminatory practices, and the admissions process is not clearly

monitored. Most of the complaints that the Commission for Racial Equality receives in the primary and secondary sectors are in the area of admissions to secondary schools.

- 4.19.2 **The panel recommends that the DBE take further steps to ensure that the admissions process (including selection methods) is fair and equitable to pupils from all ethnic groups in all its schools.**

4.20 EXCLUSIONS

- 4.20.1 Minority ethnic children, particularly African Caribbean boys, are over-represented in the data on exclusions from schools. Permanent exclusions are monitored, but temporary exclusions are not, even though they can lead to permanent exclusion. Temporary exclusion is also used as a form of punishment and the number of pupils temporarily excluded can be quite high. Five years ago, the Board took part in an initiative called 'Shine', a Children's Society project designed to prevent exclusions. Three schools participated, and a full time social worker worked with teachers, parents and young people to try to keep pupils in schools. It is commendable that one of the schools managed to reduce exclusions to zero during one year.

- 4.20.2 A recent OFSTED survey of 48 schools showed that 'only a few primary or secondary schools monitored or analysed pupils' behaviour in relation to ethnic background'. In the case of school exclusion:

... the government has set out its policy for addressing school exclusions in the Social Exclusion Unit's *Truancy and Social Exclusion* report and the legally binding document Circular 10/99 – *Social Inclusion: Pupil Support, The Secretary of State's guidance on pupil attendance, behaviour, exclusions and re-integration for schools, governors and LEAs*. Both documents give a comprehensive account of how schools, governing bodies and LEAs should deal with truancy and exclusion (The Runnymede Trust Briefing Paper, December 1999).

- 4.20.3 **The panel recommends that all diocesan schools systematically monitor temporary and permanent exclusions and pupil behaviour by ethnicity, and that the DBE consider the results and support schools in tackling over-representation of minority ethnic pupil exclusions. The panel also recommends that 'Shine' should be replicated in other schools in the diocese.**

4.21 GOVERNANCE OF SCHOOLS AND COLLEGES

- 4.21.1 The panel reached the conclusion that all aspects of governance, particularly admissions, exclusions, appeals and recruitment, need to be reviewed and made more rigorous. DBE representatives accepted the advice, but pointed out that it could only be put into practice by appointing a full-time officer with specific responsibility for this work.
- 4.21.2 **The panel recommends that consideration should be given to appointing a full-time officer to deal with all aspects of governance. The panel also recommends that the diocese adopt and implement *Learning for All*, the Commission for Racial Equality's standards for racial equality in schools in England and Wales, both at Board level and in schools.**

4.22 MISSION STATEMENT

- 4.22.1 The DBE's mission statement has not been reviewed for some time and contains no reference to diversity.

The panel recommends that the DBE review its mission statement and include a reference to celebrating diversity and meeting the needs of diverse communities.

5. A STRATEGIC APPROACH TO EQUAL OPPORTUNITIES AND POSITIVE ACTION WITHIN THE DIOCESE

5.1 LEADERSHIP AND ACCOUNTABILITY

- 5.1.1 Almost everyone we spoke to said that they had great faith in the episcopal leadership of the diocese. However, it will take more than the honourable intentions of the Bishops to achieve equality of opportunity within the diocese. Other people at senior levels within the diocese will also have to take responsibility in their capacity as leaders. These include Archdeacons, diocesan and Cathedral staff. Accountability can only be ensured when an individual's behaviour is reviewed and action taken if it is not acceptable. One way in which to ensure accountability on the part of senior managers is to incorporate equal opportunities objectives in their work programmes. In order to win commitment to these objectives, it is vital that they are agreed jointly. Senior staff should therefore be encouraged to consider how they can help to implement the equal opportunities policy. Without their dedication and involvement, equal opportunities will never become a reality in the diocese.
- 5.1.2 **The panel recommends that the Diocesan Bishop should have lead responsibility for equal opportunities. A senior Committee or team including the Provost and the heads of Boards and key Committees should be set up and given responsibility for overseeing implementation of the policy. Area Bishops should have specific responsibility for equal opportunities in their areas, and the Personnel Manager responsible for equal opportunities should be integral to the entire process. The team would be expected to have some members in common with the new Committee for Minority Ethnic Anglican Concerns (if approved), who would serve as a link between the two bodies.**

5.2 PERSONAL COMMITMENT

- 5.2.1 People at all levels of the diocese need to play an active and committed role if the equal opportunities and positive action programme is to succeed.
- 5.2.2 **The panel recommends the introduction of a series of equal opportunities courses for all staff on their roles and responsibilities, beginning with the Bishops, the Bishop's Council, the Bishop's staff, the Provost and other senior staff within the structures of the diocese. The aim of the programme should be to ensure that everyone in the diocese understands the equal opportunities policy and what is expected of them.**

5.3 POLICY DEVELOPMENT

- 5.3.1 The diocese should develop a framework of equality standards to ensure consistent practice, treatment, behaviour and decision-making. The introduction of formal policies and procedures covering all aspects of the diocesan life will help to create an environment where change and development are not seen as threatening or hostile. The diocese's policies, practices, and procedures should be formulated to ensure that they comply with the highest standards of good equal opportunities practice. Areas to be covered should include:
- (i) recruitment and selection processes
 - (ii) training courses
 - (iii) admissions (vocational training)
 - (iv) positive action initiatives
 - (v) assessments
 - (vi) ethnic monitoring
 - (vii) harassment, discipline and grievance procedures.
- 5.3.2 Each of these activities will require individual policies and procedures, but they should all be developed and implemented within the framework of the diocese's equal opportunities programme. The policies must reinforce the diocese's needs and must in turn be guided by its priorities. The Joint Equal Opportunities Policy in Church House will be a useful resource here.

5.4 ACTION PLAN

- 5.4.1 Implementation of the policies and procedures should be approached through an action plan, designed to cover the entire diocese. The plan should include the following:
- (i) who has overall responsibility for equal opportunities
 - (ii) the purpose of each policy and the outcomes expected from each organisational area
 - (iii) the names of officers responsible for implementing various initiatives within the action plan
 - (iv) the individual responsibilities and expectations associated with implementation of the action plan
 - (v) training for senior officers and other staff, where needed
 - (vi) timescales and budgets for specific initiatives and for the action plan as a whole.

