

Appendix to be held as a Record Apart

In writing this review, I have tried to avoid reproducing a laundry list of complaints (which is what I received from some submissions) but instead to look at the larger picture, to sift complaints to find what is truly important, and to ask how the diocese may be enabled to recover and flourish.

There have been many comments and complaints about the Bishop's interpersonal relations. Sifting these complaints, I have asked myself: Are these simply the blunt but telling remarks of a brusque Yorkshire woman, in which case their briskness should be accepted as well meant, or are they damaging, unkind, unaware and at times oppressive? If they are the latter, I believe the Bishop's continuation in office should not be sustained.

It is in that spirit that in this Record Apart I turn to (1) the successful grievance lodged against the Bishop by Dr Poobalan; (2) the Bishop's alleged bullying of the diocesan IT Officer; (3) complaints of bullying by ordinands and others; (4) complaints of pastoral insensitivity and neglect; (5) the Bishop's track record and earlier complaints of bullying or oppressive behaviour.

(1) The grievance lodged by Dr Poobalan

On the 8th of April 2021, Dr Poobalan submitted a grievance to the Primus against Bishop Dyer. On the 19th of April 2021, Dr Poobalan was informed that the Primus had appointed a cleric (Dr Alison Peden) to hear the grievance. Dr Peden was advised by Shepherd & Wedderburn LLP. On the 21st of May 2021, Dr Poobalan was informed of the outcome.

The grievance hearing is valuable for my questions because (a) it was a semi-legal process advised by independent solicitors, and (b) it was an internal process and so should command the agreement of the College of Bishops.

Inter alia, the hearing noted the context for the Bishop's decision to remove Dr Poobalan's licence as Assistant Priest at St Mary's:

The suspension of IP's licence as Assistant Priest at St Mary's appears to have been the last step in a much longer breakdown of relationships between IP and +A, with its roots in the difficulties of St Andrew's Cathedral. By the time arrangements were being made for St Andrew's congregation to move to St Mary's in September 2020, mutual trust was diminishing and frustration increasing.

This came to a head in a meeting on 22nd September between +A and IP at which the Primus was also present. +A had set out the clergy roles and responsibilities in May 2020 which involved IP and the Rector of St Mary's, Rev. Terry Taggart, being licensed by her as Assistant Priests to each other's congregations 'as worship will be shared and there is the possibility of shared pastoral ministry'. **(B3)**

+A's distrust of IP was heightened at this meeting because he had forwarded a confidential email to the Trustees for transparency. **(M1)** IP was surprised to see the Primus at the meeting, and perceived that he was acting in support of +A.

The forthcoming licensing of IP as Assistant Priest at St Mary's now became not simply a liturgical measure but also a statement of IP's loyalty in the oath of obedience that he would

take to +A at this licensing. The licence thus acquired added significance in the relationship of +A and IP, making its suspension an implicit removal of confidence in IP's loyalty.

.....

The events of the week leading up to and including Sunday 11th October have been related by both IP and +A. **(SG; B2; and in notes of meetings)** The issue here is IP's role in the conflict with Chris Cromar and whether the suspension of his licence as Assistant Priest was appropriate and justified.

The letter suspending IP's licence as Assistant Priest at St Mary's states the following accusations against IP **(A000)**:

- (i) That he failed to ensure that Chris Cromar did not attend St Mary's on 11th October.
- (ii) That he failed to collect Chris Cromar's key from him.
- (iii) That he placed a Facebook entry [on the St Andrew's Facebook page] stating that Chris Cromar had accepted an invitation to be Director of Music at St Mary's.
- (iv) That he had made reference to 'St Andrew's Cathedral' in an online service when it was no longer to be called 'Cathedral'.
- (v) That he had failed in his 'duty as Christ's priest' to ensure that Chris Cromar's threats to +A were withdrawn.

.....

+A states that there were two reasons for suspending IP's licence as Assistant Priest at St Mary's: 'to allow time and space for investigation, dialogue and to help manage the immediate security threat at (and to) St Mary's and beyond'. **(B1)** The second reason, the perception that action was needed straightaway to contain a potentially unmanageable situation, seems to have been the reason why IP was suspended in a summary way.

This second reason appears to have been the most important one, because the charges against IP were not otherwise sufficiently grave in themselves to call for his suspension. He may have failed to achieve what +A asked of him, but that is not to say that he did not try, nor was he the only one with responsibility for preventing Chris Cromar from attending St Mary's and getting him to withdraw his threats.

