



Review of Safeguarding Practice

in the

The Irish Region of the Anglo Irish Province of the

Discalced Carmelite Friars

(OCD).

undertaken by

The National Board for Safeguarding Children in the

Catholic Church in Ireland (NBSCCCI)

Date: October 2014

CONTENTS

Background	<i>Page 3</i>
Standard 1 <i>A written policy on keeping children safe</i>	<i>Page 7</i>
Standard 2 <i>Management of allegations</i>	<i>Page 11</i>
Standard 3 <i>Preventing Harm to Children</i>	<i>Page 18</i>
Standard 4 <i>Training and Education</i>	<i>Page 22</i>
Standard 5 <i>Communicating the Church's Safeguarding Message</i>	<i>Page 24</i>
Standard 6 <i>Access to Advice and Support</i>	<i>Page 26</i>
Standard 7 <i>Implementing and Monitoring Standards</i>	<i>Page 28</i>
Recommendations	<i>Page 30</i>
Terms of Reference	<i>Page 32</i>

Background

The National Board for Safeguarding Children in the Catholic Church in Ireland (NBSCCCI) was asked by the Sponsoring Bodies, namely the Irish Episcopal Conference, the Conference of Religious of Ireland and the Irish Missionary Union, to undertake a comprehensive review of safeguarding practice within and across all the Church authorities on the island of Ireland. The purpose of the review is to confirm that current safeguarding practice complies with the standards set down within the guidance issued by the Sponsoring Bodies in February 2009, *Safeguarding Children: Standards and Guidance Document for the Catholic Church in Ireland* and that all known allegations and concerns had been appropriately dealt with. To achieve this task, safeguarding practice in each Church authority is to be reviewed through an examination of case records and through interviews with key personnel involved both within and external to a diocese or other authority.

This report contains the findings of the *Review of Safeguarding Practice in the Discalced Carmelite Friars (OCDs)* undertaken by the NBSCCCI in line with the request made to it by the Sponsoring Bodies. It is based upon the case material made available to the reviewers by the Discalced Carmelites, along with interviews with selected key personnel who contribute to safeguarding within the Discalced Carmelite Friar Communities. The NBSCCCI believes that all relevant documentation for these cases was passed to the reviewers, and Fr. Michael McGoldrick has confirmed this.

The findings of the review have been shared with a reference group in redacted form before being submitted to the Provincial Leader, Fr. Michael McGoldrick, along with any recommendations, arising from the findings.

Introduction

History of the Order

The Carmelite Order had its origins on Mount Carmel near Haifa in north west Israel. The mountain was considered holy and many hermits chose to live on it. Some had stayed on after the Crusades. At their request St Albert, Patriarch of Jerusalem gathered a group together and wrote a rule for them. From the 1230's the situation in the Holy Land became more precarious for Westerners. Some of the hermits sought refuge in Europe.

The Carmelites appear in England and France soon after their departure from the Holy Land. They made foundations and began to adapt their life to this new setting becoming more pastorally active. They placed themselves at the service of the Church as one of the orders of mendicant friars (Franciscans, Dominicans and Augustinians). Like many Orders they went into decline in the 15th & 16th Century. This led to a reform by St Teresa of Avila and St John of Cross. This led to the formation of two of the Carmelite family: Order of Carmelites (O.Carm) and Discalced Carmelites (OCD).

The Discalced Carmelites came to Dublin in 1625 but had to move to Loughrea in 1643. After several unsuccessful attempts they founded a community in Dublin in 1707. They had to move a number of times until in 1797, when they founded St Teresa's, Clarendon Street. St Mary's (Donnybrook) was founded in 1875 and in 1884 became the junior college for people considering a Carmelite vocation. Due to increasing numbers the Discalced Carmelites bought a property in Castlemartyr, Co Cork in 1929 and this became the junior college.

In 1927 the Order amalgamated the Irish and English provinces into what is called today the Anglo-Irish Province. In 1940s members of the Anglo-Irish province founded houses in the Philippines, Australia and California. The Philippines and California became in time independent provinces of the Order while Australia is a Regional Vicariate. Designation as a Vicariate is a first step towards becoming an independent province. The Provincial chairs the three yearly Chapter in the Vicariate but the Vicar and his Council look after day to day matters.

Further expansion took place with a foundation in Termonbacca, Derry in 1982 and in 1984 the acceptance of the pastoral care of Berkeley Road parish in Dublin.

In 1988 the Superior General asked a number of Irish working in different countries to set up a house in Nigeria under his jurisdiction. The Anglo-Irish province was asked to take responsibility for the mission in 1993. Nigeria has progressed well and has 82 members now, 45 of them priests. It is now a Vicariate.

In the past 30 years numbers in Ireland have been diminishing rapidly due to deaths, departures from the Order and fewer vocations. The Order closed the boarding school in Cork in 2003. It withdrew from Scotland in 2009. There is now only one Irish friar in Nigeria and three in Australia.

There are 31 Irish friars (30 priests and 1 brother) in Ireland with an average age of 75. Of those four are fully retired from ministry and some others are semi-retired because of age and health. There are three Nigerian friars helping in Ireland, one of whom is studying. There are two Indian friars who are studying. There are 14 friars in England with an average age of 62. There is one Nigerian friar assisting in London while he completes studies. They have one non-professed student and two in simple profession. One of these is a diocesan priest transferring to the Order.

The Discalced Carmelite Order consists of 55 provinces in 98 countries and is guided by the Superior General and his Council who are resident in Rome. The day to day running of each province is done by the Provincial and four Councillors. The Provincial is elected for a period of three years and can be re-elected for three more.

The Anglo-Irish Province consists of four areas: Ireland, England, Australia and Nigeria.

The Provincial resides in Marlborough Rd, Dublin. England has a Provincial Delegate with two Councillors who look after issues; including safeguarding, vocation promotion, formation, and finance. The Provincial may transfer friars to and from the English communities but may not do so in the Australian and Nigerian Vicariates.

STANDARDS

This section provides the findings of the review. The template employed to present the findings are the seven standards, set down and described in the Church *Safeguarding Children: Standards and Guidance Document for the Catholic Church in Ireland*. This guidance was launched in February 2009 and was endorsed and adopted by all the Church authorities that minister on the island of Ireland, including the Discalced Carmelite Friars. The seven standards are:

Standard 1 A written policy on keeping children safe

Standard 2 Procedures – how to respond to allegations and suspicions in the Republic of Ireland and Northern Ireland

Standard 3 Preventing harm to children:

- recruitment and vetting
- running safe activities for children
- codes of behaviour

Standard 4 Training and education

Standard 5 Communicating the Church’s safeguarding message:

- to children
- to parents and adults
- to other organisations

Standard 6 Access to advice and support

Standard 7 Implementing and monitoring the Standards

Each standard contains a list of criteria, which are indicators that help decide whether this standard has been met. The criteria give details of the steps that a Church organisation, diocese or religious order, needs to take to meet the standard and ways of providing evidence that the standard has been met.