5.5 EQUAL OPPORTUNITIES TRAINING

5.5.1 Training will have a vital role to play in helping to achieve equality of opportunity within the diocese. Without it, the culture of the diocese is unlikely to change. The Training Department should be able to undertake the training programme, once the trainers have themselves taken the relevant training courses for trainers. To be effective, the training programme will also need to draw substantially on minority ethnic support.

5.5.2 **The panel recommends three types of training:**

- (i) ***Training for officers responsible for policy development and implementation. The broad aim of this training should be to provide officers with the skills to develop and implement policies. The course should include equal opportunities training, especially for those involved in recruitment and selection.***
- (ii) ***Training to change the culture of the organisation. Whereas policies and procedures provide direction and method for an organisation, individual attitudes can only be shifted through gradual but fundamental change in the overall culture***

of the organisation. Officers need to be equipped with the basic competencies for management in a multicultural organisation. This can only be achieved by raising their awareness (and self-awareness) through discussions of ethnic and cultural diversity, and through an examination of attitudes and responses to workplace situations that can lead, however unintentionally, to discriminatory treatment.

- (iii) *Training to empower people from minority ethnic communities.* The panel believes there may be a place for such training, although it needs to be carefully thought through. For example, the diocese has a number of further education colleges, and it may be possible to work closely with them to offer training courses for people from minority ethnic communities who need to develop their skills and acquire self confidence and respect for their talents and abilities. Mentoring programmes offer another approach. The panel acknowledges, however, that although the diocese has a fair number of minority ethnic Anglicans who play prominent roles in their communities, these individuals are not similarly involved in the church.

5.6 MANAGING THE EQUAL OPPORTUNITIES PROGRAMME

- 5.6.1 The newly appointed diocesan Personnel Manager has overall responsibility for equal opportunities within the diocese. The panel is concerned that one person should be expected to cover every aspect of the programme and suggests that the role needs to be more specifically defined. It should also be made clear that the Manager can call on support and resources from the diocese through the proposed senior Committee team. Senior staff must establish the aims and objectives of the diocese in relation to equal opportunities and take responsibility for the operation of the policy.
- 5.6.2 Management of the policy will include:
 - (i) developing an equal opportunities action plan based on clearly defined aims

- (ii) implementing the equal opportunities action plan
- (iii) coordinating initiatives (both locally and in the diocese at large)
- (iv) regular reviews of the equal opportunities action plan and the equal opportunities policy.

6. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

- 6.1 Following the Stephen Lawrence Inquiry Report which asked ‘every institution to examine their policies and the outcome of their policies and practices to guard against disadvantaging any section of our communities’, the Diocese of Southwark is one of the first institutions, and certainly the first Church institution, to have taken up the challenge. The Bishops are to be commended on this initiative, and we hope that other institutions, inside and outside the Churches, will follow their lead.
- 6.2 However, it became apparent from the panel’s inquiries that the Diocese of Southwark cannot fully ensure equality of opportunity within its structures without also making a formal commitment to equal opportunities as an employer and in its role as a provider of services. Thus the panel’s recommendations focus not only on statutory compliance but also on ways in which the diocese can actively embrace cultural diversity as an employer and as an institution, in order to widen participation and be more inclusive of people from different ethnic, cultural and social backgrounds. The panel recommends that the diocese adopt a strategic approach to equal opportunities, including positive action and empowerment of minority ethnic communities, and ensure that it is implemented.

THE PANEL’S RECOMMENDATIONS

Under-representation of minority ethnic Anglicans within the structures of the diocese

- 6.3 The Bishop’s Council, in consultation with the new Diocesan Committee for Minority Ethnic Anglican Concerns (if approved, see 6.35), should take prompt action to deal with the issue of minority ethnic under-representation (See 4.2.2)
- 6.4 A register of people from minority ethnic communities should be developed, listing details of their experience and skills. In time, as positions become vacant, it should become relatively

easy to check whether there are suitable candidates and to invite them to put themselves forward for consideration for election. Bishops and Archdeacons, as well as the Black Forum, should be involved in compiling the register. (See 4.2.6)

- 6.5 Minority ethnic Anglicans should be encouraged to register on the electoral roll. (See 4.2.6)
- 6.6 The diocese should consult Operation Black Vote on ways of improving minority ethnic participation. (See 4.2.4)
- 6.7 The diocese should consider drawing up a 'menu' of core skills, experiences and backgrounds required for particular appointments, and, if necessary, provide training in those skills. (see 4.5.2)

PCCs, Deanery Synod, Diocesan Synod, Boards and Committees

- 6.8 The diocese should consider adopting new measures to encourage minority ethnic representatives to serve on PCCs. (See 4.3.2)
- 6.9 In the short term, the diocese should consider co-opting minority ethnic representatives with the requisite skills and experience on to Boards, Committees and other bodies and giving them the support they need to succeed, including proper induction to the work of the relevant Board or Committee and the role of members. (See 4.3.2)
- 6.10 The diocese should consider a more flexible and open approach to appointing lay persons to Boards and Committees, including the introduction of non-geographical forms of representation. Appointment or co-option of at least two minority ethnic representatives would help to avoid isolation and reluctance to contribute. (See 4.3.2)

Ordained ministry

- 6.11 Parish clergy, higher and further education chaplains and Bishops, too, should play a much more active role in identifying, supporting and encouraging minority ethnic Anglicans for vocation. (See 4.4.5)
- 6.12 The diocese should set achievable and measurable targets as a means of increasing the proportion of minority ethnic Anglicans entering ministry. (See 4.4.5)

- 6.13 The diocese should commission periodic surveys of the parishes, involving relevant bodies such as the Black Forum and the Race Relations Commission (or any successor body), in order to appreciate and take on board the views and concerns of all the communities in the diocese. (See 4.4.5)

Deaneries

- 6.14 All deaneries should consider factors that have inhibited minority ethnic people in the past and take action to remove any unjustified barriers. (See 4.5.2)
- 6.15 The diocese should consider introducing electoral arrangements that offer the widest possible opportunity for electing minority ethnic candidates. Consideration should be given to having more co-options, although this should be a short term solution only. (See 4.5.2)