+A states her sense of extreme fear and stress from the events of 11th October. **(B2 and M1)** But the threat of further disruption at St Mary's came from Chris Cromar, not from IP, and Chris was removed from his duties at St Mary's. It appears to have been the underlying breakdown of +A's trust in IP's loyalty, which she had sought to ensure by profession of obedience at his licensing, that led her to suspend his licence as Assistant Priest.

Suspension of a licence is not a Canonical measure, as the Diocesan Chancellor found. **(B13)** In workplace situations, suspension carries with it implications of a disciplinary measure, and the risks of inevitable stigma and reputational damage make it advisable to consider the action carefully and consider possible alternatives (unless there are clear safeguarding concerns that need immediate action). The move to suspend IP's licence the day after the events of 11 October suggest an over-hasty action in the midst of high tension. However, the fact that +A suspended IP's Assistant Priest licence, rather than his Rector's licence (which would have more

bearing on IP's perceived failure to act effectively as Chris Cromar's Rector), does indicate that +A was aware of the potential 'incendiary' impact that suspending his Rector's licence would have. (M2)

The letter of suspension was drafted by the Diocesan Chancellor (B13, B14) and adopted by +A with two changes of words.¹ Its tone was angry and very unlike the dispassionate templates available online for letters of suspension. It makes clear that IP was suspended as Assistant Priest at St Mary's until +A can meet with him in the presence of another Bishop.

[All the underlining is from Iain Torrance. I conclude from this that the suspension was an overhasty act, communicated in an angry way which departed from available templates. I am disappointed that the Chancellor drafted this 'angry' letter and believe it would have helped the Bishop if he had stepped back and advised greater caution. I do consider this hasty action to be more than the brusque but well intended speech of a Yorkshire woman and betrays a punitive streak.]

.....

Grievances 12, 13 and 14 (LG) raise the issue of the clarity with which the suspension was communicated to the Trustees of St Andrew's. The extract from the minutes of the meeting of the Trustees Meeting of 15th October 2020 submitted by IP in his evidence was the draft version made by the Secretary to the Trustees, and it refers to IP being 'on suspension'. (A024 Item 4) The amended version, approved by the Trustees and signed by +A at the Trustees Meeting of 19 November 2020 reads: 'The Bishop confirmed IP was not suspended from ministry related to St Andrew's and so able to take full part in the meeting.' (B15 Item 4) The request for clarification was repeated at the Trustees Meeting on 21 January 2021, and again +A 'replied that Isaac was not suspended from ministry at St Andrew's, but fully functioning as Rector'. (B16) This does indicate that clarification was needed, but it does not show that +A misled the Trustees as IP alleges.

Why was clarification needed? Several issues arise:

- (a) *The public perception of 'suspension'*. The distinction between Rector of St Andrew's and Assistant Priest at St Mary's might not be obvious to those not conversant with the complexities of the situation, especially if IP was not allowed to be present in St Mary's at all. IP communicated the suspension to his congregation thus: 'Chris and I have been suspended from our duties at St Mary's Carden Place'. (A027) This is clear with regard to the location, though not completely accurate in that it does not mention the Assistant Priest licence. Bracketing himself with Chris Cromar, who was effectively dismissed permanently from his duties at St Mary's, may have suggested a more permanent and serious suspension of IP than was the case. The Trustees had an unambiguous statement from +A in the Minutes of the 15/10/20 meeting, and so should not have needed further clarification, suggesting that +A is right that a less precise understanding of the suspension was circulating. (M4)
- (b) *IP's understanding of and representation of the suspension*. On 8 February 2021, IP questioned whether his licence as Assistant Priest to St Mary's could effectively be separated from his licence as Rector of St Andrew's, (A023) in response to +A's clarification that IP was 'fully functioning as the Rector of the Andrew's' and that 'it is the assistant priest licence that is suspended, not you personally'. (A022)

¹ Paragraph 4: 'notice' changed to 'notices'; paragraph 5: 'nothing' changed to 'little'.

+A had set out the terms of 'What it means to be 'Rector of St Andrews' on 22nd September 2020: Pastoral care of the St Andrew's congregation including live-streamed worship and leading them into the future; care of the buildings [of St Andrew's]; continuing mission and relationships in the canonical area of St Andrew's. **(B4)** +A maintains that IP can function fully as Rector: 'The piece of ministering that is suspended is attendance at St Mary's at these small services where a few people are present.' **(M2)** Nevertheless, his suspension as Assistant Priest at St Mary's does mean that he has not been able to minister in person sacramentally at all, even to a minority of the congregation of St Andrew's, and he has felt this deeply. IP's visible absence from St Mary's must also add to the perception that his suspension is from a wider role than it actually is.