Standard 1

A written policy on keeping children safe

Each child should be cherished and affirmed as a gift from God with an inherent right to dignity of life and bodily integrity, which shall be respected, nurtured and protected by all.

Compliance with Standard 1 is only fully achieved when the Discalced Carmelites meet the requirements of all nine criteria against which the standard is measured.

Criteria

Number	Criterion	Met fully or Met partially or Not met
1.1	The Church organisation has a child protection policy that is written in a clear and easily understandable way.	Met partially
1.2	The policy is approved and signed by the relevant leadership body of the Church organisation (e.g. the Bishop of the diocese or provincial of a religious congregation).	Met fully
1.3	The policy states that all Church personnel are required to comply with it.	Not met
1.4	The policy is reviewed at regular intervals no more than three years apart and is adapted whenever there are significant changes in the organisation or legislation.	Not met
1.5	The policy addresses child protection in the different aspects of Church work e.g. within a church building, community work, pilgrimages, trips and holidays.	Not met
1.6	The policy states how those individuals who pose a risk to children are managed.	Not met
1.7	The policy clearly describes the Church's understanding and definitions of abuse.	Met partially
1.8	The policy states that all current child protection concerns must be fully reported to the civil authorities without delay.	Not met
1.9	The policy should be created at diocese or congregational level. If a separate policy document at parish or other level is necessary this should be consistent with the diocesan or congregational policy and approved by the relevant diocesan or congregational authority before distribution.	Met fully

The Discalced Carmelites present their safeguarding policies and procedures in the document, *Discalced Carmelite Safeguarding Policy*. This is a 28 page A5 booklet which has been written

to accompany the *Safeguarding Children - Standards and Guidance Document for the Catholic Church in Ireland, 2008, implemented in 2009*; rather than to be a stand-alone document. The document is undated, but the reviewers are aware it was produced in April 2009. Given the structure of the document, it is concise and in the reviewers opinion too much so; with emphasis placed on referring the reader to the relevant sections of *Safeguarding Children - Standards and Guidance Document for the Catholic Church in Ireland*. Therefore, Criterion 1.1 is met partially.

The Discalced Carmelites (OCD) policy document contains the Discalced Carmelite's Safeguarding Policy Statement;

It is the policy of the OCDs to do everything in our power to safeguard the welfare of children to whom we minister or with whom we share our lives.

We cherish and affirm each child/person as a gift from God with an inherent right to dignity of life and bodily integrity which shall be respected, nurtured and protected by all and we strive to protect them from physical, sexual and emotional harm.

Everyone in the church has an obligation to ensure that the fundamental rights of children are respected.

These guiding principles inform the overall OCDs policy. The policy has been devised to ensure that the OCDs in the Anglo Irish Province (Republic of Ireland, Northern Ireland, Scotland, England, Nigeria and Australia) take every possible measure to prevent abuse. It aims to ensure that none of its personnel or volunteers engages in behaviour that could allow abuse to occur or actions that could be misinterpreted by children, their families or other adults as constituting or leading to abuse.

This statement sets out the safeguarding intent of the Discalced Carmelites and recognises that the fundamental rights of children are to be respected. However, it does not place a requirement on all Church personnel to comply with the safeguarding policy.

On page 3 the 'Purpose' of the policy document is outlined and the following three statements are made under the heading,

To ensure that the Discalced Carmelites (OCDs) in the Anglo Irish Province (Ireland, Scotland, England, Australia and Nigeria) have a Safeguarding Policy in keeping with the National Board for Safeguarding Children in the Catholic Church (NBSCCC)

To ensure that every OCD Ministry and Community has in place what is required of them by the OCD Safeguarding Policy and the NBSCCCI

This is a policy for the OCD Friars, including employees and volunteers, in all our communities and ministries.

None of these statements is a categorical requirement for all Church personnel to comply with its safeguarding policy; and while the third statement goes some way towards being a clear statement that all members, employees, and volunteers must adhere to the provisions of the document, it is not sufficiently clear and strong enough to fully meet the requirements of Criterion 1.3.

As mentioned above, the OCD policy document was compiled in April 2009. Given the expectation of a three year review policy to include changes to Church or State guidance or legislation, it would be reasonable to expect that revision should have been undertaken, and completed prior to 2012. Irrespective of this expectation, the document does not make any commitment to a revision policy. With consideration to these points, Criterion 1.4 is not met.

The Discalced Carmelites (OCD) safeguarding policies were subject of a Child Protection Policy Review by the HSE (now Tusla) in 2009. An abbreviated version of the HSE/Tusla report was provided to the OCD in June 2014. Tusla were very critical of the policy document and highlighted significant deficiencies in its contents, along with required expectations to diminish those deficiencies. While the Order have been aware of the deficits in their safeguarding policies and procedures, they are also aware that the NBSCCCI is in the process of reviewing and revising its own 2008 *Safeguarding Children: Standards and Guidance Document for the Catholic Church in Ireland* with a view to producing a new set of standards in 2015. In this situation the OCD are in a predicament regarding investing resources in producing a new policy and procedures document that would have to be revised very soon after adoption due to the launch of new NBSCCCI's standards. The reviewers undertook to give consideration to how best to address this quandary. Having done so they make the following recommendation:

Recommendation 1

That the Provincial of the Discalced Carmelites (OCD) request the immediate assistance of the NBSCCCI in producing and adopting an interim policy and procedures document that would meet the requirements of the NBSCCCI's *Safeguarding Children: Standards and Guidance Document for the Catholic Church in Ireland*.

While the OCD safeguarding policy document does not address child protection policy in various Church settings, the requirements of Criterion 1.5 are not met. The reviewers acknowledge that Dublin Archdiocesan safeguarding policies are in place in St. Joseph's Church. The Abbey in Loughrea also applies safeguarding procedures from the Clonfert Diocese. The OCD Church of Our Lady of Mount Carmel & St. Simon Stock, follows safeguarding policies and procedures from the Diocese of

Westminster; while Northampton Diocesan safeguarding policies encompasses activities at St. Joseph's Church in Bucks. The Discalced Carmelites (OCD) direct contact with children is predominantly within parish activities, and therefore children are protected by the

diocesan safeguarding policies and procedures. However, the OCD also have four centres of spirituality and prayer. The development of policies and procedures, which reflect the different aspects of religious activities engaged in by the OCD, is necessary to meet the requirements of Criterion 1.5.

The policy document does not contain reference or guidance on *how those individuals who pose a risk to children are managed*. Page 25 of the policy document does advise *anyone...who has perpetrated abuse should be assisted and supported in seeking help*. However, the document does not provide practical guidance on the process the respondent will undergo and there is no reference to the management of risk, or support available to the respondent. Therefore, Criterion 1.6 is not met.

