



**Private and Confidential**

**Review of Safeguarding Practice  
in the  
Archdiocese of Cashel and Emly  
undertaken by**

**The National Board for Safeguarding Children in the  
Catholic Church in Ireland (NBSCCCI)**

**The content of this Report is not to be accessed or shared without the consent  
of Archbishop Dermot Clifford**

**Dated: 23<sup>rd</sup> May, 2013**

**CONTENTS**

<b>Background</b>	<i>Page 3</i>
<b>Standard 1</b> <i>A written policy on keeping children safe</i>	<i>Page 7</i>
<b>Standard 2</b> <i>Management of allegations</i>	<i>Page 10</i>
<b>Standard 3</b> <i>Preventing Harm to Children</i>	<i>Page 16</i>
<b>Standard 4</b> <i>Training and Education</i>	<i>Page 20</i>
<b>Standard 5</b> <i>Communicating the Church's Safeguarding Message</i>	<i>Page 22</i>
<b>Standard 6</b> <i>Access to Advice and Support</i>	<i>Page 24</i>
<b>Standard 7</b> <i>Implementing and Monitoring Standards</i>	<i>Page 26</i>
<b>Recommendations</b>	<i>Page 28</i>
<b>Terms of Reference</b>	<i>Page 29</i>

## **Background**

The National Board for Safeguarding Children in the Catholic Church in Ireland (NBSCCCI) was asked by the Sponsoring Bodies, namely the 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, *Safeguarding Children: Standards and Guidance Document for the Catholic Church in Ireland* 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.

This report contains the findings of the *Review of Safeguarding Practice within the Archdiocese of Cashel and Emly* 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 by Archbishop Clifford and his safeguarding team, along with interviews with selected key personnel who contribute to safeguarding within the archdiocese. The NBSCCCI believes that all relevant documentation for these cases was passed to the reviewers and Archbishop Clifford has confirmed this.

The findings of the review have been shared with a reference group in redacted form before being submitted to Archbishop Clifford, along with any recommendations arising from the findings.

## **Introduction**

The Metropolitan Archdiocese of Cashel and Emly in mid-western Ireland is in the province of Munster. The then separate dioceses of Cashel and Emly were established in 1111 by the Synod of Rathbreasail. Cashel diocese was promoted to the status of a Metropolitan Province in 1152 by the Synod of Kells. Emly diocese was formally joined to Cashel in 1718. The incumbent Ordinary Dermot Clifford has been archbishop since 1988. The Province of Cashel, is one of the four ecclesiastical provinces that together form the Roman Catholic Church in Ireland; the other provinces are Dublin, Tuam and Armagh. Its metropolitan bishop is the Archbishop of Cashel and Emly. The geographical remit of the province is confined to the Republic of Ireland. The suffragan dioceses of the province are: Cloyne; Cork and Ross; Kerry; Killaloe; Limerick; Waterford and Lismore. The Archdiocese of Cashel is divided into eight deaneries, each of which is divided into a number of parishes (or combined parishes). In total there are forty six parishes in the Archdiocese with a Catholic population of 82,275. There are 82 active Diocesan priests, 5 who are retired, sick, on study leave or working in other Dioceses in Ireland or abroad. In addition there are 52 priests, 13 brothers and 132 sisters from Religious Orders working or living in the Archdiocese.

At the request of Archbishop Clifford, the NBSCCCI staff engaged in a review of safeguarding children practice in the Archdiocese of Cashel and Emly, with the on-site fieldwork taking place on the 20<sup>th</sup> and 21<sup>st</sup> May 2013. This consisted of a series of interviews with diocesan personnel and external safeguarding agencies and a full case file review of all allegations against living and deceased priests. The initial two day fieldwork was then supplemented with a review of all written policies, procedures, guidance documents and statistical information contained within the archdiocese. This report is the product of a critique of all the information obtained.

The review team would like to take the opportunity to thank Archbishop Clifford, his designated person, his safeguarding coordinator and all whom the reviewers met who hold safeguarding roles for their commitment to the review process, for their openness and obvious enthusiasm for safeguarding and the learning opportunities that the review afforded them.

In preparation for the review, Archbishop Clifford posted a notice on his diocesan website informing viewers of the pending review and inviting anyone who had a complaint or a concern to come forward. This notice did not result in any new allegations.

The purpose of the review is set out within the Terms of Reference that are appended to this report. It seeks to examine how practice conforms to expected standards in the Church. Two separate but related aspects of child safeguarding are examined during a review. The first is how abuse concerns about priests from the archdiocese were managed both at the time an allegation was received and currently. The second focus of a review is on the structures and processes that have been put in place to ensure the safety of children in the present and into the future.