There appears not to be a shared understanding of +A's statement that 'it is the assistant priest licence that is suspended, not you personally'. **(A022)** +A appears to mean that IP is not suspended from all ministry because of personal failings as a priest, but only from licence to minister as Assistant Priest at St Mary's. IP appears to mean that he cannot offer personal ministry to members of St Andrews who go to St Mary's to worship, and that he has been personally affected by the suspension emotionally and financially.

i.e. +A: it is not to do with IP as a person therefore it is not personal

IP: suspension has a personal impact therefore it is personal

[All the underlining is from Iain Torrance. I do not believe her action was thought through by the Bishop. In practical terms, her act meant that she deprived Dr Poobalan of his sacramental ministry. I received many comments from members of St Andrew's who were disappointed and confused by Dr Poobalan's status. This has continued since the 12th of October (10 months). As an external person, I believe this was an excessive and continued act of unkindness, not merely a well-intended but brusque action. Why not remove this sanction earlier? Why persist until a grievance was lodged? Why not apologise and reconcile?]

The hearing concluded:

Grievance 2 That on 16th October 2020 Bishop Anne requested that I attend a meeting with only a friend, when she would have present the Primus, chairing the meeting, and the Diocese's two senior legal officers.

Given that there was no Canonical process to follow in this dispute, +A was entitled to invite whomsoever she wished to the meeting. However, the imbalance in legal representation was sufficient to make this a **justified grievance**.

[Emboldened old font by Iain Torrance. Comment: normally, holding an imbalanced disciplinary meeting is considered a form of oppression or bullying.]

Grievance 3 That in her letter of 25th October 2020 Bishop Anne requested me to attend a meeting on 30th October 2020 with an altered format from that of her letter of 16th October 2020 but which nonetheless remained prejudicial and balanced against me.

+A's proposal was for the Chancellor to take notes, which was a functional role not an imbalance of legal representation prejudicial to IP. It is a particular skill of solicitors and lawyers to take notes of

meetings such as was being proposed. No evidence has been supplied to substantiate the claim that this meeting would be 'prejudicial', even if IP feared that it would be. This grievance is not justified.

Grievance 4 Because Bishop Anne had requested me to attend a meeting the purpose, format and structure of which lacked good faith and was unfair, I was required to challenge its fairness and potential, if not actual, prejudice against me.

Challenging one's bishop is difficult, especially from a position of suspension from part of one's role. IP's fears of unfairness and prejudice must have been strong, and his legal advice robust, to lead him to challenge +A in this way, and **this is a justified grievance.**

Grievance 5 Because Bishop Anne had changed the roles and personnel in the scheduled meeting in the light of challenges I made to each, she created in me the impression of an arrangement that had not been properly thought through in terms of normal procedures for such. Her way of seemingly *ad hoc* working left me with little confidence and much fear of what she was planning and doing.

Whilst it is true that the process of addressing the dispute was evolving, this was largely in response to the objections being raised by IP. There were no 'normal procedures' to be followed. This grievance is not justified.

Grievance 6 That Bishop Anne has given shifting roles to the Primus from: 'Chairing the meeting', to 'advising her', to 'assisting and advising both of us'. This shifting, or multiplication, of roles coupled with the incorrect statement of the Primus' role in her letter of 29th October 2020 occasioned me further disquiet and confusion about what she intended for that meeting.

The adjustment in roles given to the Primus reflect +A's attempt to respond to IP's concerns about the personnel of the proposed meeting. As IP has accepted, he meant 'inconsistent' or 'conflicting' rather than 'incorrect' in the wording of this Grievance. **(M3 p.8)** Given the Primus' prior involvement in a dispute that had reached a serious point, it would have been preferable for +A to invite a neutral person to attend the meeting. **This grievance is justified.**

Grievance 7 That Bishop Anne made no inquiry, nor arranged for any other person to contact me to inquire after my pastoral well-being, with regard to the inevitable stress and distress her suspension would, and did, cause me.

