

Review of Safeguarding Practice

in the

The Marist Fathers – Society of Mary

undertaken by

The National Board for Safeguarding Children in the

Catholic Church in Ireland (NBSCCCI)

Date: September 2014

CONTENTS

Background	<i>Page 3</i>
Standard 1 <i>A written policy on keeping children safe</i>	<i>Page 8</i>
Standard 2 <i>Management of allegations</i>	<i>Page 12</i>
Standard 3 <i>Preventing Harm to Children</i>	<i>Page 17</i>
Standard 4 <i>Training and Education</i>	<i>Page 21</i>
Standard 5 <i>Communicating the Church's Safeguarding Message</i>	<i>Page 23</i>
Standard 6 <i>Access to Advice and Support</i>	<i>Page 25</i>
Standard 7 <i>Implementing and Monitoring Standards</i>	<i>Page 27</i>
Recommendations	<i>Page 30</i>
Terms of Reference	<i>Page 31</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 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.

The reviewers wish to acknowledge the assistance and co-operation they received when conducting the fieldwork for this review.

In the course of the two days spent at the Irish regional headquarters of the Marist Fathers on September 8th and 9th, 2014, the reviewers met and interviewed the Regional Superior; his immediate predecessor, who also takes responsibility for Garda vetting; the Designated Liaison Person, who also acts as the Safeguarding Coordinator; the Deputy Liaison Person, a priest advisor; a community house superior; the Chairperson and one member of the Safeguarding Committee; a school chaplain who is also responsible for the public oratory in Dundalk; and a school principal, who is also a Designated Liaison Person for that school. The reviewers also conducted telephone interviews with the European Deputy Provincial; a senior manager in Tusla, the Child and Family Agency; a senior manager in An Garda Síochána; a parish safeguarding representative; and an external trainer.

This report contains the findings of the review of safeguarding practice within the Irish region of the Marist Fathers 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 Regional Superior, Fr. Edwin McCallion sm, along with interviews with selected key personnel who contribute to safeguarding within the Marist Fathers. The NBSCCCI believes that all relevant documentation for these cases was passed to the reviewers, and the Regional Superior has confirmed this.

The findings of the review have been shared with a reference group before being submitted to Fr. McCallion sm, along with any recommendations arising from the findings.

Introduction

The Society of Mary, more commonly known as the Marist Fathers is a religious order founded by a French man, Jean-Claude Colin and approved in 1836. The website of the order contains a very detailed exposition of the history of the development of the idea of a religious order of priests especially devoted to Our Lady, which had been developed by a number of contributors but brought to fruition by Fr. Colin, who had been a curate in a parish in the Diocese of Lyon. By the time the order was approved it had since 1816 collected a large group of like-minded men, priests and seminarians who had dedicated themselves to establish the Society of Mary, having received permission from the Bishop of Lyon in 1824 to preach missions within his diocese. The website describes the formal foundation as follows:

In January 1836 the Pope confided the missions of Western Oceania in the South Pacific to this new group of Marist Fathers and the following April Rome approved the Society of Mary, Marist Fathers. The following September the first twenty Marist Fathers made their profession and Fr. Colin was elected as the First Superior General. On Christmas Eve 1836, the first group of Marist missionaries left for the missions in Western Oceania in the South Pacific.¹

In parallel an order of religious Brothers, the Little Brothers of Mary, or the Marist Brothers was formed in 1817 and approved in 1863; and an order of religious Sisters was formed in 1823 approved in 1864, the Sisters of the Congregation of Mary, or the Marist Sisters. A further missionary order of Sisters, the Missionary Sisters of the Society of Mary was approved as a religious congregation in 1931 following the work of a French lay woman who had been working alongside the Marist Fathers in Wallis Island in the South Pacific. Along with the Marist Laity, these four religious orders make up the Marist ‘family’, all linked by shared history and spiritual roots, but each a separate legal entity.

As well as developing missions in the South Pacific, the Marist Fathers sought a base in England, as they needed to be able to service and support their activities in English-speaking Australia and New Zealand. Their first activity in England was running a parish in Whitechapel in East London.

In 1861 the Marist Fathers were invited by the then Archbishop of Armagh to establish a secondary school in Dundalk, St. Mary’s College which is still operating as a Marist Father’s school with over 650 students. Plans for a complete new build of the college are at an advanced stage.