Equal opportunities

- 6.16 The diocese should review its present equal opportunities policy and consider introducing and implementing a new programme aimed at influencing and ultimately changing the culture of the diocese to one where greater participation and involvement by people from widely different ethnic, cultural and social backgrounds becomes the norm. (See 4.6.2)
- 6.17 The Diocesan Bishop should have lead responsibility for equal opportunities. A senior Committee or team, including the heads of Boards and key Committees, should be set up and given responsibility for overseeing the implementation of the policy. Area Bishops should have specific responsibility for equal opportunities in their areas, and the Personnel Manager responsible for equal opportunities should be integral to the entire process. (See 5.1.2)
- 6.18 A series of equal opportunities courses for all staff on their roles and responsibilities, beginning with the Bishops, the Bishop's Council, the Bishop's staff, the Provost and other senior staff within the structures of the diocese. The aim of the programme should be to ensure that everyone in the diocese understands the equal opportunities policy and what is expected of them. (See 5.2.2)
- 6.19 The diocese should endorse the Wood-Sheppard Principles, include them in its action plan and actively encourage companies in which the diocese invests, and with which it has

purchasing, construction or other contracts, also to endorse the Principles and put them into practice. (See 4.9.8)

Recruitment and training of parish clergy

- 6.20 Job descriptions and person profiles for clergy appointments should contain standard diocesan requirements on the qualities and proven abilities needed for effective service to the wider community. Parishes may then add their own particular requirements. (See 4.7.2)
- 6.21 Consideration should be given to introducing a procedure for recruiting clergy that is consistent with the principles of racial equality and the highest standards of equal opportunities practice. (See 4.7.3)
- 6.22 Consideration should be given to the following questions
- (i) should the Church remain exempt from the Race Relations Act 1976?
 - (ii) should the government be petitioned for change in the legislation?
 - (iii) should the system of patronage be changed? (See 4.7.3)
- 6.23 Parish clergy and those in other ministries should receive special training in racism awareness and cultural diversity as part of their post-ordination, in-service and lay training. Consideration should also be given to providing a short course on these issues for clergy arriving in multicultural parishes for the first time. (See 4.7.5)
- 6.24 Some dioceses have developed resource packs for clergy on minority ethnic issues as well as interfaith matters which have proved very helpful. The panel recommends that resource packs could be developed for the diocese by the Continuing Ministerial Education and Post Ordination Training Unit in collaboration with the Race Relations Advisers. (See 4.10.4)

Minority ethnic clergy

- 6.25 With respect to Vocations, the diocese should set up a robust programme of strategies to encourage minority ethnic Anglicans to explore ordained ministry. This should involve parish clergy, Diocesan Directors of Ordinands, Vocations Advisers, Vocations Guidance Units and the Urban Ministry

Adviser, and could be initiated by the new Diocesan Committee for Minority Ethnic Anglican Concerns (if approved). (See 4.8.5)

- 6.26 The diocese should raise the question of setting a target for a suitable number of minority ethnic selectors at national level. (See 4.8.6)

Ethnic monitoring

- 6.27 Every effort should be made to ensure that a system for collecting ethnic origin data is in place before 2002, and that reports are submitted annually on it thereafter. The monitoring information obtained should then be considered, initially, by the new Diocesan Committee for Minority Ethnic Concerns (if approved), before being passed on to the decision-making bodies in the diocese for regular review and appropriate action. (See 4.9.6)

Training

- 6.28 Consideration needs to be given to appropriate training. Training needs should be identified and incorporated within the interest of the diocese equal opportunities programme. This means that different kinds of equality training will be needed at different certain stages and for different groups of people. Most importantly, all training should be tailored to its purpose; that is, to enable the course participants to undertake their responsibilities efficiently, effectively and with absolute fairness. (See 4.10.3)
- 6.29 The panel recommends four types of training:
- (i) *Training for officers responsible for policy development and implementation.* The broad aim of this training should be to provide officers with the skills to develop and implement policies. The course should include equal opportunities training, especially for those involved in recruitment and selection. (See 5.5.2)
 - (ii) *Training to change the culture of the organisation.* Whereas policies and procedures provide direction and method for an organisation, individual attitudes can only be shifted through gradual but fundamental change in the overall culture of the organisation. Officers need to be equipped with the basic competencies for management in a multicultural organisation. This can only be achieved by raising their

awareness (and self-awareness) through discussions of ethnic and cultural diversity, and through an examination of attitudes and responses to workplace situations that can lead, however unintentionally, to discriminatory treatment. (See 5.5.2)

- (iii) *Training to empower people from minority ethnic communities.* The panel believes there may be a place for such training, although it needs to be carefully thought through. For example, the diocese has a number of FE colleges, and it may be possible to work closely with them to offer training courses for people from minority ethnic communities who need to develop their skills and to acquire self confidence and respect for their talents and abilities. Mentoring programmes offer another approach. The panel acknowledges, however, that although the diocese has a fair number of minority ethnic Anglicans who play prominent roles in their communities, they are not similarly involved in the church. (See 5.5.2 and 6.32)
- (iv) *The need for an effective ecumenical training agency in this field.* The diocese should raise this at national level (in the churches) with those responsible for racial justice issues.

Increasing minority ethnic participation within the diocese

- 6.30 Bishops and other diocesan leaders should themselves undertake anti-racist training as they prepare to encourage others to do the same. (See 4.11.7)
- 6.31 The Black Forum, in conjunction with Area Race Relations Advisers and the proposed new Committee for Minority Ethnic Anglican Concerns (see 6.34) should further develop 'empowerment training' and mentoring for minority ethnic communities in the diocese. (See 4.11.7)
- 6.32 The Committee for Minority Ethnic Anglican Concerns should begin setting targets for various aspects of diocesan life (where this is appropriate), including the recruitment of clergy. (See 4.11.7)
- 6.33 The role of the Urban Ministry Development Adviser should be reviewed, to compliment his excellent work with more overt responsibility for encouraging participation in leadership by people from minority ethnic communities. (See 4.11.7)

Southwark Race Relations Commission

6.34 To take forward the work of the Commission, the panel recommends the establishment of a Diocesan Committee for Minority Ethnic Anglican Concerns, for an initial three-year term, subject to review after 27 months. The Committee should have clear and focused terms of reference, to be set by the Bishop's Council in consultation with the retiring Race Relations Commission. These should include the following:

- (i) to work with and influence the diocesan structures at all levels, promote racial justice concerns and ensure that the programme for 'empowerment' of minority ethnic communities and educational work with schools and parishes continues
- (ii) to monitor an Action Plan drawn up on the basis of the panel's report
- (iii) to implement relevant points from Towards an Agenda for Action for the Church of England
- (iv) to organise an ongoing programme of 'sensitivity meetings' between the leadership team, senior clergy and minority ethnic representatives, including young people
- (v) to review the diocesan equal opportunities policy and practice and consider drawing up a new policy.