+A did arrange for the Dean to contact IP and he tried to do so. Therefore, although this was a limited action by +A and apparently not followed up after its failure, **this grievance not fully justified.**

Grievance 11 That Bishop Anne failed to acknowledge, with fairness and in good faith, that I have incurred significant expense as a result of the suspension she imposed upon me before seeking my response to the concerns she had and of which she prejudged I was culpable.

IP has incurred expenses through the way he has addressed the dispute, and +A did not explicitly acknowledge that fact in her correspondence with him. **This grievance is justified.**

Grievance 14 That Bishop Anne continued to mislead the St Andrew's Trustees by saying that I am fully functioning as Rector when my letter to her, 8th February 2021, demonstrates that under her suspension I cannot be the fully functioning Rector.

IP is correct in that he cannot minister sacramentally to the members of St Andrew's congregation who worship in person at St Mary's, Carden Place, and so is not able to exercise all the functions of the Rector of St Andrew's. **This is a justified grievance.**

The hearing recommended:

The investigation of this Grievance aims to consider the events and reactions leading to it and to identify where things went wrong. There were several misunderstandings of terms and some mismanagement of the dispute. Each party considered that the other over-reacted to the situation. The heightened tension and increasing mutual distrust have made resolution impossible, and the restrictions necessitated by the Covid-19 pandemic – even if Zoom calls might have helped - have made communication and action more difficult.

To summarise the case briefly here would be to miss much of the complexity and nuance of the investigation, and the determination of the Grievance cannot be based on the decisions relating to each of the Grievances listed in the summary. However, IP is justified overall in presenting a grievance that he was suspended from his licence as Assistant Priest in hasty way that had a serious impact on him. On the other hand, he has avoided robust discussion of his behaviour by raising repeated objections to a meeting, even if some at least of these were justified.

My recommendations are:

- (1) That the suspension of IP's licence as Assistant Priest at St Mary's Carden Place be lifted.** It is no longer effective as a tool to reduce the tension at St Mary's. IP is well aware of the need to have a good working relationship with the Provost and Rector, and this will restore sufficient good will and morale to begin reconstructing the situation.
- (2) That the lifting of this suspension is done on the understanding that there is no public or private statement made that the allegations and accusations against IP are withdrawn, but simply that, pending a meeting between +A and IP, the suspension of his Assistant Priest licence is lifted.**
- (3)** That there should be a meeting between +A and IP to address the original issues of the suspension, to be held as soon as possible, chaired by a bishop who is not the Primus nor a member of the SEC College of Bishops. Any other persons present must be agreed to by this episcopal chairperson.
- (4)** That the legal and travel costs of IP are not met by IP's Diocesan bishop.
- (5)** That a period of sabbatical leave for IP is authorised and supported financially by the Diocese of Aberdeen, provided that a clear programme is presented for it by a mentor for IP who has been approved by +A, and who shall demonstrate that it covers vocational and professional development as well as spiritual renewal and recovery, and that this mentor together with IP will submit a report on the sabbatical leave within one month of the sabbatical being completed.

My own comments are as follows:

- (a) It appears to be accepted that the Bishop acted in a hasty and unwarranted way.
- (b) This state of affairs has been allowed to continue in a way that has done much harm to Dr Poobalan.

(c) Recommendation (2) appears to coincide with a culture of secrecy and this is very corrosive of trust.

(2) Alleged bullying of the diocesan IT Officer
It was submitted to me (Sney) that:

PERSON A

post. It was obvious from the beginning that there was a personality clash between these two people. However, one would expect someone entrusted with the office of Bishop to have the maturity to overcome this. Bishop Anne resorted to openly deriding PERSON A, telling her off in front of others, and opposing any ideas which she suggested. This was notable at two Diocesan Mission and Ministry Board meetings, on 27th February and 18th June 2019, where the Bishop publicly admonished and ridiculed PERSON A. PERSON A's skills and abilities were undermined on an almost daily basis. Any attempts to defend PERSON A were seen by the Bishop as a personal attack on herself. PERSON A was eventually signed off on sick leave due to stress, and was made redundant in 2020 – in the middle of a pandemic where a lot of communications, worship, and so on were dependant on information technology.

It was submitted to me (Sdcs) that:

After the appointment of Bishop Dyer, I became aware of developing tensions with the IT Officer who frequently appeared distressed following discussions with the Bishop who had taken over as her Line Manager. Distress resulted from the undermining of the confidence of the IT Officer through excessive personal criticism. The IT officer is deaf but her ability to lip read is so good that her deafness is not apparent but has confidence issues. On a number of occasions, I needed to provide support following events which it seemed to me could have been classed as Bullying. Following one of these the IT Officer was signed off as suffering from work related stress.