The final page of the safeguarding policy document has brief definitions of the types of abuse and neglect. These definitions provide minimum information and would give little guidance on the recognition and understanding of abuse. The definitions lack context, and there is no reference to them from other sections of the document. Instead, the policy again refers the reader to the relevant text in *Safeguarding Children - Standards and Guidance Document for the Catholic Church in Ireland, 2008*. While the reviewers are of the opinion that the definitions and explanation of abuse could have been compiled in a more comprehensive manner, information is provided within the Discalced Carmelite safeguarding policy document. Therefore Criterion 1.7 is seen as partially met.

Criterion 1.8 is not met within the safeguarding policy document. The reviewers noted that the internal structures for addressing current child protection concerns are clearly defined. However, emphasis is placed on the Designated Officer role, where that person *will make decisions regarding reporting to HSE and Gardai/PSNI*. This is the only reference to reporting to the statutory authorities and the policy does not set out an obligation to report child protection concerns to the civil authorities without delay, as required by Criterion 1.8.

Recommendation 2

That the Provincial of the Discalced Carmelites (OCD) develops a written policy giving a commitment to report child protection concerns to the statutory authorities without delay.

Standard 2

Management of allegations

Children have a right to be listened to and heard: Church organisations must respond effectively and ensure any allegations and suspicions of abuse are reported both within the Church and to civil authorities.

Compliance with Standard 2 is only fully achieved when OCD Carmelites meet the requirements of all seven criteria against which the standard is measured.

Criteria

Number	Criterion	Met fully or Met partially or Not met
2.1	There are clear child protection procedures in all Church organisations that provide step-by-step guidance on what action to take if there are allegations or suspicions of abuse of a child (historic or current).	Met partially
2.2	The child protection procedures are consistent with legislation on child welfare civil guidance for child protection and written in a clear, easily understandable way.	Not met
2.3	There is a designated officer or officer(s) with a clearly defined role and responsibilities for safeguarding children at diocesan or congregational level.	Met fully
2.4	There is a process for recording incidents, allegations and suspicions and referrals. These will be stored securely, so that confidential information is protected and complies with relevant legislation.	Met fully
2.5	There is a process for dealing with complaints made by adults and children about unacceptable behaviour towards children, with clear timescales for resolving the complaint.	Not met
2.6	There is guidance on confidentiality and information-sharing which makes clear that the protection of the child is the most important consideration. The Seal of Confession is absolute.	Not met
2.7	The procedures include contact details for local child protection services e.g. (Republic of Ireland) the local Health Service Executive and An Garda Síochána; (Northern Ireland) the local health and social services trust and the PSNI.	Not met

In preparation for the review, the Order prepared box files on each of the seven standards, in which were collected information and guidance in relation to the specifics of each standard. While these boxes were of interest and contained a great deal of useful information, they did not constitute the sort of robust and coherent guidance that is needed. Within the detail of all of these documents is a great deal of the information that could be used to develop child safeguarding policy and procedures for the OCD.

In addition to the brief sections in the *Discalced Carmelite Safeguarding Policy* on 'Initial Reception of a Complaint of Abuse' (Page 9) and on 'How a complaint is dealt with' (Page 11), the Order has also developed information sheets for display in each Centre of Spirituality. These information sheets display a diagram that illustrates the contact process when wanting to voice concerns/suspicions that a child has been abused.

While acknowledging the synchronal relationship between the OCD's safeguarding policies and the diocesan safeguarding policies, as well as the UK National Catholic Safeguarding Commission policies, the reviewers found that there are deficits in the *Discalced Carmelite Safeguarding Policy*. This is particularly in relation to step-by-step guidance on what action to take if there are allegations, or suspicions about the abuse of a child. In the document, emphasis is placed on the role of the designated officer, contact with that person and the subsequent initiation of internal OCD safeguarding procedures. While this process is correct, the reviewers felt that emphasis could have been equally placed in other areas where procedural guidance would also be beneficial. Examples of these areas include, guidance on responding to a child making an allegation of abuse and guidance on giving children the confidence to speak out. With consideration to the above the reviewers found that Criterion 2.1 was met partially.

Criterion 2.2 is not met as the policy and procedures is not written in a clear and easily understandable way and it has recently been critically appraised by Tusla, the statutory child protection service for children and has been found to be deficient.

The reviewers consider that Criterion 2.5 is not met. The OCD policy document outlines the procedures on the 'Initial Reception of a Complaint of Abuse'; to address the process for dealing with complaints made by adults and children about unacceptable behaviour towards children. However, the procedure lacks detail and clarity. While the safeguarding document offers guidance stating: *Sensitively hear the person's story. Then explain the initial procedures and give the name and phone number of our Designated Officer. (p.9)*; the safeguarding procedures do not clarify what the 'initial procedures' are.

As part of their evaluation, Tusla assessed the OCD's policy on sharing information with the statutory authorities and concluded that the required expectations were not met. The reviewers are consistent in their similar observations and as noted above, the Discalced Carmelites safeguarding policy does not place an obligation, or expectation, on the Order to inform civil authorities without delay.

The OCD policy refers to confidentiality and notes that *‘a priest cannot guarantee confidentiality to anybody who wishes to speak about a situation of abuse (p.10).*

The policy also distinguishes the Sacrament of Penance (confession) and the recognition that the seal of confession is inviolable. The reviewers welcome the inclusion of these guidelines, and the clear expectations on priests within the Sacrament of Penance.

However, the reviewers conclude that guidance and policy relating to the seal of confession and confidentiality could be more comprehensive. It would be beneficial to recognise the obligations of the sacramental seal and set down that no priest exercising a function under child safeguarding procedures, should celebrate the Sacrament of Penance with a person whom he knows is a respondent or a complainant in a child abuse case. A priest must be clear about the status of any conversation relating to an allegation of abuse and make sure there is no misunderstanding about whether the seal of confession applies.

With consideration to the points raised above, the requirements of Criterion 2.6 are not met.

The OCD safeguarding policy does not contain contact details for the statutory agencies, and therefore Criterion 2.7 is not met.

Recommendation 3

With consideration to Recommendation 1, the Discalced Carmelites (OCD) should incorporate into their revised policies and procedures document, a full and comprehensive text regarding the management of allegations.

Table 1

Incidence of safeguarding allegations received within OCD Carmelites against Friars, from 1st January 1975 up to time of review.