The Committee should be chaired by a Bishop and its membership should include at least two Area Race Relations Advisers, the Diocesan Secretary, the Personnel Manager and representation from the old Race Relations Commission, the Black Forum organising Committee and key areas in the diocesan structures. Two of its members should be under 25 years old. To be effective, the Committee would need an office and a full-time executive officer. (See 4.12.5)

Young people

6.35 Particular attention should be given to finding ways of attracting minority ethnic young people in the diocese into the Church. If having local Youth Ministers, (where these can be afforded) would help to achieve this, then serious consideration should be given to the idea. If not, it is crucial to consider what other appropriate action should be taken. The Race Relations Commission has developed an impressive programme of work with young people and should be consulted. (See 4.13.2)

Parishes

- 6.36 Local clergy should find ways of encouraging minority ethnic Anglicans to explore a wide range of ministries. (See 4.14.2)
- 6.37 Parishes should undertake audits every three years, to check on their progress in the area of race relations and minority ethnic representation and participation in lay representation and ministry. *Seeds of Hope in the Parish*, the study pack, can be very helpful in undertaking this exercise, as it offers parishes and PCCs, whatever the size of their minority ethnic Anglican population, strategies for discussion and action both in the parish and in the wider community. (See 4.14.2)
- 6.38 Archdeacons should consider involving minority ethnic representatives in their regular visitations. (See 4.14.2)
- 6.39 All parishes should observe Racial Justice Sunday every September. (See 4.14.2)

Board of Education

- 6.40 The revised version of the guidance, *Colour and Spice*, should incorporate the advice on auditing and action planning in *Learning for All: Racial equality standards for schools*, which was published by the Commission for Racial Equality in February 2000. (See 4.15.3)
- 6.41 Consideration should be given to developing a positive action initiative to recruit more minority ethnic Board members. Given the ethnic make-up of diocesan schools, co-option may be the best solution. All Board members, new and old, should receive thorough equal opportunities training. (See 4.15.6)
- 6.42 Funds should be actively sought for the initiative by the Board of Education to second an minority ethnic teacher for one year as a matter of priority, possibly through sponsorship. (See 4.15.9)
- 6.43 The DBE should address the issues raised in the Stephen Lawrence Inquiry Report and consider their implications for education in Southwark's Church schools. The paper 'Towards an Agenda for Action for the Church of England' would be helpful as a reference. (See 4.15.9)
- 6.44 Urgent consideration should be given to launching a positive action project to increase the number of minority ethnic teachers in the diocese. (See 4.16.2)

- 6.45 Curriculum planning should take account of the ethnicity, background, and language needs of students in all schools and colleges. Good practice should be identified and shared with all staff and schools within the diocese and the Church nationally should take up the issue of the content of the National Curriculum with the government. (See 4.17.3)
- 6.46 All governors, school board members, teachers and administrative and ancillary staff should undertake anti-racist and cultural awareness training. In the case of teaching staff, this should be done during their Inset training on a regular and 'on going' basis. (See 4.18.5)
- 6.47 All the diocesan schools should be encouraged to adopt equal opportunities, anti-racist, anti-racial harassment and anti-bullying policies that have been agreed with staff. (See 4.18.5)
- 6.48 The DBE should take steps to ensure that the admissions process (including selection methods) is fair and equitable to pupils from all ethnic groups in all its schools. (See 4.19.2)
- 6.49 All the diocesan schools should systematically monitor temporary and permanent exclusions and pupil behaviour by ethnicity, consider the results, and support schools in tackling over-representation of minority ethnic pupil exclusions. The Children's Society's 'Shine' project should be replicated in other schools in the diocese. (See 4.20.3)
- 6.50 Consideration should be given to appointing a full-time person to deal with all aspects of governance. The panel also recommends that the diocese adopt and implement *Learning for All*, the Commission for Racial Equality's standards for racial equality in schools in England and Wales, both at Board level and in schools. (See 4.21.2)
- 6.51 The DBE should review its mission statement and include a reference to celebrating diversity and meeting the needs of diverse communities. (See 4.22.2)

APPENDIX 1 : THE INTERVIEWEES

The Revd John Gooden – Diocesan Adviser in Rural Ministry and Rector of Chipstead, St Margaret.

Mr Chris Chapman – Diocesan Urban Ministry Development Adviser and Lay Training Adviser in the Woolwich Area Mission Team.

The Revd Tunde Roberts – Assistant Curate at Mitcham, St Barnabas (now Priest-in-Charge, Woodbury Down, St Olave).

The Revd Canon David Painter – Diocesan Director of Ordinands (now Archdeacon of Oakham).

Ven Douglas Bartles-Smith – Archdeacon of Southwark.

Mr Ralph Straker – Race Relations Adviser in the Kingston Area Mission Team.

Ms Debbie Welch – Adviser on Ethnic Minority Concerns in the Woolwich Area Mission Team.

The Revd Lukas Wanjie – Race Relations Adviser in the Croydon Area Mission Team.

The Revd Canon Bruce Saunders – Canon Missioner for Church in Society.

Mrs Linda Borthwick – Director, Southwark Diocesan Board of Education.

The Revd Canon Ivor Smith-Cameron – Honorary Curate at Battersea Fields, All Saints.

Ms Vasantha Gnanadoss – member of General Synod.

The Revd Dr Alan Gadd – Curate-in-Charge at Battersea Fields, All Saints.

The Revd Geoff Mason – Ministry Development Adviser and OLM Selection Officer.

North Lambeth Parish Youth Group.

Rt Revd Dr Wilfred Wood – Bishop of Croydon.

Note: The list is in order of interview

Ms Steph Blackwell – Urban Projects/CUF Adviser.

The Revd Cecil Heatley – Rural Dean of Dulwich and Vicar of Peckham, St Saviour.

The Revd Canon David Peacock – Chair, Southwark Diocesan Board of Education.

Ms Sharon Findlater and Mr Raymond Erijivo.

Mrs Lesley Morrison – Head of St Martin-in the-Fields High School for Girls

The Revd Peter Wells – Chair, Equal Opportunities Development Group and Team Vicar in the North Lambeth Team Ministry.