The culmination of the poor relationship between the IT Officer and Bishop Dyer was the unexpected decision by Bishop Dyer to make the Post of IT officer redundant in May 2020.The format of the digital meetings followed normal practice but **Bishop Dyer provided no opportunity for discussion of [...] submissions.** Bishop Dyer merely said that she would think about what [...] had said and come back to [...], which she did to say that she had not changed her mind and so ultimately the post and subsequently the post holder were made redundant. The Diocesan Standing Committee were not allowed to discuss this matter on the basis of the Diocesan Registrar's view that this was a matter for the Bishop. As at this time the Diocesan Mission Board was not functioning there was no option to get a view from the Committee which had brought the Post into being.

.....during the Period of Covid Restrictions the IT Officer had been on Furlough and so the Diocese had been receiving Government support for this employment. Employers were at this time being urged to maintain employment of Furloughed employees. Businesses who dismissed Furloughed employees were being identified as bad employers and so it seemed [...] strange that a church should elect to join this group.

(3) Alleged bullying or intimidation of ordinands and lay readers

Because of the village-like nature of the diocese and the risk of identification, I cannot write of these cases with much detail.

I can refer to impact and lack of pastoral care.

One submission (S9) noted:

Over the course of 2019 I became increasingly concerned that my experience of gaslighting behaviour from Anne Dyer was not an isolated case. I saw several friends, including other ordinands, paid staff and clergy being told they were not suitable for their jobs, not 'healthy' enough or not trustworthy, even though after over 10 years of working alongside these people I am confident that this is not true of any of them. I became very concerned in late 2020 when one individual expressed suicidal thoughts to me.

Another (Sptt) wrote:

I felt I could no longer continue as a member of a church in which there was apparently no adequate way to complain about abuses of power, in which senior figures were repeatedly dishonest and which did not offer satisfactory pastoral care

I was told (Swfl):

Bishop Anne displayed various behaviours and actions which created an unsafe and untenable working environment, including targeting me in a deeply discriminatory manner. I experienced a stark contrast in her public behaviour, when compared to meeting alone, in terms of bullying and harassment behaviours. She disliked and refused my request for an accompanier to meetings. In addition, Bishop Anne presented a deeply hierarchical clericalist view in terms of how she personally related to me, a lay person

This writer continued:

She cut me off very abruptly and with increasing volume pointedly said, "This is NOT up for discussion". I remained silent. She continued to shout and had moved forward up onto the edge of her seat, leaning towards me, stating "As your BISHOP, I AM TELLING YOU..." whilst jabbing her finger at me. I found this shocking and was at a loss as to what to do or say. Her words and manner changed and were deeply patronising

.....Bishop Anne, despite an unfair balance of power, was now also refusing me an accompanier going forward. Given her previous bullying behaviour behind closed doors I found this particularly unsafe and something which contravenes standard advice in such situations

And continued further:

Bishop Anne created an intolerable working environment for me Throughout the short period of time described above she consistently attacked my professional and personal standing. Whilst I was able to be relatively calm throughout this, it was an unacceptable ordeal to be targeted in such a manner. This behaviour rapidly escalated and caused significant stress and distress to me, as well as to those around me, and has had lasting effects on me and my reputation.... Bishop Anne refused to accept evidence nor allow me a voice in any of her dealings despite couching her communications in supportive language when it suited her.

Another submission (Stfs) informed me:

.....The whole discernment process, and my peremptory dismissal from it, has been spiritually and mentally debilitating, leaving me with a continuing sense of personal disgrace and shame....

Another submission (Snrx) informed me:

Once one becomes sensitised to issues of power abuse, which have figured prominently in the Christian churches in the last year and decades (and when not), it is hard to miss the

questionable discourse around power in the SEC, and to see how the structures leave people vulnerable to the misuse of power, with the words 'authority' and 'obedience' flowing too easily and unilaterally, without the accompanying necessity of transparency and accountability. I don't write this lightly. It hurts to see how relationships are damaged, how people see no other option than to go to the media with open letters, and how the Church in our Diocese is quite dysfunctional in some respects – a far cry from the kingdom of God, which is justice and peace and joy in the Holy Spirit.