The Marist Fathers now operate in the following parts of the world: Africa (Cameroun and Senegal); Americas (Brazil, Canada, México, Peru, Venezuela and the USA); Asia (Philippines and Thailand); Europe (England, France, Germany, The Netherlands, Ireland, Italy, Norway and Spain); and Oceania (Australia, New Zealand, Fiji, New

¹ <http://www.maristfathers.ie/about/history/our-founder-and-other-biographies>

Caledonia, Papua New Guinea, Samoa, Solomon Islands, Tonga, Vanuatu and Wallis & Futuna). The order has decided to organise itself into three Provincial units, Asia, the Americas and Europe. The order has its Headquarters in Rome, where the Superior General, currently an Irish Marist Father, is based.

The Marist Province of Europe has its Provincial Headquarters in Paris, and the current Deputy Provincial of Europe is an Irish Marist. The Irish Region of the European Province and the Province itself is relatively new, having been established on June 1st 2008; prior to that there had been a joint Anglo-Irish Province until 1952 when this was divided into the Province of Ireland and the Province of Great Britain.

The Marist Fathers have their Irish Regional Headquarters at Mount St. Mary's in Milltown, Dublin 14. This is one of six Marist Fathers' communities in Ireland, all of which are in the Republic of Ireland in either Co. Louth or Co. Dublin. In all there are 43 Irish Marist Fathers in the Irish Region, six of whom live outside the Republic of Ireland (one in Northern Ireland, one in London, two in France and two in Rome).

The Irish Region has a Regional Superior, Fr. Edwin McCallion, who is supported by a Regional Council. Fr. McCallion formally took over as Regional Superior at the beginning of August 2014. In order to get a sense of how the transition from one leadership team to another was being undertaken, especially with reference to child safeguarding, the reviewers met and interviewed the incoming and the outgoing Regional Superiors, both were still completing a detailed handover process at the time of the review. The Regional Superior is appointed by the Provincial of Europe following consultation with the Irish membership of the order.

Each Marist Fathers' community house in the Irish Region has a superior.

The ministries of the Marist Fathers in Ireland involve being the patrons and trustees of three second level voluntary schools, St. Mary's College, Dundalk, Chanel College in Coolock, Dublin 5, and the Catholic University School (CUS) in Leeson Street, Dublin 2. Similar to many other religious orders in Ireland, the Marist Fathers are exploring ways of transferring the management of its schools to independent trustees, while protecting their Marist ethos. In this regard it established the Marist Education Authority (MEA) in 2003. The history and functions of this agency are well described on its website www.maristeducationauthority.ie.

In addition to its educational ministry, the Marist Fathers operate three parishes. Two of these, St. Brendan's in Coolock and St. Teresa's in Donore Avenue are in the Archdiocese of Dublin, and the third, Holy Family Parish in Muirhevnamore, Dundalk is in the Archdiocese of Armagh. The Marist Fathers also run the oratory of St. Mary's in Dundalk, which while not being a parish church, does provide Mass and other liturgical events to the public who choose to attend.

Individual members of the Marist Fathers are involved in third level teaching, psychotherapy, counselling, spiritual direction, chaplaincy and administrative work.

Twelve Marist Fathers in Ireland have retired and carry out no active ministry and some of these men are in assisted living or nursing care placements. The order has substantially refurbished its community of Chanel in Coolock to provide for assisted living and has also made adaptations to two other community residences for the same purpose. The age profile of the order's membership indicates that further planning for the needs of its members in the future will be required. Of the 43 members, 15 are under 70 years of age, while 28 are 70 years or older, with 13 of these men over 80 years of age.

Of the active Marist priests, four work in some capacity in education, fourteen work in parish ministry, six have administrative responsibilities within the order and the other seven have a variety of roles, none of which involve ministry to children or young people.

The following is a list of Marist Fathers' community houses with the numbers of residents in each house in brackets:

- Milltown, Dublin 14 - (9)
- Cerdon, Dundalk – (7)
- Chanel, Coolock, Dublin 5 – (6)
- St. Brendan's Parish, Coolock, Dublin 5 – (4)
- Holy Family Parish, Dundalk – (4)
- St. Teresa's Parish, Donore Avenue, Dublin 8 – (4)

In addition, four members live on their own due to the nature of their particular ministries.

The overall Mission of the Society of Mary – Marist Fathers is described on its website as:

The Society of Mary (Marist Fathers) has but one overall mission – to proclaim the Gospel to the people of our time, ever conscious of the mystery of Mary in the Church...