The Rt Revd Colin Buchanan – Bishop of Woolwich.

The Rt Revd Peter Price – Bishop of Kingston.

Ven David Gerrard – Archdeacon of Wandsworth.

Mr Simon Parton – Diocesan Secretary.

APPENDIX 2: RACE RELATIONS WORK IN SOUTHWARK DIOCESE, 1969–2000

**by The Rt. Revd Dr Wilfred
Wood, Bishop of Croydon**

1. The context is important. There was, in the mid-sixties, an upsurge of discontent on the part of black people around the world with the racial injustice that was the normal state of affairs. White racism responded with even greater viciousness. In South Africa, apartheid armed white police officers to shoot and killed unarmed black children at Sharpeville and imprisoned hundreds, including Nelson Mandela. In Rhodesia, Ian Smith, declaiming that not in a thousand years could there be black majority rule in that country, preferred instead in 1965, the illegal Declaration of Independence; while in the USA black people were set upon with dogs and water hoses when they stood in queues to register to vote. Many of them were murdered, including Martin Luther King in 1968. Here in Britain, Enoch Powell's racist speeches, and the National Front with a sea of Union Jacks commandeering the streets for their regular marches, escorted by hundreds of police, were bringing racists out of each social class's woodwork. Black immigrants from the Caribbean, Africa and the Indian sub-continent, conditioned by years of colonial education to be proud of their Britishness, were bewildered to find themselves regarded as some kind of virus in the nation's bloodstream. They were encountering racism and bigotry at work, in the street, and in the church, and their children were being ground down by it in the schools. The fork-tongued approach of the Government was (a) to impose more and more restrictions on so-called 'coloured immigration', and (b) to initiate a race relations 'employment profession' to help with the assimilation of 'those already here'. The first was to appease the racists and the second was a sop to liberal-minded people who were ashamed of the racism in their society, as well as to head off any USA type, Civil Rights Movement not controlled by Government. With no friends in the corridors of power and little voice in the media or elsewhere, black people were suffering out of sight.

2. This was the context when, in 1969, Bishop Mervyn Stockwood appointed Revd. David Sheppard, the Bishop of Woolwich. He soon identified race relations in South London as one of the most pressing issues for the Church's work. A Race Relations Group, under the Council for Social Aid, was set up, with members such as the Revd. Bob Nind, Canon Mick Pinder, and Revd. Andrew Grant and others, with Revd. Jack Pawsey later joined by Horace Parkinson, a black youngster from Brixton as its workers. Bishop Sheppard was also instrumental in the recruitment of Ivor Smith-Cameron as Diocesan Missioner, and in 1974, myself as an incumbent in the diocese.

3. When in 1975 Bishop David Sheppard was transferred to Liverpool, his successor, Michael Marshall, while having personal friends in the Tory hierarchy was no less an opponent of racist bigotry. He did not shrink from confronting on radio and in the newspapers Martin Webster and other National Front publicists who were being given a considerable amount of publicity, and he was most supportive of the black community at the time of the New Cross fire when thirteen young black people died at a party when the house was set on fire. When the National Front staged a demonstration in Lewisham and the Churches mounted a counter march, Bishop Mervyn Stockwood led the march alongside the Mayor of Lewisham. The Diocesan Synod passed a strong motion proposed by Bishop Hugh Montefiore, Bishop of Kingston, affirming the worth and rights of black people in British society.

4. The Revd. Keith Sutton became Bishop of Kingston in 1978 and Bishop Ronnie Bowlby Bishop of the diocese in 1980. Both are champions of racial justice, and it fell to the former to pilot through Diocesan Synod a motion setting up in 1983 the Southwark Diocese Race Relations Commission with a director, two field workers and an administrative secretary. The Commission reported directly to the Bishop's Council, which appointed its members, six of them on the nomination of the three Area Bishops. In 1983, David Udo was appointed its first director, with Doug Pescod, a young white man, and Edna Reynolds, a young black woman, as the other two workers. The latter two served for just over four years before leaving to further their careers. It could be argued that in the pursuit of racial justice the Bishops were well ahead of the remainder of the diocese.

5. One serious drawback to the Commission's work was the failure to provide it with adequate self-contained premises. It was not always a welcome tenant in shared premises, but persevered in visits to parishes and schools trying to get parishes to see racial justice as integral to the Gospel and a matter of priority for their programmes. David Udo had come from Nigeria in the early 1960's to train as a Methodist

Minister, but events in that eye-opening decade caused him to switch to be a school teacher in Brixton instead. Like myself he was unshakeable in his conviction that the stability and security of the black community are the key to good race relations in this country with young people helped to be at ease with both their ethnic identity and their citizenship. The education of the majority community would follow from this and from the presentation of racial justice as a Gospel imperative rather than from an agenda which avoided constructive engagement or disturbing people's unwitting prejudices. This approach pleased neither those who expected a church version of official race relations organisations, nor those who thought there was no need for such a Commission in the Church at all, even though there were riots in Brixton and young men were being murdered in various parts of this diocese. It did not help that in the Thatcherite eighties a multi-ethnic Britain was not at the top of the political or public agenda. The 'Race Relations Industry', as it was sneeringly called, struggled for survival as jobs and Committees were abolished. General Synod decided that, of the 61 recommendations from the Archbishop's Commission on Urban Priority Areas, the only one that was unacceptable was the proposal for a Commission for Black Anglican Concerns! Later it also rejected a proposal for a minimum of 24 black members in a total of over 550. Church and State seemed to be at one. Context is always important.

6. During the life of the Commission there have been several re-orderings of Social Responsibility work in the diocese, but each time apart from the freezing of a post as an economy measure, the Commission had been allowed to retain its structure and its direct accountability to the Bishop's Council. However, in 1996 a Committee examining the Boards and Committees of the diocese recommended that there should be a race relations worker on each Area Team and that the post of Director of the Race Relations Commission should be abolished. There would be no provision made for a budget for the Commission or for its administrative or secretarial support. In 1998 soon after the motion which would effect these changes was passed in Diocesan Synod, David Udo resigned.

7. At the present time, each Area Team has been ordered to dispense with a full-time worker. It is therefore not impossible that before long there will be no Race Relations Commission and no full-time race relations workers in the diocese.