It is beyond the capacity of this review to embark on a grievance process with each complainant. However, I have read enough and have had sufficient follow-up conversations through Teams to be confident in reporting my anxieties to the College of Bishops. I believe individuals have been treated in an arbitrary way, spoken to harshly and subjected to meetings with an asymmetric positioning of power (exactly as happened in the case of Dr Poobalan).

I believe the ordination cases should be reviewed by a person other than the Bishop and I fear that an atmosphere of distrust and intimidation will continue until the Enquiry Process is reviewed and made accountable and transparent.

(4) Complaints of pastoral insensitivity and neglect

It was written to me (Sgls):

Jean Souter is an NSM in this diocese who was ordained Deacon in September 2019, and placed at St James in Holburn. In January 2020, she was admitted to ARI with a pulmonary embolism as a complication of chemotherapy. I was asked to go and visit Jean at the hospital. When I arrived she and her husband were extremely distressed, having been visited by the Bishop in hospital, when she insisted on trying to discuss the arrangements for Jean's funeral with her. The Bishop's questioning so disturbed Jean that the Ward Staff decided that she would not be admitted again.

Due to Jean's health conditions, and the state of the church at Holburn Junction, Jean has been advised that she cannot return to work there. Despite informing the Bishop of this last year, no attempt has been made to suggest an alternative church for Jean to be based in, and there has been no communication from the Bishop about her ministry in over a year.

In January 2021, Jean underwent a serious operation and was in intensive care. Despite being informed of this, at no point did the Bishop contact Jean to see how she was.

This is mentioned with Jean and David's permission.

Mar Lodge is run on a day to day basis by Dr Hugh Dawson, reader in charge. The Bishop is however Rector, and all decisions ultimately lie in her hands. In 2018, a quinquennial review showed that the Chapel of St Ninian, Mar Lodge needed extensive remedial work carrying out. This was reported to the Bishop by Dr Dawson, who stated that he was not able to coordinate repairs, due to ill health. Issues surrounding who was responsible for the repairs to the building were also raised with the Bishop, who said she would take these to Standing Committee. This never happened. In January 2019, the Bishop was again contacted on this matter, at which point she asked Hugh – who by this time had been widowed and whose health was deteriorating – to deal with it. He was not able to do so and informed her of this. Again, she was asked to refer the matter to Standing Committee. It still has not been raised at Standing Committee, and no work has been done on the building. Neither has the Bishop had any pastoral contact with Dr Dawson over the last year, despite his bereavement and continuing health issues.

This issue is raised with the consent of Dr Dawson.

These reports speak for themselves. I had a fuller report of the incident at the hospital from the Reverend Jean Souter herself.

(5) The Bishop's previous track record and earlier complaints of bullying or oppressive behaviour. I had a submission from a person who was present at Cranmer Hall both before and later during Anne Dyer's time as warden.

This person (Sdme) wrote:

It is difficult to convey the contrast in culture, mood and morale at Cranmer Hall in these two periods. In my first stint there, the place was happy and vibrant. In my second one, it was radically different, and very much for the worse. From the first day in the second appointment, I was swamped by persons distressed by Anne Dyer's behaviours. I did not stay for long because I myself found Anne Dyer's conduct disingenuous, unmeriting of trust, and disturbingly marked by setting persons against one another in pursuit of power for herself.

I hope that I am not the only person among the staff and students of Cranmer Hall writing to you now. You could profitably enquire with the College Council at the time about the process of leave that led to Anne Dyer's resignation, though you will of course need to hear not only from those with oversight of the college, but those whose concerns were apparently slow to be heard by governors.

I followed up and this person amplified:

I can confirm that I was sought out by staff—both teaching and support staff—and students in distress. The students were ordinands at Cranmer Hall or candidates for Methodist ministry at the Wesley Study Centre, rather than more widely from John's Hall (the undergraduate wing of the college). But disarray ran through Cranmer Hall & WSC.

I can also confirm that I met with the Principal about my concerns and that I enquired about process for reporting with the HR department of Durham University, though was referred by the latter back to the church.

I followed up further and exchanged emails or spoke directly to 3 others who were in Durham at that time and confirmed this account of the situation. I also spoke to another principal of a college at that time who was aware of what was happening.

It appears to me that this confirms an unhappy track record.

I recommend that, on occasions when Canon 4 is utilised, there should be the most rigorous background checks into history and personality.

Although out-with the remit of this review, it is my belief that the overall culture within the SEC and its leadership is of sufficient concern to demand a wider inquiry.

This concludes my review, and I am happy to be interviewed by the College of Bishops if that is considered helpful.