OCD Carmelites		
1	Number of Friars against whom allegations have been made since the 1 st January 1975 up to the date of the Review.	6
2	Total number of allegations received by the Order since 1 st January, 1975	11
3	Number of allegations reported to An Garda Síochána involving friars since 1 st January 1975.	*8
4	Number of allegations reported to TUSLA/HSE/HSC (or the Health Boards which preceded the setting up of the HSE) involving friars of the Order since 1 st January 1975.	**6
5	Number of friars (still members of the Order) against whom an allegation was made and who were living at the date of the review.	2
6	Number of friars against whom an allegation was made and who are deceased.	4
7	Number of friars against whom an allegation has been made and who are in ministry.	2
8	Number of friars against whom an allegation was made and who are 'Out of Ministry', but are still members of the Order.	0
9	Number of friars against whom an allegation was made and who are retired	0
10	Number of friars against whom an allegation was made and who have left the Order/ priesthood.	0
11	Number of friars of the Order who have been convicted of having committed an offence or offences against a child or young person since the 1 st January 1975.	0

- *One allegation was referred to An Garda Síochána by a therapeutic service who received the allegation from their client. The Discalced Carmelites did not have adequate information to notify the An Garda Síochána.
- *One alleged victim did not give permission to the Discalced Carmelites to disclose their allegation to the An Garda Síochána.
- *One allegation was not referred to the An Garda Síochána.
- **One allegation was referred to the Health Services Executive (HSE) by a therapeutic service who received the allegation from their client.
- **Three allegations were not reported to the HSE because the alleged offender was deceased at the time the allegation was received by the Discalced Carmelites.
- **One allegation was not referred to the HSE.

The reviewers had access to all case files generated from child safeguarding concerns received by the Discalced Carmelites. The safeguarding files held by the OCD are well organised. The files are structured under the name of the respondent priest with reference to the alleged victim. The Discalced Carmelites have received eleven allegations against six priests or friars since 1975. At the time of receiving the information, eight allegations were made against five living priests. Three of those priests are since deceased. Three allegations were also received by the OCD between approximately three and twelve years after the death of another priest.

All of the allegations were formally received by the Discalced Carmelites between 1997 and 2013. Of the eleven allegations received by the Discalced Carmelites, ten were retrospective, referring to incidents that were alleged to have occurred between 1945 and 1993. There have been no criminal convictions related to the allegations against any priest or friar from the Discalced Carmelites (Anglo Irish Province).

The Discalced Carmelites have two living priests against whom allegations have been made. One of these priests is in restricted/private ministry, while the other remains in public ministry.

The timeframe for reporting all of the allegations against living friars received by the OCD has been appropriate; and the reviewers commend the prompt communication between the OCD and the statutory authorities in this regard. The exception of two allegations that were made against a deceased priest and not notified to An Garda Síochána for a number of years must be noted. The reviewers were informed of the uncertainty within OCD surrounding the notification process of allegations against deceased priests and it is acknowledged by the reviewers that the welfare of children was not compromised because of the delayed notification.

The reviewers read the files relating to the two living priests. These files are comprehensive and provide a structured and chronological narrative of the

safeguarding practices completed by the OCD in both cases.

In the first of these cases Fr A, living in another jurisdiction, accessed internet child pornographic material. This occurred on multiple occasions prior to the discovery which brought Fr A's behaviour to light. The case file indicates that Fr. A's engagement in the behaviour was substantial. The behaviour was notified to An Garda Síochána and child protective services promptly and the OCD quickly facilitated a psychological (sexual behaviour) assessment and treatment for Fr A. In managing this case, the OCD have referred Fr A for a number of psychological (sexual behaviour) assessments over a 17 year period. Upon discovery of his inappropriate actions, Fr A admitted to the behaviour and it is recorded that he was placed on restricted ministry, which included no ministry with children. There has not been a criminal conviction and the HSE investigation concluded that there is not any evidence of contact abuse with minors. However, downloading child pornography is an offence in canon law. The reviewers noted that Fr A was allowed to continue '*ministry to a school where he said Mass and administered the sacrament of reconciliation once per month*'. This record is undated but the chronology of the file indicates that an appropriate Covenant of Care was put in place at a later date, which defined Fr A's extent of ministry and was not to include any ministry involving children. Despite this, Fr A was again given permission to exercise pastoral ministry.

Due to unforeseen circumstances, when the Prior where Fr A resided became ill, Fr A took over the role of 'Acting Prior'. It is evident from the file that Fr A has ambitions to continue or undertake a leadership position within the Order. While Fr A continues to be challenged on the implications of his historical behaviours and the consequences of same regarding his desire for a leadership position, he appears to have been given conflicting views on this in the past, and there is a lack of clarity on his current and future status of ministry.

On this point, the reviewers sought to clarify what Fr A's ministry is and are satisfied that Fr. A's religious activities and role constitutes public ministry. The reviewers have concerns, given Fr A's activity of downloading and viewing child pornographic material, that he should now be in public ministry.

Recommendation 4

The Provincial must initiate, as a matter of urgency a review of Fr A's case to date, to establish what is the nature of Fr A's ministry; how a decision was made that he could have any form of public ministry and the extent of children's access to the environment where Fr A resides and exercises his ministry. The Provincial should seek the advice of his Advisory Panel in relation to managing any risk identified.

The reviewers acknowledge the great deal of work that has been conducted on Fr A's case and the substantial time period that has lapsed since the original concern. As already stated, the Discalced Carmelites commissioned a number of assessments and therapeutic programmes, all of which informed the management plans that were put in place. However NBSCCCI does not support the degree of ministry allowed. While Fr A's current ministry facilitates his wellbeing, it is accepted that he may pose a risk to children; his proximity to children, unrestricted/unmonitored use of electronic

equipment,

and his perceived position of authority and responsibility, may increase that risk. NBSCCCI believe this is an avoidable situation that warrants further assessment and consideration.

The reviewers acknowledge when these concerns were raised, that immediate corrective action was taken by the OCDs.

The response of the OCD to the second living priest (Fr B) is markedly different and the reviewers noted discrepancies in the application of safeguarding practices when comparing the two cases.

An individual, through a therapeutic service, made allegations against Fr B. The individual did not want contact with other agencies and the information supplied by the therapeutic service to the OCD was extremely limited. The OCD were supplied with the complainant's name, the respondent priest and details of the allegation, which was a non-contact sexually inappropriate behaviour that allegedly occurred approximately 43 years ago. While the Designated Officer offered to be available to the complainant, the person gave explicit instructions, through the therapeutic service, that they did not wish to have contact with the OCD. A Covenant of Care was put in place, which placed Fr B under clear and comprehensive ministerial restrictions. These restrictions are still in place.

Given the information that is available and with the unlikely possibility of an elaboration of that information, the reviewers consider that a re- evaluation of the case is warranted. The expectation, following completion of any criminal or civil investigations, is that a preliminary investigation should be initiated. This did not happen in this case. The purpose of the preliminary investigation is to establish if the allegation meets the threshold of "a semblance of truth"

Recommendation 5

The Provincial should appoint a suitably qualified person to conduct a preliminary investigation, consult with the civil authorities and establish the facts of this case in order to determine the status of Friar B's ministry.

The reviewers also sampled three other safeguarding files relating to deceased priests. All three files were well structured and highlighted good safeguarding practices and case management.