It is an expectation of the NBSCCCI that key findings from the review will be shared widely so that public awareness of what is in place and what is planned may be increased, as well as confidence that the Church is taking appropriate steps to safeguard children.

The review was initiated through the signing of a data protection deed, allowing full access by staff from NBSCCCI to all case management and other child safeguarding records. This access does not constitute disclosure as the reviewers, through the deed, were deemed to be nominated data processors of the material for the archbishop.

The process involved the fieldwork team reading all case management records of living priests who were/are incardinated into the archdiocese of Cashel and Emly and any priests who may have retired to the archdiocese from other areas against whom there were concerns/allegations of child sexual abuse.

In addition, interviews were held with Archbishop Clifford, the current and previous designated persons, the safeguarding co-ordinator, members of the Safeguarding Committee, two safeguarding/parish representatives, three registered trainers and one who is currently being assessed as a trainer for the archdiocese, the vetting co-ordinator who is also the archbishops secretary and chancellor of the archdiocese, a priest adviser and a priest of the archdiocese who did not have a formal role in the safeguarding structure apart from his own responsibilities as a parish priest.

An interview was also held with a HSE Child and Family Services representative and a telephone discussion was had with the chief superintendent of An Garda Síochána at the Sexual Crimes Management Unit in Harcourt Square in Dublin.

The final part of the review was an assessment of the archdiocesan *Safeguarding Children Policy Standards and Procedures* document and other documents relating to child safeguarding activities.

The review process uses the seven standards outlined within the NBSCCCI *Safeguarding Children: Standards and Guidance Document for the Catholic Church in Ireland* as an assessment framework. The report below, therefore, highlights the findings by the fieldworkers under each standard and draws conclusions regarding the effectiveness of policies and practices in the archdiocese to prevent abuse, as well as the ability of the relevant personnel within the archdiocese to assess and manage risk to children. Where appropriate, recommendations for improvements are made.

The reviewers note that Archbishop Clifford was appointed Apostolic Administrator for the Diocese of Cloyne in March 2009 and held that position until the ordination of a new bishop there on 27.1.13. Since 2011 the designated person for Cashel and Emly also took responsibilities as designated person in Cloyne.

## **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 Archdiocese of Cashel and Emly. 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 Cashel and Emly Archdiocese meets the requirements of all nine criteria against which the standard is measured.

### **Criteria**

<b>Number</b>	<b>Criterion</b>	<b>Met fully or Met partially or Not met</b>
<b>1.1</b>	The Church organisation has a child protection policy that is written in a clear and easily understandable way.	Fully Met*
<b>1.2</b>	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).	Fully Met
<b>1.3</b>	The policy states that all Church personnel are required to comply with it.	Fully Met
<b>1.4</b>	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.	Fully Met
<b>1.5</b>	The policy addresses child protection in the different aspects of Church work e.g. within a Church building, community work, pilgrimages, trips and holidays.	Fully Met
<b>1.6</b>	The policy states how those individuals who pose a risk to children are managed.	Partially Met
<b>1.7</b>	The policy clearly describes the Church's understanding and definitions of abuse.	Fully Met
<b>1.8</b>	The policy states that all current child protection concerns must be fully reported to the civil authorities without delay.	Fully Met
<b>1.9</b>	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.	Fully Met

\* The Safeguarding Policies and Procedures were reviewed early in 2013.

The revised archdiocesan policy and procedures document (2013) entitled *Safeguarding Children* states that this is not a stand alone document but that it seeks to incorporate best practice as found in the civil and Church documents including *Children First* and NBSCCCI's *Safeguarding Children: Standards and Guidance Document for the Catholic Church in Ireland*. Cashel and Emly's document is clear, well written, gives clear definitions of abuse and processes for managing and reporting allegations/concerns of child abuse. The document sets out the archdiocese's implementation of the seven standards at diocesan and parish level. There is a requirement that all Church personnel both clerics and lay staff and volunteers sign a form to state that they have received, understood and will implement the diocesan policy and procedures. This form "5a" is a diocesan specific form and is a good way of encouraging active engagement with the policy and procedures in relation to safeguarding children. In addition to the full set of policies and procedures being detailed in one comprehensive document, the archdiocese has produced a leaflet for the lay faithful which is available in all Church properties. The policy statement is displayed in all Churches and Church properties which allow public access. The archdiocese has a significant Polish community and the poster has therefore also been translated into Polish and displayed in Churches in both English and Polish. The safeguarding team have not received any concerns or allegations from members of the Polish community.