APPENDIX 3: MEMBERSHIP OF DIOCESAN BODIES

| Body/Committee | Approximate current membership | How elected | Number of minority ethnic members | % Minority ethnic members |
|---------------------------------------|--------------------------------|---|-----------------------------------|---------------------------|
| Diocesan Synod | 218 | Members elected from Deanery Synods. | - | 10% |
| Deanery Synods | See appendix 3a | | | |
| Bishop's Council | 33 | Members elected from Diocesan Synod. | 4 | 12% |
| Board of Finance | 46 (4 vacancies) | Elected by Deanery Synods (but not necessarily members of Deanery Synod). | 0 | 0% |
| Board of Education | 46 | Members elected by and from Deanery Synods. | 3 | 7% |
| Schools Committee | 18 | | 1 | 6% |
| Finance & General Purposes | 16 | | 0 | 0% |
| Higher Education Committee | 15 | | 2 | 13% |
| Further Education Committee | 16 | | 2 | 13% |
| Board for Church in Society | 50 (13 vacancies) | Elected by Deanery Synods (but not necessarily members of Deanery Synod). | 4 | 8% |
| World Mission & Development Group | 19 | Volunteer | 1 | 5% |
| Equal Opportunities Development Group | 5 | Volunteer | 1 | 20% |
| Inter Faith Group | 12 | Volunteer | 3 | 25% |
| Urban Mission & Development Group | 8 | Volunteer | 2 | 25% |
| Church Urban Fund Committee | 8 | Elected | 2 | 25% |
| Liturgical Committee | 14 | | 1 | 7% |
| Race Relations Commission | Did not respond | | | |

| | | | | |
|--------------------------------------|-----------------|--|----|-----|
| Urban Umbrella | 15 | Staff group | 3 | 20% |
| Social Responsibility Cluster | 14 | Staff group | 3 | 20% |
| Faith in the Countryside Group | 8 | | 0 | 0% |
| Millennium Group | 10 | Volunteers | 1 | 10% |
| Children & Young People Committee | 3 | Currently being reconstituted | 0 | 0% |
| Evangelism Resources Group | 12 | Volunteers | 0 | 0% |
| Ministry & Training Policy Committee | 15 | Appointed by various Boards | 1 | 7% |
| SPA Council | 12 | Appointed/Elected by SPAs | 0 | 0% |
| Readers' Board | Did not respond | | | |
| SPAs (Trained) | 135 | N/A | 10 | 7% |
| SPAs (In training) | 32 | N/A | 6 | 19% |
| Readers | 363 | N/A | 17 | 5% |
| Pastoral Committee | 27 | Elected from Archdeaconry Pastoral Committees. | 2 | 7% |
| Advisory Committee | 30 | Appointed by Bishop's Council. | 0 | 0% |

APPENDIX 3A: MEMBERSHIP OF DEANERY SYNODS

CROYDON EPISCOPAL AREA

Croydon Archdeaconry % minority ethnic members

| | |
|-------------------|-----------|
| Croydon Addington | 9% |
| Croydon Central | 4% |
| Croydon South | 2% |
| Croydon North | 19% |
| Sutton | No return |

Reigate Archdeaconry

| | |
|----------|-----------|
| Caterham | 0% |
| Godstone | No return |
| Reigate | No return |

KINGSTON EPISCOPAL AREA

Lambeth Archdeaconry

| | |
|-----------|-----------|
| Brixton | 82% |
| Clapham | 9% |
| Lambeth | No return |
| Merton | 12% |
| Streatham | No return |

Wandsworth Archdeaconry

| | |
|---------------------|-----------|
| Battersea | 25% |
| Kingston | No return |
| Richmond and Barnes | 2% |
| Tooting | No return |
| Wandsworth | 7% |

WOOLWICH EPISCOPAL AREA

Lewisham Archdeaconry % minority ethnic members

Deptford 19%

East Lewisham 17%

Greenwich South 2%

Greenwich Thameside 3%

West Lewisham 18%

Southwark Archdeaconry

Bermondsey 7%

Camberwell 23%

Dulwich 11%

Southwark and Newington 14%

APPENDIX 4: THE WOOD-SHEPPARD PRINCIPLES

Companies wishing to support Race Equality in Employment are asked to give general endorsement to these Principles; to work progressively towards their implementation and be willing to provide a modest response annually on their progress. The Principles are a model for Positive Action and do not imply any form of 'positive discrimination'.

1. Adopt a detailed Equal Opportunities Policy (EOP), preferably with assistance from the Commission for Racial Equality (CRE) or similar body.
2. Declare a clear intention to increase the representation of the Black and minority ethnic population in the workforce, wherever they are under-represented in relation to the local community.
3. Undertake Positive Action to improve the proportion of minorities in the workforce, to offset any imbalance caused by historical discrimination in the wider society.
4. Practise effective ethnic monitoring of the EOP, with a regular review.
5. Use fair recruitment and selection processes, with clear objective criteria, and avoid reliance on 'word of mouth' or family contact methods.
6. Evolve comprehensive training opportunities, both for those carrying out the policy and for potential recruits and employees from the Black and minority communities, integrated where possible but separate if necessary, and focused on enabling the latter to fulfil their potential.
7. When all departments or divisions of the company or group do not yet have EOP fully operational, designate an Equal Opportunities Manager, who shall be responsible for assisting line managers to draw up an action plan; this should be linked to business needs and aimed at maximising the benefits of a diverse workforce, and for ensuring the policy, its monitoring and the related practices are carried through.

8. Make racial and religious harassment or discrimination – verbal, non-verbal or physical – serious offences under the company’s disciplinary code, to be fully and properly investigated by a panel which includes Black/minority representation wherever possible, this information to be clearly publicised in the company’s terms and conditions of employment.
9. Publish an annual employee profile by ethnic origin, gender and grade within the company in relation to the Annual Report and use this to enhance the company’s image as a progressive employer.
10. Consider making one Board member responsible for the overseeing of the EOP monitoring, and seek actively for a professionally qualified minority ethnic Board member.

Race Equality in Employment

These principles in the name of Bishop David Sheppard and Bishop Wilfred Wood, have been drawn up and published by the Churches Commission for Racial Justice and the Race Equality in Employment Project.