The Marist mission is to be carried out persuasively but quietly, because that is how Mary carried out her role in the early church. Mary's role is the foundation upon which Marist life is built. They are inspired by her person and follow her example.²

Among the six Aims and Objectives of the Irish Region is one of continuing to participate in and contribute to the mission of:

Safeguarding and Child Protection, through the various operations of the National Board for Safeguarding Children in the Catholic Church (NBSCCC), the 'Towards Healing' counselling service, and 'Towards Peace' spiritual direction service, along with other emerging initiatives in this area.³

² www.maristfathers.ie/about/our-mission

³ Marist Fathers *Internal Pastoral Policy* document provided to the reviewers

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 guidance, *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 Marist Fathers. 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 a religious order meets 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 partially
1.3	The policy states that all Church personnel are required to comply with it.	Met partially
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.	Not met

There is a significant difficulty for the Marist Fathers regarding Standard 1. The order's *Marist Fathers Safeguarding Policy* document, launched on October 7th 2009 following consultation with the membership, has been written to accompany the *Safeguarding*

Children - Standards and Guidance Document for the Catholic Church in Ireland, rather than to be a stand-alone document. It does not meet Standard 1 in a number of important ways that are outlined here.

The Marist Fathers' website at www.maristfathers.ie/safeguarding does present a Marist Fathers safeguarding policy statement:

It is the policy of the Marist Fathers 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 Marist Fathers policy. The policy has been devised to ensure that the Marist Fathers in Ireland take every possible measure to prevent abuse. It aims to ensure that none of its personnel or volunteers engage 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 is not as developed as it could be, and as a result, Criterion 1.1 is met partially.

It needs to be clarified at this point that the children and young people who attend the three Marist schools and who participate in activities in the three Marist parishes already described are protected under the child safeguarding policies and procedures of the Department of Education and Skills; of each school, as adopted by their respective Boards of Management; and by the child safeguarding policies and procedures of the two Archdioceses in which the Marist parishes are based. What is important therefore is that all of the ministries and activities that involve the Marist Fathers directly with children and young people are subject to clear and comprehensive child safeguarding policies and procedures.

The *Marist Fathers Safeguarding Policy* was drawn up to cover child safeguarding issues arising in relation to the six Marist Fathers' community residences only. Weaknesses in this policy, while definitely requiring immediate remediation, are not quite as serious as may appear at first glance.

The *Marist Fathers Safeguarding Policy* on page 10, at the end of a list of persons to whom a concern about the welfare or safety of a child could be reported, has typed the words:

Signed: Fr. A
Irish Regional Superior

(The previous Irish Regional Superior's name is used here). In the context of the contents of the page on which it appears and without evidence of a signature or date, this cannot be taken as evidence that Criterion 1.2 is fully met.

On page 5 of this policy document the following three statements are made under the heading, *Purpose*:

To ensure that the Marist Fathers in Ireland have a Safeguarding Policy in keeping with the National Board for Safeguarding Children in the Catholic Church (NBSCCC)

To ensure that every Marist Ministry and Community has in place what is required of them by the Marist Fathers Safeguarding Policy and the NBSCCC

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

None of these statements is a categorical commitment to ensuring all Church personnel comply with the Marist Father's Child Protection 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 to fully meet the requirements of Criterion 1.3.

The policy and procedures of the Marist Fathers is not dated, so it is not possible to accurately establish when it needed to be reviewed, but at the latest this should have been in train by early 2013. While there is no evidence of a previously circulated guidance document, the reviewers saw a copy of *The Procedure to be Followed where an Allegation of Child Sexual Abuse is Made against a Marist Confrere* which had been written by the then Provincial in 2003 and there is evidence on case files that it was used; but the reviewers are unclear as to why it seems to have been set aside in the intervening years. That document was quite good and should now be revisited as the Marist Fathers revise their more recent written guidance.

The Marist Fathers have now been audited by Tusla, the Child and Family Agency and Tusla has made it clear to the order that it is unhappy with the 2009/2010 policy. The order has received a clear critical analysis from Tusla in the form of a five-page letter of May 23rd 2014. The order has been aware for some time of the deficiencies in its policy, but is also aware that the NBSCCCI is in the process of reviewing and revising its own 2009 *Safeguarding Children: Standards and Guidance Document for the Catholic Church in Ireland* document with a view to producing a new set of standards in 2015. In this situation the Marist Fathers 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 national standards by the NBSCCCI. 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 Regional Superior of the Marist Fathers 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*.