In 2012 in a published audit report by the HSE into safeguarding practice in the archdiocese it was stated that "There were a number of omissions in the Policy that are required by the NBSCCC Standards: All Church personnel are required to comply with it; how those individuals who pose a risk to children are managed; and all current child protection concerns must be reported to the civil authorities without delay."

There is much evidence to support significant progress in these areas in the development of the new policy document in 2013. As noted above there is now a specific form which all Church personnel complete to state that they have read and will comply with the policy and procedures of the archdiocese. In the view of the reviewers all allegations are now promptly referred to the civil authorities, usually within 3 days of receipt by the diocese. In fact there is considerable communication between the designated person, An Garda Síochána and the HSE as well as NBSCCCI on all matters, including new allegations and management of men out of ministry.

There is however one area where written guidance needs to be more explicit and that relates to safety plans (Standard 1, Criterion 1.6). The reviewers noted that written safety plans are in place in case files, but there is an absence of guidance on these within the policy document.

In spite of this lack of reference in the policy document the review team are satisfied that the production, dissemination and implementation of the revised policy document in relation to all other requirements now meets the necessary standard.



Archbishop Clifford is direct in his communication and shows leadership as well as giving support for all matters relevant to safeguarding children. He has dedicated personnel whom he can rely on to make things happen at archdiocesan and local level.

**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 Cashel and Emly Archdiocese meets the requirements of all seven criteria against which the standard is measured.

**Criteria**

<b>Number</b>	<b>Criterion</b>	<b>Met fully or Met partially or Not met</b>
<b>2.1</b>	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).	Fully Met
<b>2.2</b>	The child protection procedures are consistent with legislation on child welfare civil guidance for child protection and written in a clear, easily understandable way.	Fully Met
<b>2.3</b>	There is a designated officer or officer(s) with a clearly defined role and responsibilities for safeguarding children at diocesan or congregational level.	Fully Met
<b>2.4</b>	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.	Fully Met
<b>2.5</b>	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.	Fully Met
<b>2.6</b>	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.	Fully Met
<b>2.7</b>	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.	Fully Met

**Table 1**

**Incidence of safeguarding allegations received within the archdiocese against priests, from 1<sup>st</sup> January 1975 up to time of review.**

<b>Cashel and Emly Archdiocese</b>		
<b>1</b>	Number of Diocesan priests against whom allegations have been made since the 1 <sup>st</sup> January 1975 up to the date of the Review.	<b>13*See note 1</b>
<b>2</b>	Total number of allegations received by the Diocese since 1 <sup>st</sup> January, 1975	<b>19</b>
<b>3</b>	Number of allegations reported to An Garda Síochána involving priests since 1 <sup>st</sup> January 1975.	<b>19</b>
<b>4</b>	Number of allegations reported to the HSE (or the Health Boards which preceded the setting up of the HSE) involving priests of the Diocese since 1 <sup>st</sup> January 1975.	<b>16* See note 2</b>
<b>5</b>	Number of priests (still members of the Diocese/) against whom an allegation was made and who were living at the date of the review.	<b>7</b>
<b>6</b>	Number of priests against whom an allegation was made and who are deceased.	<b>6</b>
<b>7</b>	Number of priests against whom an allegation has been made and who are in ministry.	<b>5* See note 1</b>
<b>8</b>	Number of priests against whom an allegation was made and who are “Out of Ministry, but are still members of the Diocese”.	<b>2* See note 3</b>
<b>9</b>	Number of priests against whom an allegation was made and who are retired	<b>0</b>
<b>10</b>	Number of priests against whom an allegation was made and who have left the Diocese/ priesthood.	<b>0</b>
<b>11</b>	Number of priests of the Diocese who have been convicted of having committed an offence or offences against a child or young person since the 1 <sup>st</sup> January 1975.	<b>0</b>

Note 1 -This includes allegations of physical abuse

Note 2 -Agreed with HSE that priests who had died prior to 1996 not be notified as this was the cut-off date for HSE audit

Note 3 -Both of the priests out of Ministry are over 75years of age

**Footnote:** The term allegation in this table includes complaints and expressions of concern

Over the past year, the Archdiocese of Cashel and Emly has worked alongside other dioceses in the metropolitan area to draft a detailed procedure for dealing with allegations of abuse, in addition to that stated in their policy document. This procedure is a working tool for designated people and others involved in all aspects of case management. This document distinguishes the roles of the designated person and advisory committee from the preventative work undertaken by the safeguarding committee and ensures appropriate communication between all. Most helpfully the document sets out the procedures, in laymen language for dealing with allegations under canon law, once the civil processes have been completed. While further work is required on this draft procedure, NBSCCCI commends the dioceses involved in this initiative for developing straightforward easy to understand local guidance. NBSCCCI would suggest that the procedure could be enhanced through the development of a process flowchart which could be placed on each file and details recorded at each stage of the process once completed to evidence action taken.