Standard 3

Preventing Harm to Children

This standard requires that all procedures and practices relating to creating a safe environment for children be in place and effectively implemented. These include having safe recruitment and vetting practices in place, having clear codes of behaviour for adults who work with children and by operating safe activities for children.

Compliance with Standard 3 is only fully achieved when the OCDs meets the requirements of all twelve criteria against which the standard is measured. These criteria are grouped into three areas, safe recruitment and vetting, codes of behaviour and operating safe activities for children.

Criteria – safe recruitment and vetting

Number	Criterion	Met fully or Met partially or Not met
3.1	There are policies and procedures for recruiting Church personnel and assessing their suitability to work with children.	Not met
3.2	The safe recruitment and vetting policy is in line with best practice guidance.	Met partially
3.3	All those who have the opportunity for regular contact with children, or who are in positions of trust, complete a form declaring any previous court convictions and undergo other checks as required by legislation and guidance and this information is then properly assessed and recorded.	Met fully

Criteria – Codes of behaviour

Number	Criterion	Met fully or Met partially or Not met
3.4	The Church organisation provides guidance on appropriate/ expected standards of behaviour of, adults towards children.	Met fully
3.5	There is guidance on expected and acceptable behaviour of children towards other children (anti- bullying policy).	*Not met
3.6	There are clear ways in which Church personnel can raise allegations and suspicions about unacceptable behaviour towards children by other Church personnel or volunteers ('whistle-blowing'), confidentially if necessary.	Met fully

3.7	There are processes for dealing with children's unacceptable behaviour that do not involve physical punishment or any other form of degrading or humiliating treatment.	*Not met
3.8	Guidance to staff and children makes it clear that discriminatory behaviour or language in relation to any of the following is not acceptable: race, culture, age, gender, disability, religion, sexuality or political views.	Met fully
3.9	Policies include guidelines on the personal/intimate care of children with disabilities, including appropriate and inappropriate touch.	*Not met

Criteria – Operating safe activities for children

Number	Criterion	Met fully or Met partially or Not met
3.10	There is guidance on assessing all possible risks when working with children – especially in activities that involve time spent away from home.	*Not met
3.11	When operating projects/ activities children are adequately supervised and protected at all times.	Met partially
3.12	Guidelines exist for appropriate use of information technology (such as mobile phones, email, digital cameras, websites, the Internet) to make sure that children are not put in danger and exposed to abuse and exploitation.	Not met

Where criteria are denoted with an *, it is recognised that the range of activity relating to children and young people exclusively performed by the OCD is very limited and the criteria has limited application.

As mentioned above, diocesan safeguarding procedures are adopted in public churches and in the OCD Abbey. Where children involved with outside agencies engage in activities in the Centres of Prayer and Spirituality, safeguarding policies and procedures employed by the agency are applied. However, it is necessary for the OCD to develop policy in these areas that will coexist and compliment the diocesan procedures and the policies of the other agencies. The development of OCD policies will mean that they are readily available and accessible to OCD members, staff, and volunteers.

The Discalced Carmelite safeguarding policy document does not include a policy on *Safe Recruitment*. While Page 16 of the document refers to three sections within

Safeguarding Children - Standards and Guidance Document for the Catholic Church in Ireland

(2008/9) on the matter, the information contained in the OCD policy document does not provide comprehensiveness and clarity to meet the requirement of Criterion 3.1.

The reviewers are satisfied that appropriate vetting procedures are in place within the OCD. They have an appointed a Vetting Coordinator who undertakes to ensure that all members, staff and volunteers are vetted. The procedure places responsibility on each local safeguarding committee member and Prior of each Centre of Prayer, to begin the vetting process with new members, employees or volunteers. However, while the practical procedures relating to vetting are in place, there is no written policy. Again, reference is made to *Safeguarding Children - Standards and Guidance Document for the Catholic Church in Ireland*, on Page 19 of the OCD document. The reviewers are concerned that without written policy and direction, responsibility for Garda vetting lacks strict guidelines that should be adhered to into the future. Therefore, Criterion 3.2 is met partially.

In the *OCD Safeguarding Policy* there is a Code of Behaviour (Page 17), and this is also reproduced on the OCD website. The code covers a number of important issues and is reproduced here.

- Treat all to whom we minister with respect and courtesy.*
- Respect the boundary of physical and emotional space that others require, using touch in a prudent and responsible way.*
- *Provide pastoral ministry in a sufficiently safe environment, ordinarily one that is open and visible.*
 - *Ensure whenever reasonably possible that another adult is present or close by when providing pastoral ministry to a minor or vulnerable adult.*
 - *In the event of pastoral outings, behave with due prudence that has the other as its central concern. Avoid staying in the same room or travelling alone with a minor or vulnerable adult.*
 - *Avoid all inappropriate communication with children and vulnerable adults through the internet, e-mail, text messages or otherwise.*
 - *Ensure that permission of the parent/guardian is given when taking photographs and making videos or other recordings of children in the course of ministry to them.*
 - *Avoid the use of the pastoral role to foster relationships of dependence and subservience, over-familiarity with one child or vulnerable adult to the exclusion of others.*
 - *Avoid any form of over-familiarity or inappropriate language that could reasonably be interpreted as harassment.*

- *Never provide alcohol or any drug/substance to a minor without the express permission of the parent/guardian.*
- *Never act in a way that is intended to shame, humiliate, belittle or degrade.*

This is a good overall guide for the membership and it satisfies the requirement of Criteria 3.4 and 3.8.

The OCD have a comprehensive and good whistle-blowing policy and this needs to be inserted into the revised safeguarding policy document when that is adopted. Criterion 3.6 is met fully.

The OCD safeguarding policy document does not make any reference to the use of information technology or electronic equipment. Criterion 3.12 is not met.

Recommendation 6

With consideration to Recommendation 1, the Discalced Carmelites (OCD) Safeguarding Committee should incorporate into their revised policies and procedures document, full and comprehensive text regarding safe recruitment and vetting.

The reviewers spoke to a range of personnel who assist with ensuring that safe environments are developed and maintained within OCD Churches. These are clearly committed and able personnel who give freely of their time in the interests of safeguarding children. The reviewers commend them for their practical work in safeguarding children.

Standard 4

Training and Education

All Church personnel should be offered training in child protection to maintain high standards and good practice.