The *Marist Fathers Safeguarding Policy* does not address child safeguarding in different aspects of the order's activities. It significantly does not make any statement about the order's commitment to ensuring that '*...all current child protection concerns must be fully reported to the civil authorities without delay*'. The document has on Page 13 the contact details for the Designated Officer and the Deputy Designated Officer of the order and the Designated Officers for the two Archdioceses in which it operates parishes. However, the policy has no information on the contact details for the statutory child protection agencies. On the basis of these findings, Criteria 1.4, 1.5 and 1.8 are not met. Criterion 1.9 cannot be met due to the Order's policy being not fit for purpose.

The policy document of the Marist Fathers does not address '*...how those individuals who pose a risk to children are managed*', and therefore does not meet the stipulation of Criterion 1.6.

On the final page of the *Marist Fathers Safeguarding Policy* there is a listing of definitions of types of child abuse. These are presented without any introductory text that might provide some context for the definitions. It is the opinion of the reviewers that Criterion 1.7 is partially met.

The Irish Province of the Marist Fathers produced a booklet in 2001 entitled *Effective Instruments of Divine Mercy – A Code of Ethics and Procedures*. This booklet was distributed to the membership of the Irish Province after an Assembly gathering, and was also sent to other Provinces to guide their policy. It contains useful guidance on *Sexual Conduct* and on *Procedures for child abuse issues*, but it falls short of meeting the requirements of a policy and procedures document for the order. Along with *The Procedure to be Followed where an Allegation of Child Sexual Abuse is Made against a Marist Confrere* of 2003, it is clear that the leadership of the Marist Fathers has been engaged for some time in developing thinking about child safeguarding and in putting this in writing. However, this does not appear to have been undertaken in an organised and effective manner that fully accords with requirements of Standard 1.

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 a religious order meets 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.	Met fully
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

Table 1

Incidence of Safeguarding allegations received within the Marist Fathers from 1st January 1975 up to the time of the review.

Marist Fathers Irish Region		
Item	Information on	Number
1.	Number of Marist priests against whom allegations have been made since the 1 st January 1975 up to the date of the review.	7
2.	Total number of allegations received by the Marist Fathers since 1 st January, 1975.	18
3.	Number of allegations reported to An Garda Síochána involving Marist priests since 1 st January 1975.	17
4.	Number of allegations reported to the TUSLA/ HSE/HSC (or the Health Boards which preceded the setting up of the HSE,) involving Marist priests since 1 st January 1975.	17
5.	Number of Marist priests (still members of the order) against whom an allegation was made and who were living at the date of the review.	1
6.	Number of Marist priests against whom an allegation was made and who are deceased.	4
7.	Number of Marist priests against whom an allegation has been made and who are in ministry.	0
8.	Number of Marist priests against whom an allegation was made and who are 'Out of Ministry', but are still members of the Order.	0
9.	Number of Marist priests against whom an allegation was made and who are retired.	1
10.	Number of Marist priests against whom an allegation was made and who have left the order / priesthood.	2
11.	Number of Marist priests who have been convicted of having committed an offence or offences against a child or young person since the 1 st January 1975.	0

Footnote: The term allegation in this table includes complaints and expressions of concern based on reasonable grounds.

The reviewers had access to all case files generated from child safeguarding concerns being received by the Marist Fathers concerning a priest member. The order has developed such files in relation to 10 named members or ex-members and one unidentified member. Of this group of 11, seven are deceased and three are living. It is impossible to know whether the unidentified man is alive or dead, but for the purposes of this table it is taken that he is deceased. Of the three men who are still alive, two are now former members of the order.

Of the seven deceased members on whom files had been created, it transpired during the review that in four of these cases, no concern of sexual abuse had been raised, but complaints had been received about cruel physical punishment in a Marist Fathers' school. Table 1 above only contains information on concerns about possible sexual abuse of children. All complaints against deceased members were received after these men had died, which meant that no criminal investigation could be conducted and no assessment of risk to children was required by the HSE / Tusla.

Recommendation 2

That the Regional Superior ensures that the DLP further develop the case filing system to clearly differentiate and separate out cases of alleged child sexual abuse from those involving a complaint about alleged cruel physical punishment.

This review is primarily focused on child safeguarding concerns that involve the possible sexual abuse of children. It is of course perfectly correct for religious orders to also respond supportively and effectively to complaints about historical or current physical abuse or neglect of children and to make whatever reports to the statutory agencies that are required in legislation and statutory guidance.

The reviewers read the substantial case files on the three men who are still living. It is clear that in the case of one of these, no longer a member of the order, the initial concern was spurious and had no substance. In fact it was withdrawn and an apology was proffered by the original complainant.