**Recommendation 1. The designated person from Cashel and Emly Archdiocese should consult his colleagues in the metropolitan area with a view to developing a process flowchart to guide action in all cases where there is an allegation of child abuse.**

Cashel and Emly have received 19 allegations/suspicious/concerns against 13 priests since 1975. This is a relatively small number in comparison to other dioceses. Allegations of sexual abuse were made against 6 living priests and an allegation of physical abuse against 1 living priest. The reviewers examined all case files including allegations against deceased priests. Of the living priests following civil authority notification and Church inquiries, 5 are currently in ministry and 2 are out of ministry, as Archbishop Clifford believes that based on the evidence that there is a semblance of truth to the allegations in relation to these 2 priests. Having read all files the reviewers support the position of the 5 living priests who are in ministry and agree that the allegations were not substantiated or based on evidence that there was or is current risk to children, consultation in all cases took place with HSE and An Garda Síochána.

The following themes/issues emerged from examining the case files, from interviews with the current and former designated person, An Garda Síochána and HSE.

- The current designated person has constructed the case records into logical sections, which allow the reader to understand the processes engaged and how decisions were made in relation to the management of cases, response to victims and management of risk. The reviewers appreciate the considerable hard work engaged by him in preparing the case files. The case files could be improved further by the presence of detailed narrative recording which supplements the correspondence and minutes of meetings. There are some gaps in the narrative recording. Good recording is an integral part of case management and the reviewers would recommend that the designated person adopts the NBSCCCI case file template for new cases and ensure that all actions, contacts and responses are noted in a chronological narrative report; the inclusion of a timeline to summarise key stages in the management of each case would be beneficial.

- In 4 cases where allegations were brought to the attention of the diocese there were delays in notifying An Garda Síochána; the explanation by the diocese was that the complainants did not want An Garda Síochána informed. In three of these cases the alleged perpetrator was deceased; in the fourth case, in 1999, the priest was out of ministry and had no access to children, therefore the diocese assessed that there was no risk; however it is noted that there was a delay of 9 years in reporting this case to the civil authorities. In all other cases An Garda Síochána were notified the same day or within acceptable timeframes. It is noted in the HSE audit of 2012 that in two cases there was a delay of 11 days and 3 weeks in notifying the civil authorities. Previously the diocese worked under the protocol whereby the civil authorities informed each other once an allegation was brought to their attention; the archdiocese now notifies both agencies in the case of living priests, the HSE have advised that they do not wish to receive information about priests who were deceased before 1996.
- Archbishop Clifford promptly removed priests from public ministry, usually within days of the allegations being brought to his attention.
- While all appropriate Church action was taken following the civil authorities investigations, the records do not demonstrate the formality of the Church process, in other words there was limited evidence of precepts setting out the restrictions on the priest's ministry and limited evidence of decrees initiating the preliminary investigations. The absence of these important documents alongside good case narratives and meeting minutes led the reviewers to assess that most action was taken informally. In future to ensure greater clarity of purpose and to ensure a process of natural justice all Church action should follow appropriate canon law processes and be recorded in full.
- Responses from the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith (CDF) in the Vatican, to Archbishop Clifford have been slow, accounting for the delays in processing cases canonically.
- Practice in responding to complainants was inconsistent. The reviewers read excellent examples of compassionate caring responses which were clearly appreciated by the complainants. In contrast there were other examples of notes and letters which were sharp in tone and approach towards victims. The archdiocese until recently has not had a support person who can ensure that the needs of the complainant are heard and acted upon by the diocese. The appointment of someone to this role, alongside a victim protocol<sup>1</sup> should ensure a more consistent response to complainants in the future.
- The compassion of the victims towards their abuser was striking in two cases. The same compassion was not shown by one of the respondent priest, who often continued to deny the allegations. The other priest was deceased at the time the complaint was received.