REEP

C/o Christ Church
27 Blackfriars Road
London SE1 8NY

APPENDIX 5: STORIES AND SNIPPETS FROM THE INTERVIEWS

THE GOOD

1. Southwark Diocese was the first diocese to set up a Race Relations Commission, with properly paid staff. This has led to the diocese being much more aware than it might otherwise have been of race issues. It has also meant that many Anglicans and others in local churches and schools have been able to avail themselves of training opportunities, which they might otherwise not have had. The Commission has created a Black Forum, which is now an impressive annual gathering in the diocese, and a Youth Initiative, which included a visit by an all-black group to meet young people in Zimbabwe.
2. One parish church has developed its own 'Guidelines for Speakers', to assist those coming to preach or speak. The guidelines remind speakers that language can be alienating for some people, for example words such as 'mankind', 'immigrant' and a 'black day'. Jokes, it says, sometimes help the congregation not to fall asleep, but they should avoid negative stereotyping about minorities or the elderly or those with disabilities. The guidelines also urge preachers to be aware of the wide diversity of family life among those listening, and not to assume that all are engaged in 'normal family life'. Preachers are also encouraged to use multiethnic images wherever possible, and when inviting readers or others to assist in worship to remember to choose with diversity in mind. This church also has its own equal opportunities statement.
3. One of the diocesan staff has drawn together a group called 'Understanding and Affirming African Christians'. This enables a number of clergy and lay Christians of African origin to meet, in company with sympathetic white people who are willing to listen and learn. This enables the black Christians to share experiences and support one another, and the white Christians to hear the problems they face and the means used to deal with these problems. The white Christians can begin to understand the differences in black spirituality

and the reasons why some African Christians go to Anglican services in the mornings and Pentecostal services later in the day.

THE NOT SO GOOD

1. An African priest who came to the diocese in the mid-70s and – as an accountant – became a church treasurer and churchwarden, eventually took the Southwark Ordination Course and became a non-stipendiary minister. He then decided to become stipendiary and in 1996 was appointed a curate. He was elected to the Bishop's Council and served on the Race Relations Commission, the Black Forum and the Stipends and Budgets Review Committee. When vacancies arose for priests in 1998 he began to discuss appointments, but was unsuccessful within the diocese. During this interview with the panel the priest listed the tiny numbers of black and other minority ethnic communities in the decision making bodies of the diocese and remarked, apropos of black people: 'Why are we in this Church?' This priest has now been recruited by another diocese.

2. A senior member of the diocese, who is from an minority ethnic community and sits on the general Synod, told the panel of her experiences at the time that the new diocesan Bishop was being appointed. As a member of the Vacancy-in-See Committee, she pointed out that the new Bishop would need to be someone who had prolonged experience of multi-cultural, multi-racial and multi-faith affairs. She was treated as though she was wasting time. When she quoted from the guidance notes for the election of four representatives on the Crown Appointments Commission the reminder that those elected should represent a balance of interests, she was brushed aside, both by the Committee Chair and other senior white clergy present. Four white male clergy were elected. Her efforts to include the importance of minority ethnic representation in the Statement of Needs in relation to the new Bishop were rejected by the former diocesan secretary, who was not even a member of the Drafting Committee, but simply its secretary. Her contribution was only included when a senior white clergyman supported her. Minority ethnic representatives only being heard when white clergy support them is a common experience among those who sit on Boards and Committees.

3. In an interview with young black people in one parish it became clear that, in spite of support from the clergy, they found it very difficult to get older white people to listen to their hopes and aspirations. They were treated paternalistically as dreamers rather than young adults with a faith and a passion to put that faith into practice. In this parish the drama group did an Easter play. Jesus and the disciples

were mainly white, Judas and the bad characters mainly black. The undertones of this were raised with the group, but they refused to see it as a problem. The young people commented that, because they are so few black priests, their contemporaries did not see the priesthood as in any way a proper job for a black person. This means they have to cut themselves off from their peer group and their culture, if they want to consider ordination.

4. The young people also noted that, when a congregation becomes mainly black, white people start to leave for other neighbourhood churches, thus reducing the proportion of white people in the congregation.

APPENDIX 6: RESOURCES

PUBLICATIONS

Advisory Board of Ministry. *Integration and Assessment: An interim evaluation of college and course responses to ACCM Paper No. 22*. 1992

Black Anglican Celebration for the Decade of Evangelism. *Roots and Wings: A report of the Black Anglican Celebration for the Decade of Evangelism*. 1994

Catholic Youth Services. *Racial Justice*. National Youth Sunday Resource Pack. 1996

Childline. *Children and Racism*. 1996

Churches Together in England. *Report of a Working Party on the Sharing and Sale of Church Buildings*. London Office. 1993

Churches' Commission for Racial Justice. *One Race: A study pack for churches on racial violence*. 1994. Available from 35 Lower Marsh, London SE1 7RL

Churches' Commission for Racial Justice. *We Belong to One Another*. Study packs for Racial Justice Sunday. 1995 - 1999

Commission for Racial Equality. (**website: <http://www.cre.gov.uk>**)
The Commission has published a variety of statutory and non-statutory publications on the prevention of racial discrimination and the promotion of equal opportunities and good race relations. These include: codes of practice, reports of formal investigations, good practice guides and racial equality standards for employers, local government, schools (in England and Wales) and providers of services for young people. A publications catalogue is available from Central Books, 99 Wallis Road, London E9 5LN (☎ 0208 986 5488; fax: 0208-533 5821). A full list of publications is also posted at the Commission's website, together with a selection of downloadable texts.

Committee for Black Anglican Concerns. *Seeds of Hope: Report of a survey on combating racism in the Diocese of the Church of England*. 1991.