This file and the other two case files were well constructed and contained evidence of good safeguarding work. In one of these it is evident that the then Provincial in 1994 managed one of these cases in an excellent way and took decisions and actions that were very prescient of case management approaches. Within five days of receipt of the first allegation against the priest, the Provincial had asked him to step aside from ministry. As soon as was practicable, the respondent priest was sent for residential assessment and therapy to a specialist clinic in another jurisdiction. The Marists have received seven separate allegations against this man and in all cases appropriate outreach and support was provided to each of these complainants. The priest was encouraged to consider his position and he subsequently applied for and was granted dispensation from his priestly vows, i.e. he was laicised in late 1996. Criminal charges have since been initiated against this man.

In the second case file examined, which also relates to an allegation received in the 1990s, within three days of a formal complaint against a priest member of the Marists, he was removed from his school-based ministry. He was sent for assessment as soon as this could be arranged and he was subsequently sent for treatment to a specialist residential clinic in another jurisdiction. There were subsequently two further allegations of sexual abuse made against this priest. The Marist Fathers have provided outreach and support to these three complainants. The priest remains a member of the order. His behaviour is governed by a strictly supervised Covenant of Care that is reviewed every three months

by the order's Designated Liaison Person. This written management plan was drawn up following a risk assessment process.

While a great deal of the work in this case has been of high quality and effectiveness, there have been some delays in the making of notifications to An Garda Síochána and HSE in relation to the separate allegations received by the order. The Covenant of Care is excellent but was only introduced three years ago. The HSE (now Tusla) have been kept informed of this priest's situation and has expressed the view that all appropriate child safeguarding steps have been taken by the order in relation to him.

The reviewers sampled three other files, two of which related to deceased priests and the final one which related to the unidentified priest. All three files were well structured and showed evidence of good case management within the limitations of the types of cases involved. One of these complaints was made in 2009, while the other two were made in 2011.

The complaint made against an unidentified member of the Marist Fathers was not supported by any compelling evidence. It is clear from the file that the leadership of the order went to great lengths to try and identify who this man might be, but with no success. In all three case files examined, reporting to the statutory authorities was made without delay.

Overall, the reviewers are of the view that the management of cases of alleged sexual abuse within the Marist Fathers has been of a good standard; that there has been a good focus maintained on avoiding risk to the welfare and safety of children; and that there has been a concerted effort made to address the needs of complainants. These practices are commended.

The reviewers have formed the opinion that three of the seven criteria required to meet Standard 2 have not been met, i.e. 2.2, 2.5 and 2.7. 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. For instance, in the file box marked Standard 2, there are approximately 38 separate documents, including flow-chart diagrams, photocopied pages from *Children First*, photocopied pages from case files, correspondence and minutes of meetings, policies in draft form, and copied guidance from the NBSCCCI and from two other religious orders. 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 Marist Fathers; but this has yet to be undertaken.

In addition to the brief sections in the *Marist Fathers Safeguarding Policy on Initial Reception of a Complaint of Abuse* (Page 12) and on *How a complaint is dealt with* (Page 14), the order has also developed A4 sized laminated sheets for display in each community residence with the guidance on *Initial Reception of a Complaint of Abuse*.

These two together assist the Marist Fathers to partially meet the requirements of Criterion 2.1.

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 Marist Fathers do have a Designated Liaison Person (DLP) in place. This professionally qualified practitioner also fills this role with a number of other Church authorities in Ireland. She is active and well known within the Marist Fathers and there is a Deputy Designated Liaison Person also in place, who is a Marist priest. The reviewers interviewed both of these people. Criterion 2.3 is met fully.

The reviewers were informed that a group of six religious orders, including the Marist Fathers are actively examining a plan to engage between them a person who will act as the DLP for all of them. This plan also envisages that this new person would act as Safeguarding Coordinator for this group of religious orders. The reviewers would be concerned that the Marist Fathers would not proceed with this plan until they have had the opportunity to consider the feedback that they have received from Tusla in May 2014, and until they have reflected on this review report.

Recommendation 3

That the incoming Regional Council of the Marist Fathers reviews the roles of the DLP, especially in relation to their Risk Management responsibilities and of the Co-ordinator of Safeguarding, especially in relation to their training and development responsibilities, with a view to having sufficient information with which to confidently plan for the filling of these two positions. The advice of the NBSCCCI can be sought in this regard.