Criteria

Number	Criterion	Met fully or Met partially or Not met
4.1	All Church personnel who work with children are inducted into the Church's policy and procedures on child protection when they begin working within Church organisations.	Not met
4.2	Identified Church personnel are provided with appropriate training for keeping children safe with regular opportunities to update their skills and knowledge.	Met partially
4.3	Training is provided to those with additional responsibilities such as recruiting and selecting staff, dealing with complaints, disciplinary processes, managing risk, acting as designated person.	Met partially
4.4	Training programmes are approved by National Board for Safeguarding Children and updated in line with current legislation, guidance and best practice.	Met partially

The commitment to safeguarding training within the Order is poor. The reviewers saw no evidence that religious personnel, staff or volunteers received induction on the OCD safeguarding policies and procedures while working within the Order. Acknowledging that the Discalced Carmelites safeguarding policy document is to be revised, in its current format it would offer minimal guidance on child safeguarding. The expectation then that internal training took place with supplementary information, for individuals with a safeguarding role, did not materialise. There was also no record of congregational personnel, lay staff, or volunteers having signed adherence to the OCD safeguarding policy. Therefore the requirements to meet Criterion 4.1 are not met.

The OCD have a Province Safeguarding Coordinator for training and there is evidence of highly experienced personnel in the application of safeguarding procedures within the Order, including the current Provincial. However, the dissemination of training among all of the individuals holding safeguarding positions is not evident. The reviewers are aware that some safeguarding personnel have obtained diocesan training,

the NBSCCCI, or training from the National Catholic Safeguarding Commission in England and this has aided their role within the OCD. For this reason, Criteria 4.2 and 4.3 are considered to be met partially.

The Discalced Carmelites, Anglo Irish Province, has religious facilities both nationally and internationally, with each facility having some safeguarding representation. The reviewers believe that due to the geographical diffusion, safeguarding personnel would benefit from central leadership and direction, to ensure that they are all provided with the training necessary to conduct their role; it will be necessary to evaluate their training needs.

Recommendation 7

With consideration to Recommendation 1, the Discalced Carmelites (OCD) Safeguarding Committee should incorporate into their revised policies and procedures document, a full and comprehensive text regarding training and education.

Recommendation 8

That the Safeguarding Committee/Co-ordinator of the Discalced Carmelites (OCD) conducts an audit of all members, lay staff, and volunteers who hold a safeguarding role within the Order, and plan and provide necessary safeguarding training for them as a matter of urgency.

Recommendation 9

That the Discalced Carmelites (OCD) Provincial consult the NBSCCCI in relation to how best to plan for and deliver child safeguarding training within the Order.

Standard 5

Communicating the Church's Safeguarding Message

This standard requires that the Church's safeguarding policies and procedures be successfully communicated to Church personnel and parishioners (including children). This can be achieved through the prominent display of the Church policy, making children aware of their right to speak out and knowing who to speak to, having the Designated Person's contact details clearly visible, ensuring Church personnel have access to contact details for child protection services, having good working relationships with statutory child protection agencies and developing a communication plan which reflects the Church's commitment to transparency.

Criteria

Number	Criterion	Met fully or Met partially or Not met
5.1	The child protection policy is openly displayed and available to everyone.	Met partially
5.2	Children are made aware of their right to be safe from abuse and who to speak to if they have concerns.	Met partially
5.3	Everyone in Church organisations knows who the designated person is and how to contact them.	Met fully
5.4	Church personnel are provided with contact details of local child protection services, such as Health and Social Care Trusts / Health Service Executive, PSNI, An Garda Síochána, telephone helplines and the designated person.	Not met
5.5	Church organisations establish links with statutory child protection agencies to develop good working relationships in order to keep children safe.	Met fully
5.6	Church organisations at diocesan and religious order level have an established communications policy which reflects a commitment to transparency and openness.	Not met

Standard 5 is not well considered in the OCD safeguarding policy document. The one page presentation contains a series of questions and as is the case throughout the document, references the relevant section of the NBSCCCI's *Safeguarding Children: Standards and Guidance Document for the Catholic Church in Ireland*. The reviewers are aware from their fieldwork that the Discalced Carmelite's safeguarding policy does not reflect the practical application of safeguarding within the Order's religious

activities. This was evident in observations of the Discalced Carmelite's child protection notices, which was comprehensive, and openly displayed in the Carmelite Centre in Dublin.

The Discalced Carmelites have a website (www.oed.ie) which has a dedicated section on child safeguarding. This section contains a safeguarding statement and provides contact details for reporting concerns about a child. While this is welcomed, the link to access the safeguarding section is not given any prominence and is located in supplementary links at the bottom of the website page.

The reviewers were made aware that in public Churches, the diocesan safeguarding policy takes precedence and is displayed, with the Discalced Carmelites in addition providing contact details for their safeguarding personnel and support agencies. Criteria 5.1 and 5.2 are considered to be met partially.

The OCD policy does not provide details for the Health and Social Care Trusts/The Child and Family Agency, PSNI, An Garda Síochána, or telephone helplines. The document does refer to the 'local office' of the statutory authorities. Criterion 5.4 requires that each religious facility and the safeguarding personnel within those facilities, are provided with the local contact details for child protective services/social services. Therefore, Criterion 5.4 is not met.

Within the communications policy, ministries are encouraged to '*follow Diocesan programmes for communication*'; while communities are directed to '*arrange a meeting of all staff in communities to explain the OCD Safeguarding Policy and/or a joined up meeting for all Discalced Carmelite Friars in the Dublin area and Derry*'. The reviewers consider that this policy direction lacks clarity and is not comprehensive enough to meet the requirements of Criterion 5.6.

Recommendation 10

With consideration to Recommendation 1, the Discalced Carmelites (OCD) Provincial should incorporate into their revised policies and procedures document, a full and comprehensive text regarding how the OCDs intend to communicate their messages regarding the importance of safeguarding children and how this will be done within the Order.

Standard 6

Access to Advice and Support

Those who have suffered child abuse should receive a compassionate and just response and should be offered appropriate pastoral care to rebuild their lives.

Those who have harmed others should be helped to face up to the reality of abuse, as well as being assisted in healing.

Criteria

Number	Criterion	Met fully or Met partially or Not met
6.1	Church personnel with special responsibilities for keeping children safe have access to specialist advice, support and information on child protection.	Met fully
6.2	Contacts are established at a national and/ or local level with the relevant child protection/ welfare agencies and helplines that can provide information, support and assistance to children and Church personnel.	Met fully
6.3	There is guidance on how to respond to and support a child who is suspected to have been abused whether that abuse is by someone within the Church or in the community, including family members or peers.	Met partially
6.4	Information is provided to those who have experienced abuse on how to seek support.	Met partially
6.5	Appropriate support is provided to those who have perpetrated abuse to help them to face up to the reality of abuse as well as to promote healing in a manner which does not compromise children's safety.	Met fully

It is noted that the OCD have a positive, professional relationship with relevant professionals and experts in the field of child safeguarding and there was evidence, through correspondence on file, to show that the Provincial and Designated Officer have sought advice on the management of cases from the NBSCCCI. The OCD are in the process of referring one of their cases to the NBSCCCI's National Case Management Reference Group (NCMRG) for guidance on the person's fitness for ministry and risk management. The reviewers had no concerns in relation to the Discalced Carmelites' relationship with the relevant statutory agencies. Therefore, the reviewers are satisfied

that the requirements of Criteria 6.1 and 6.2 are met fully.