Committee for Minority Ethnic Anglican Concerns. *Seeds of Hope in the Parish*. Study pack. Church House Publishing. 1996

- Committee for Minority Ethnic Anglican Concerns. *The Passing Winter: Sequel to 'Seeds of Hope'*. Church House Publishing. 1996
- Derbyshire, Helen. *Not in Norfolk: Tackling the invisibility of racism..* . Norfolk and Norwich Race Equality Council. 1994.
- Dalech, Mohamed, supported by The Countryside Agency. *Challenging Racism in the Rural Idyll*. Devon Learning Resources. 1999
- Gaine, Chris. *Still no Problem Here*. BPC Wheatons Ltd. Exeter. 1995.
- Haslam, David. *Race for the Millennium: A challenge to Church and society*. Church House Publishing. 1996
- How we Stand: A report on Black Anglican membership of the Church of England in the 1990s*. 1994
- Jay, Eric. *Keep them in Birmingham: Challenging racism in south-west England*. Commission for Racial Equality. 1992
- Norfolk and Norwich Race Equality Council. *Now in Norfolk*. 1998
- Norfolk Education and Action for Development. *All Different – All Equal*. Produced by Compass. 1997
- Osovae, Jenny, Lee Bridge and Chris Searle. *Outcast England: How schools exclude Black children*. Institute of Race Relations. 1994
- Sentamu, the Rt Revd Dr John. *Towards an Agenda for Action for the Church of England*. 1999.
- Social Responsibility Committee. *Race Relations and Racial Justice: Issues for Christians in Devon*. 1994
- Southwark Diocesan Board of Education. *SHINE (Schools Have Inclusive Education)*. 1996.
- Southwark Diocesan Education Services Lts. *Colour and Spice: Guidelines on combating racism in Church schools*. 1994. Available from 48 Union Street, London SE1 1TD.
- Southwark Diocesan Race Relations Commission. *Understanding Racism*. A study pack for Church and community groups from a Christian perspective. 1991
- Southwark Diocese. *Working Together*. Internal document.
- The National Society. *Youth Apart: Young people and the Church*. Church House Publishing. 1996
- The National Society. *Respect for All: Developing anti-racist policies in a Church School*. 1996

The Rt Revd Dr Wilfred Wood. 'Notes on Racism Awareness'. Annual Report of Appendix Committee. 1992

The Rt Revd Dr Wilfred Wood. *Keep the Faith, Baby! A Bishop speaks on evangelism, race relations and the community*. Bible Reading Fellowship. 1994

The Runnymede Trust. *Equality Assurance in Schools: Quality, identity and society: A handbook for action planning and school effectiveness*. Trentham Books. 1993

The Runnymede Trust. *Challenge, Change and Opportunity: The future of multi-ethnic Britain*. A report on the conference held at the University of Reading. 1994

Udo, David. *King of Love and Justice: Account of the life and contribution of Martin Luther King Jnr: The state of race relations in Britain*. African Caribbean Education Resource Centre. 1995

Wilkinson, John. *Windows on Theology: Church in Black and White*. St Andrews Press. 1993

VIDEOS

Being White. Albany Video Distribution. 1987

Black Anglican Celebration for the Decade of Evangelism. 1994

Class Divided. Concord Video and Film Council. 1985

Eye of the Storm. Concord Video and Film Council. 1970

Out of the Shadows. Catholic Association for Racial Justice. 1988

GLOSSARY

Black

Black is sometimes used as a general term for people of African, African-Caribbean, South Asian and other Asian origin. Black is also one of the ethnic monitoring categories used in the census.

Discrimination

The Race Relations Act 1976 makes it unlawful to treat a person less favourably on racial grounds, which are defined as grounds of race, colour, nationality (including citizenship) and ethnic or national origin. It is not necessary to prove that there was an intention to discriminate; what is relevant is that the outcome was discriminatory. The Act identifies three major forms of racial discrimination: direct, indirect and through victimisation.

Empowerment

Encouragement of people from minority ethnic groups through training and assertiveness courses to participate fully at all levels of an organisation, including its decision making structures. .

Ethnicity

This term comes from the Greek word 'ethnos', meaning a nation or people. Ethnicity refers to a person's identification with a group which shares some or all of the same culture, lifestyle, language, religion, nationality, geographical region and history. Everybody belongs to an ethnic group, including, for example, English, Irish, Scottish and Welsh people.

Ethnic monitoring

The process of collecting and comparing data by ethnic group. The categories used in the 1991 census were: White, Black Caribbean, Black African, Black Other, Indian, Pakistani, Bangladeshi, Chinese and Other. These categories have been refined and a new set will be introduced for the 2001 census. A question on religion will also be included.

‘Institutional racism’

The Stephen Lawrence Inquiry Report defines ‘institutional racism’ as:

The collective failure of an organisation to provide an appropriate and professional service to people because of their colour, culture or ethnic origin. It can be seen or detected in processes, attitudes and behaviour which amount to discrimination through unwitting prejudice, ignorance, thoughtlessness and racist stereotyping which disadvantage minority ethnic people.

Minority ethnic community

The term ‘ethnic minority’, which is frequently used to describe people who do not describe themselves as ‘white’, emphasises their position as minorities. However, the problems they face are not due to the fact that they are in a minority, nor because they are different, but because society ascribes certain ethnic groups with lower status than others. In our view, it is more appropriate to use the term ‘minority ethnic community’.

Multiculturalism

This is about recognising the value and importance of diverse cultures and treating people from different ethnic and cultural backgrounds as one’s equals.

Positive action

Positive action is not to be confused with positive discrimination, which is unlawful in Britain. The Race Relations Act permits organisations to encourage applications for jobs or membership from people of a particular ethnic group and to provide training specifically for groups which are disproportionately under-represented in the workforce or at particular levels of the organisation. The Act also permits action to be taken to meet the special needs of people from a particular ethnic group in relation to their education, training or welfare.

Prejudice

Prejudice involves prejudging people on the basis of false assumptions or inadequate information. Racial prejudice, which is usually negative, involves holding opinions or attitudes about people because of their racial or ethnic origin, based on false assumptions, ignorance and stereotyping.

Racism

The Stephen Lawrence Inquiry Report defines racism as:

... conduct or words which advantage or disadvantage people because of their colour, culture or ethnic origin. In its more subtle form it is as damaging as in its more overt form.

Using this definition, which is consistent with the Race Relations Act, Black, white or Asian people may be victims of racism. Some groups, for example Black people, Asians, Gypsies and asylum-seekers, are much more likely to suffer racism in Britain today. Racism is sometimes used to refer to the power relationship between the majority white population and minority ethnic groups. The basis for this view is that most of the social, economic and political decisions in Britain are made by white people and that these decisions may systematically disadvantage minority ethnic communities. The term 'Black' is used politically in this context to unite all people, even white people (for example Gypsies and Jewish people), who are likely to be subjected to racism.

Targets

These refer to goals set to increase the representation of a particular ethnic group in the workforce. Targets do not constitute positive discrimination or quotas, both of which are unlawful in Britain.

White

The term is used to refer to people who do not classify themselves as Black, Indian, Pakistani, Bangladeshi, Chinese or 'Other'. In Britain, the term White describes the overwhelming majority of the population.