The case files that are kept by the Marist Fathers are of good quality and are securely stored. Access to these files is restricted and a protocol is in place to ensure that confidentiality of information is protected. The order engaged a legal secretary to assist it in bringing the case files up to a professional standard, and this initiative is commended. Criterion 2.4 is met fully. The Marist Fathers have also produced a separate written guidance for the sharing of information, *Marist Fathers Region of Ireland – Protocol for the sharing of Child Safeguarding information*, which is signed by the Regional Superior in September 2010. This is a commendable publication, which should now be reviewed and revised as originally intended. On the basis of this documentation Criterion 2.6 is met fully.

The information needed to meet Criteria 2.5 and 2.7 is not found in the *Marist Fathers Safeguarding Policy*, and therefore these criteria are not met.

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 a religious order 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 fully
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).	Met partially

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.	Met partially
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.	Met partially

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.	Met partially
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.	Met fully

While it is accepted that Marists Fathers work according to the safeguarding policy and procedures of other organisations in which they work, there is the expectation that the *Marist Fathers Safeguarding Policy* would cross reference relevant criteria, i.e. Criteria 3.5, 3.7, 3.9, 3.10 and 3.11 with their equivalent in the schools’ or parishes’ policies and procedures. This needs to be done more clearly than has been achieved to date.

Of the remaining six criteria under Standard 3, one is not met. The *Marist Fathers Safeguarding Policy* does not contain sufficient guidance on *Safe Recruitment* (Criterion 3.1).

There is a Marist priest tasked with Garda vetting and the reviewers interviewed him. He works in association with his counterpart in the Archdiocese of Dublin Child Safeguarding Office and he utilises that facility to deal with applications to the Garda Vetting Unit. In the discussion with him, it was clear that the Marist Fathers are aware of best practice in recruitment as a child safeguarding matter. Criteria 3.2 and 3.3 are met fully.

In the *Marist Fathers Safeguarding Policy* there is a Marist Fathers *Code of Behaviour* (Page 20), and this is also reproduced on a laminated A4 sheet for display in all Marist community residences. The Code covers a number of important issues and is reproduced here.

CODE OF BEHAVIOUR for our life & ministry:

- *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 at community residence level, and it satisfies the requirement of Criteria 3.4 and 3.8.

The Marist Fathers have a comprehensive and good whistle-blowing policy and this needs to be inserted into the revised safeguarding policy when that is adopted. Criterion 3.6 is met fully. They also have commendable policies on social media, electronic equipment and internet use, which allow Criterion 3.12 to be met fully. These policies

will need to be integrated into a revised child safeguarding policy and procedures document for the order.

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 treatment of Standard 4 in the *Marist Fathers Safeguarding Policy* is quite poor and does not evidence a commitment to safeguarding training within the order. However, the file box with information on Training does contain some information that helps mitigate the impression caused by the policy document.

The Marist Fathers employ some lay staff in their six community residences. However, the reviewers saw or heard of no evidence that the persons employed are provided with any briefing or training in relation to child safeguarding and this situation needs to be addressed urgently. Criterion 4.1 is not met.

Recommendation 4

That the Safeguarding Committee / Co-ordinator of the Marist Fathers conducts an audit of all lay staff employed in their community residences and plan and provide basic child safeguarding awareness training for them as a matter of urgency.

Due to the small numbers in the order, the Marist Fathers have no individual tasked with a Trainer role. They have relied on CORI and the NBSCCCI to provide training

opportunities for their members, staff and volunteers. Somebody however needs to have delegated responsibility for the Training brief within the order. The Marist Fathers are examining the possibility of recruiting a Safeguarding Coordinator to be shared with a number of other religious orders. The Training brief will be included in the portfolio of responsibilities for this new position. Before committing to this joint employment plan, the reviewers would wish the Marist Fathers to more rigorously examine their specific child safeguarding training requirements.

Recommendation 5

That the Marist Regional Council consult the NBSCCCI in relation to how best to plan for and deliver child safeguarding training within the order.

There is some evidence in the Standard 4 file box that members of the order have participated in relevant child safeguarding training, especially the outgoing Regional Superior and the incoming Regional Superior has already enrolled for such training in the near future. The reviewers would encourage the order to be more scientific in deciding who needs what training, and the recommendation made above should encompass such an approach. Criteria 4.2 and 4.3 are partially met.

The Marist Fathers have not really developed in-house training programmes. The reviewers do recognise that the DLP has provided some training over the years and for this reason deem Criterion 4.4 to be partially met.