The Discalced Carmelite safeguarding policy document contains a section headed *'Initial Reception of a Complaint of Abuse'*, which advises on the initial response that should be taken when hearing a complaint of abuse. This goes some way towards meeting the

demands of Criterion 6.3. However, the reviewers are not satisfied that there has been sufficient training and support provided to the membership in implementing the approach that is being suggested to them. The reviewers also hold concern with regard to the comprehensiveness of the policy and there is a lack of clarity on the initial procedures that should be implemented and explained to the person voicing concern. On this basis Criterion 6.3 is partially met.

There is evidence on file and from discussions with OCD members, that the Discalced Carmelites have provided pastoral and financial assistance to complainants. OCD policy on offering advice and support to alleged victims simply provides contact details for a therapy service. Again, the reviewers found that the policy lacks comprehensiveness and may not reflect the practical approach taken with victims. As mentioned previously, safeguarding personnel within the OCD, are provided a degree of autonomy, which is evident in the policy. Personnel are encouraged to compile a directory of local support services that would be available to complainants, if required.

Prior to the fieldwork visit for this review, the Discalced Carmelites placed a notice on the Home Page of their website announcing the review and inviting people who had any child safeguarding concerns to make contact with the DLP. However, the announcement was not in a prominent position and could be critically evaluated as a footnote. While the OCD have an informative website, the presence of safeguarding information is not obvious and easily accessible. For these reasons Criterion 6.4 is partially met.

The case files indicate that the OCD provided, and continues to provide, help and assistance to respondent priests/friars. While emphasis remains on the safety and welfare of children, the OCD acknowledge the potential risk of respondent priests and provide them with monitoring, care and support, to diminish risk. The reviewers are satisfied that the requirements of Criterion 6.5 are met fully.

Recommendation 11

With consideration to Recommendation 1, the Discalced Carmelites (OCD) Provincial should incorporate into the revised policies and procedures document a full and comprehensive text regarding access to advice and support for alleged victims and respondent priests.

The reviewers consulted TUSLA and An Garda Síochána as part of the fieldwork. The report has already noted that TUSLA have conducted a review of safeguarding practice and provided the Provincial with detailed guidance on improvements to the safeguarding policy document. Both agencies acknowledge the good working relationships in respect of case management issues and in terms of prompt notifications of allegations.

Standard 7

Implementing and Monitoring Standards

Standard 7 outlines the need to develop a plan of action, which monitors the effectiveness of the steps being taken to keep children safe. This is achieved through making a written plan, having the human and financial resources available, monitoring compliance and ensuring all allegations and suspicions are recorded and stored securely.

Criteria

Number	Criterion	Met fully or Met partially or Not met
7.1	There is a written plan showing what steps will be taken to keep children safe, who is responsible for implementing these measures and when these will be completed.	Not met
7.2	The human or financial resources necessary for implementing the plan are made available.	Met partially
7.3	Arrangements are in place to monitor compliance with child protection policies and procedures.	Met fully
7.4	Processes are in place to ask parishioners (children and parents/ carers) about their views on policies and practices for keeping children safe.	*Not met
7.5	All incidents, allegations/ suspicions of abuse are recorded and stored securely.	Met fully

The Discalced Carmelite safeguarding policy document defers to the *Safeguarding Children - Standards and Guidance Document for the Catholic Church in Ireland*, for guidelines on the implementation and monitoring of the NBSCCCI standards. While the policy does give a commitment that *the OCD will develop a plan of action* on implementation of the standards, a documented plan was not available to the reviewers. Therefore, Criterion 7.1 is not met.

The reviewers met with the Chairperson of the Local Safeguarding Committee (LSC) and a member of that committee. Conversations also took place with members of the Provincial Safeguarding Committee and the UK Safeguarding Coordinator and the reviewers were impressed with the enthusiasm and commitment expressed towards safeguarding within the OCD. Members of the LSC are allocated responsibility for a different church or religious centres. Again, the members of the LSC expressed some autonomy in defining their role and the work they undertake. They sought to systematically evaluate the OCD against the NBSCCCI *Safeguarding Children: Standards and Guidance Document for the Catholic Church in Ireland* and considered the practical implications of the standards when the criteria were applied to each setting.

Priority was placed on the auditing of compliance and changes were made, where necessary, to ensure adherence to the standards. The LSC are committed to completing a

yearly audit of the Discalced Carmelites' compliance with the NBSCCCI safeguarding standards. The reviewers are satisfied the requirements of Criterion 7.3 are met fully.

The safeguarding structure within the OCD is hierarchical, with multiple tiers. The Provincial Safeguarding Committee comprises of a Discalced Carmelite friar, and a representative from England, Northern Ireland, and the Republic of Ireland. Information from the LSC is shared with the Provincial Safeguarding Committee (PSC) and it is the PSC that will review and revise the current policy and procedures document. The OCD express a commitment to appropriate safeguarding practices and the provision of financial resources to assure this was given to the reviewers by the OCD Provincial. While the OCD have invested human and financial resources to child safeguarding, and are committed to continue to do so, Criterion 7.2 can only be deemed to be met partially due to there being no child safeguarding plan to be resourced.

Recommendation 12

That the Discalced Carmelites (OCD) Safeguarding Committee must develop and implement a safeguarding plan, outlining their intention to monitor compliance with the NBSCCCI Safeguarding *Children: Standards and Guidance Document for the Catholic Church in Ireland*. This may include guidance on the role of the Local Safeguarding Committee and a commitment to an annual audit.

Recommendation 13

With consideration to Recommendation 1, the Discalced Carmelites (OCD) Safeguarding Committee should incorporate, into their revised policies and procedures document, a full and comprehensive text regarding how to implement and monitor the NBSCCCI standards.

Recommendations

Recommendation 1

That the Provincial of the Discalced Carmelites (OCD) request the immediate assistance of the NBSCCCI in producing and adopting an interim policy and procedures document that would meet the requirements of the NBSCCCI's *Safeguarding Children: Standards and Guidance Document for the Catholic Church in Ireland*.

Recommendation 2

That the Provincial of the Discalced Carmelites (OCD) develops a written policy giving a commitment to report child protection concerns to the statutory authorities without delay.

Recommendation 3

With consideration to Recommendation 1, the Discalced Carmelites (OCD) should incorporate into their revised policies and procedures document, a full and comprehensive text regarding the management of allegations.

Recommendation 4

The Provincial must initiate, as a matter of urgency a review of Fr A's case to date, to establish what is the nature of Fr A's ministry; how a decision was made that he could have any form of public ministry and the extent of children's access to the environment where Fr A resides and exercises his ministry. The Provincial should seek the advice of his Advisory Panel in relation to managing any risk identified.

Recommendation 5

The Provincial should appoint a suitably qualified person to conduct a preliminary investigation, consult with the civil authorities and establish the facts of this case in order to determine the status of Friar B's ministry.