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 fully
5.2	Children are made aware of their right to be safe from abuse and who to speak to if they have concerns.	Not met
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.	Met partially

Standard 5 is not well considered in the *Marist Fathers Safeguarding Policy*. 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 however that the order has developed and arranged the display of three A4 size laminated sheets in each Marist community residence. The

sheets are headed *Initial Reception of a Complaint of Abuse, Marist Fathers Code of Behaviour*, and *Marist Fathers Safeguarding Policy Statement*.

Given the circulation of the *Marist Fathers Safeguarding Policy* to all members, Criterion 5.1 is considered to be met fully.

Criterion 5.3 is met for the same reason, as the DLP is well identified to the membership through both the policy and the laminated A4 sheets.

The reviewers have had the opportunity to discuss the Marist Fathers with senior managers in An Garda Síochána and in Tusla, the Child and Family Agency, and they are encouraged by the feedback they have received from both agencies which evidences that the order has developed and does maintain good working relationships with the two statutory child protection agencies. As a result, Criterion 5.5 is met fully.

Criterion 5.2 is really not applicable to the Marist Fathers community residences, as children and young people are not involved in any activities in these locations, but the expectation is that the *Marist Fathers Safeguarding Policy* would cross reference this criterion in their policy and procedures.

The reviewers read draft guidelines on the sharing of information in the file box on Standard 5. The document *Marist Fathers Region of Ireland – Protocol for the sharing of Child Safeguarding information* has already been mentioned under Standard 2. The draft policy states that a verified allegation of risk to a child should be routinely reported without delay to the statutory authorities. The reviewers are not satisfied however with the term ‘*verified*’; the phrases *reasonable grounds for concern*, or having a *semblance of truth* would more accurately describe what the threshold is for reporting. The reviewers welcome the emphasis on reporting without delay. The policy does state that *consent is not required for reporting to the statutory authorities*. While being aware that more work is required in the development of policy in this area, the reviewers believe that Criterion 5.6 is met partially.

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 fully
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

There is plenty of evidence that the Marist Fathers have knowledge of and access to specialist advice, support and information. The DLP is professionally trained in a relevant practice area, while the members of the Regional Safeguarding Committee have appropriate child safeguarding experience and skills. The order has good working relationships with the statutory child protection services. There is good information collected on support and therapeutic agencies. Links have been established with the NBSCCCI through which additional information and advice can be sourced. The Marist Fathers are members of the NBSCCCI's National Case Management Reference Group (NCMRG) service. On the basis of this evidence, Criteria 6.1 and 6.2 are fully met.

The *Marist Fathers Safeguarding Policy* contains a section headed *Initial Reception of a Complaint of Abuse*, and this is also reproduced as an A4 sized sheet that is displayed in all Marist community residences. This goes some way towards meeting the demands of Criterion 6.3. The reviewers however 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. On this basis Criterion 6.3 is partially met.

In examining the case files the reviewers saw evidence of outreach and support being provided to complainants. Prior to the fieldwork visit for this review, the Marist Fathers placed two notices on the Home page of their website www.maristfathers.ie, and on the parishes and schools websites, announcing the review and inviting people who had any child safeguarding concerns to make contact with the DLP or the NBSCCCI or An Garda Síochána or the HSE. These were posted on August 5th and August 23rd 2014.

The evidence from the case files suggests that the Marist Fathers have met Criterion 6.5 fully, in that every effort was made to provide appropriate support and assistance to the respondent priests in ways that did not place children at risk.

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 partially
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 reviewers met with the Chairperson of the Marist Fathers' Safeguarding Committee and a member of that committee. These two women are interested and committed to help the order to develop its child safeguarding project. The Safeguarding Committee has met on 11 occasions since its initial meeting in September 2010. It is a very small group, with only three members, the two women who participated in the review fieldwork and a third member, a Marist priest. It seems that the Safeguarding Committee has prioritised the auditing of compliance by the six Marist community residences with the requirements of the NBSCCCI's *Safeguarding Children: Standards and Guidance Document for the Catholic Church in Ireland*.

The reviewers read a two-page document entitled *Regional Safeguarding Committee Revised Action Plan September 2010 – August 2016* in the file on the Safeguarding Committee. However, the committee members interviewed did not reference this document and it was not mentioned by anyone else who was interviewed in the course of the fieldwork. The title of the document suggests that there may have been a previous document that may have been reviewed and revised, but the reviewers saw no evidence of this. While all such planning exercises are to be welcomed, it is not clear that the

document referred to here has any status within the Marist Fathers and it does not constitute the written plan that is required under Criterion 7.1.

Recommendation 6

That the Regional Superior ensures that Marist Fathers develop a written Child Safeguarding Plan for their community residences.