Recommendation 6

With consideration to Recommendation 1, the Discalced Carmelites (OCD) Safeguarding Committee should incorporate into their revised policies and procedures document, full and comprehensive text regarding safe recruitment and vetting.

Recommendation 7

With consideration to Recommendation 1, the Discalced Carmelites (OCD) Safeguarding Committee should incorporate into their revised policies and procedures document, a full and comprehensive text regarding training and education.

Recommendation 8

That the Safeguarding Committee/Co-ordinator of the Discalced Carmelites (OCD) conducts an audit of all members, lay staff, and volunteers who hold a safeguarding role within the Order, and plan and provide necessary safeguarding training for them as a matter of urgency.

Recommendation 9

That the Discalced Carmelites (OCD) Provincial consult the NBSCCCI in relation to how best to plan for and deliver child safeguarding training within the Order.

Recommendation 10

With consideration to Recommendation 1, the Discalced Carmelites (OCD) Provincial should incorporate into their revised policies and procedures document, a full and comprehensive text regarding how the OCDs intend to communicate their messages regarding the importance of safeguarding children and how this will be done within the Order.

Recommendation 11

With consideration to Recommendation 1, the Discalced Carmelites (OCD) Provincial should incorporate into the revised policies and procedures document a full and comprehensive text regarding access to advice and support for alleged victims and respondent priests.

Recommendation 12

That the Discalced Carmelites (OCD) Safeguarding Committee must develop and implement a safeguarding plan, outlining their intention to monitor compliance with the NBSCCCI Safeguarding *Children: Standards and Guidance Document for the Catholic Church in Ireland*. This may include guidance on the role of the Local Safeguarding Committee and a commitment to an annual audit.

Recommendation 13

With consideration to Recommendation 1, the Discalced Carmelites (OCD) Safeguarding Committee should incorporate, into their revised policies and procedures document, a full and comprehensive text regarding how to implement and monitor the NBSCCCI standards.

Review of Safeguarding in the Catholic Church in Ireland

Terms of Reference (which should be read in conjunction with the accompanying Notes)

1. To ascertain the full extent of all complaints or allegations, knowledge, suspicions or concerns of child sexual abuse, made to the Church Authority (Diocese/religious congregation/missionary society) by individuals or by the Civil Authorities in the period 1st January 1975 up to the date of the review, against Catholic clergy and/or religious still living and who are ministering/or who once ministered under the aegis of the Church Authority, and examine/review and report on the nature of the response on the part of the Church Authority.
2. If deemed relevant, select a random sample of complaints or allegations, knowledge, suspicions or concerns of child sexual abuse, made to the Church Authority by individuals or by the Civil Authorities in the period 1st January 1975 to the date of the review, against Catholic clergy and/or religious now deceased and who ministered under the aegis of the Church Authority.
3. Examine/review and report on the nature of the response on the part of the Church Authority.
4. To ascertain all of the cases during the relevant period in which the Church Authority
 - knew of child sexual abuse involving Catholic clergy and/or religious still living and including those clergy and/or religious visiting, studying and/or retired;
 - had strong and clear suspicion of child sexual abuse; or
 - had reasonable concern;
 - and examine/review and report on the nature of the response on the part of the Church Authority.

As well as examine

Communication by the Church Authority with the Civil Authorities;

- Current risks and their management.

5. To consider and report on the implementation of the 7 safeguarding standards set out in *Safeguarding Children: Standards and Guidance Document for the Catholic Church in Ireland (2009)*, including the following:
- a) A review of the current child safeguarding policies and guidance materials in use by the Church Authority and an evaluation of their application;
 - b) How the Church Authority creates and maintains safe environments.
 - c) How victims are responded to by the Church Authority
 - d) What training is taking place within the Church Authority
 - e) How advice and support is accessed by the Church Authority in relation to victim support and assessment and management of accused respondents.
 - f) What systems are in place for monitoring practice and reporting back to the Church Authority.

Accompanying Notes

Note 1: Definition of Child Sexual Abuse:

The definition of child sexual abuse is in accordance with the definition adopted by the Ferns Report (and the Commission of Investigation Report into the Catholic Archdiocese of Dublin). The following is the relevant extract from the Ferns Report:

“While definitions of child sexual abuse vary according to context, probably the most useful definition and broadest for the purposes of this Report was that which was adopted by the Law Reform Commission in 1990¹ and later developed in Children First, National Guidelines for the Protection and Welfare of Children (Department of Health and Children, 1999) which state that “child sexual abuse occurs when a child is used by another person for his or her gratification or sexual arousal or that of others”. Examples of child sexual abuse include the following:

- exposure of the sexual organs or any sexual act intentionally performed in the presence of a child;
- intentional touching or molesting of the body of a child whether by person or object for the purpose of sexual arousal or gratification;
- masturbation in the presence of the child or the involvement of the child in an act of masturbation;
- sexual intercourse with the child whether oral, vaginal or anal;
- sexual exploitation of a child which includes inciting, encouraging, propositioning, requiring or permitting a child to solicit for, or to engage in prostitution or other sexual acts. Sexual exploitation also occurs when a child is involved in exhibition, modelling or posing for the purpose of sexual arousal, gratification or sexual act, including its recording (on film, video tape, or other media) or the manipulation for those purposes of the image by computer or other means. It may also include showing sexually explicit material to children which is often a feature of the ‘grooming’ process by perpetrators of abuse.”

¹This definition was originally proposed by the Western Australia Task Force on Child Sexual Abuse, 1987 and is adopted by the Law Reform Commission (1990) *Report on Child Sexual Abuse*, p. 8.

Note 2: Definition of Allegation:

The term allegation is defined as an accusation or complaint where there are reasonable grounds for concern that a child may have been, or is being sexually abused, or is at risk of sexual abuse, including retrospective disclosure by adults. It includes allegations that did not necessarily result in a criminal or canonical investigation, or a civil action, and allegations that are unsubstantiated but which are plausible. (NB: Erroneous information does not necessarily make an allegation implausible, for example, a priest arrived in a parish in the Diocese a year after the alleged abuse, but other information supplied appears credible and the alleged victim may have mistaken the date).

Note 3: False Allegations:

The National Board for Safeguarding Children in the Catholic Church in Ireland wishes to examine any cases of false allegation so as to review the management of the complaint by the Diocese/religious congregation/missionary society.

Note 4: Random sample:

The random sample (if applicable) must be taken from complaints or allegations, knowledge, suspicions or concerns of child sexual abuse made against all deceased Catholic clergy/religious covering the entire of the relevant period being 1st January 1975 to the date of the review.

Note 5: Civil Authorities:

Civil Authorities are defined in the Republic of Ireland as the Health Service Executive and An Garda Síochána and in Northern Ireland as the Health and Social Care Trust and the Police Service of Northern Ireland.