There is evidence that the Marist Fathers have invested in 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.

As mentioned, the Safeguarding Committee has been most active in monitoring compliance of the six Marist community residences with the seven national standards of the Catholic Church in Ireland. They have had meetings with each community superior, on the basis of which they brought back some findings and recommendations to the Regional Superior. These included that:

1. They needed to meet every community member as the leader can't speak for others
2. The NBSCCCI audit tool and the *Marist Fathers Safeguarding Policy* were not compatible
3. A lot of the audit tool questions were only relevant for the Irish Region but not for application to community residences
4. It was unclear whose responsibility lay staff in the community residences were
5. Community members did not appear to know what to do if they needed to make an emergency child safeguarding Report
6. The Marist Fathers Safeguarding Policy needs to be more specific in some areas

On foot of these findings the Committee decided, in consultation with the Regional Superior, that they should convene meetings of the full community in each Marist residence and they had conducted one such meeting prior to the review fieldwork visit. Their intention is to continue this initiative until they have met with all remaining Marist communities. It transpired in the one community meeting that was held, that some child safeguarding issues were brought to the attention of the Safeguarding Committee and through it, to the Regional Superior. While this may have been perceived to be problematic, it did show that there is potential in such meetings to clarify local issues and to tighten safeguarding practices in each residence. That meeting took place in July 2013, but there have been no further such meetings held.

Criterion 7.3 is met partially because there is a lack of clarity about the audit methodology that needs to be used. This can be relatively easily corrected.

Recommendation 7

That the Regional Superior expands the membership of the Safeguarding Committee and develop Terms of Reference for it, to include the development of policies and procedures, the oversight of Training, recruitment and vetting and internal audit of compliance with the NBSCCCI's standards.

Recommendation 8

That the Regional Superior of the Marist Fathers charges the new and expanded Safeguarding Committee with the task of developing criteria and an appropriate methodology to apply in undertaking internal audit of the six Marist community residences.

Criterion 7.4 is not really applicable to the Marist Fathers community residences, but the expectation is that the *Marist Fathers Safeguarding Policy* would cross reference this criterion in their policy and procedures.

The Marist Fathers record keeping and filing systems are of a good quality and meet the requirements of Criterion 7.5.

Recommendations

Recommendation 1

That the Regional Superior of the Marist Fathers 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 Regional Superior ensures that the DLP further develop the case filing system to clearly differentiate and separate out cases of alleged child sexual abuse from those involving a complaint about alleged cruel physical punishment.

Recommendation 4

That the Safeguarding Committee / Co-ordinator of the Marist Fathers conducts an audit of all lay staff employed in their community residences and plan and provide basic child safeguarding awareness training for them as a matter of urgency.

Recommendation 5

That the Marist Regional Council consult the NBSCCCI in relation to how best to plan for and deliver child safeguarding training within the order.

Recommendation 6

That the Regional Superior ensures that Marist Fathers develop a written Child Safeguarding Plan for their community residences.

Recommendation 7

That the Regional Superior expands the membership of the Safeguarding Committee and develop Terms of Reference for it, to include the development of policies and procedures, the oversight of Training, recruitment and vetting and internal audit of compliance with the NBSCCCI's standards.

Recommendation 8

That the Regional Superior of the Marist Fathers charges the new and expanded Safeguarding Committee with the task of developing criteria and an appropriate methodology to apply in undertaking internal audit of the six Marist community residences.

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 Diocese by individuals or by the Civil Authorities in the period 1st January 1975 to 1st June 2010, against Catholic clergy and/or religious still living and who are ministering/or who once ministered under the aegis of the Diocese and examine/review and report on the nature of the response on the part of the Diocese.

2. If deemed relevant, select a random sample of complaints or allegations, knowledge, suspicions or concerns of child sexual abuse, made to the Diocese by individuals or by the Civil Authorities in the period 1st January 1975 to 1st June 2010, against Catholic clergy and/or religious now deceased and who ministered under the aegis of the Diocese and examine/review and report on the nature of the response on the part of the Diocese.

3. To ascertain all of the cases during the relevant period in which the Diocese:
 - 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 Diocese.

4. To consider and report on the following matters:
 - Child safeguarding policies and guidance materials currently in use in the Diocese and an evaluation of their application;
 - Communication by the Diocese with the Civil Authorities;
 - Current risks and their management.

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 1990⁴ 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.

⁴ This 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.

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 1st June 2010 and must be selected randomly in the presence of an independent observer.

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.