---

<sup>1</sup> See section on Access to Advice and Support

- The relationship between the archdiocese, An Garda Síochána and the HSE appear to be good. There is regular communication in relation to cases, and both external agencies expressed a view of confidence in the designated people past and present.
- Risks are managed by way of written agreements and follow-up monitoring plans. The reviewers noted that some of the safety plans have been recently developed.
- There is a strong sense of leadership shown by Archbishop Clifford as voiced by all personnel within the diocese. He has a clear focus on doing the right thing, taking prompt action and ensuring that risk is minimised. The reviewers experienced a man of strong views, determination and a willingness to take advice and act upon that advice.

Overall the reviewers felt that all cases were well managed. There was clarity around the need to notify the civil authorities and in those cases where there were delays, the offending priests had been removed from ministry and Church action was taken to ensure that risks were identified, managed and that children were safe. As stated above, better narrative recording and the introduction of formal canonical processes would strengthen the work on responding to and managing allegations further.

Given the number of priests who were in ministry against whom allegations had been made, the reviewers were keen to assess if these cases had been properly investigated. The reviewers noted the consultation that took place with the HSE, An Garda Síochána and the National Case Management Reference Group (NCMRG) facilitated by NBSCCCI. There were also examples of risk assessment reports undertaken by outside agencies. The reviewers agree that in all cases that the status of the priests' ministry was appropriate and in line with the need to safeguard children as well as responding fairly to the accused priest.

There are a number of male and female religious orders who live and hold appointments within the archdiocese. These include congregations who teach and work in schools, hold retreats and undertake other pastoral ministries. While their management of allegations was not examined as part of this review, it is important that there is good communication between the religious congregations and Archbishop Clifford about allegations that have been made and the status of any accused priests or religious. The archbishop is the person who gives faculties to minister, so he needs to be fully informed if anyone is removed from ministry so that the faculties can be withdrawn. In order to support this, there needs to be an agreed protocol between Archbishop Clifford and each congregational leader about sharing information appropriately where there may be issues of risk to children.

In conclusion to improve practice further, the following recommendations are:

**Recommendation 2: The designated person should employ the NBSCCCI case file template for future cases, ensuring that a narrative account of all actions is recorded.**

**Recommendation 3: Archbishop Clifford must initiate all Church action through formal decrees and ensure that there are written precepts on file outlining the restrictions on a priest's ministry.**

**Recommendation 4: Archbishop Clifford must ensure that the newly appointed support person is offered induction and support in her role and that a written protocol is developed which clarifies how this role will assist complainants.**

**Recommendation 5: Archbishop Clifford should develop a written agreement with all religious congregations within his archdiocese whereby he is informed of information that a member of the religious order has been removed from ministry following an allegation/concern of child abuse.**

### **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 Cashel and Emly 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**

<b>Number</b>	<b>Criterion</b>	<b>Met fully or Met partially or Not met</b>
<b>3.1</b>	There are policies and procedures for recruiting Church personnel and assessing their suitability to work with children.	Fully Met
<b>3.2</b>	The safe recruitment and vetting policy is in line with best practice guidance.	Fully Met
<b>3.3</b>	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.	Fully Met

#### **Criteria – Codes of behaviour**

<b>Number</b>	<b>Criterion</b>	<b>Met fully or Met partially or Not met</b>
<b>3.4</b>	The Church organisation provides guidance on appropriate/ expected standards of behaviour of, adults towards children.	Fully Met
<b>3.5</b>	There is guidance on expected and acceptable behaviour of children towards other children (anti-bullying policy).	Fully Met
<b>3.6</b>	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.	Fully Met



<b>3.7</b>	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.	Fully Met
<b>3.8</b>	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.	Fully Met
<b>3.9</b>	Policies include guidelines on the personal/ intimate care of children with disabilities, including appropriate and inappropriate touch.	Fully Met

**Criteria – Operating safe activities for children**

<b>Number</b>	<b>Criterion</b>	<b>Met fully or Met partially or Not met</b>
<b>3.10</b>	There is guidance on assessing all possible risks when working with children – especially in activities that involve time spent away from home.	Fully Met
<b>3.11</b>	When operating projects/ activities children are adequately supervised and protected at all times.	Fully Met
<b>3.12</b>	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.	Fully Met

In 2012 the archdiocesan safeguarding committee was reconstituted. Formerly there was one committee within the archdiocese which acted as a combined advisory and safeguarding committee. Cashel and Emly have since joined the National Case Management Reference Group (NCMRG) committee for advice on allegations and management of risk.

The newly constituted safeguarding committee, consisting of old and new members undertook the task of reviewing the diocesan policy and procedures and launched the new policy document in 2013. Most remarkable about this committee was their enthusiasm for the work of child safeguarding in the archdiocese and their passion and interest to be creative, work alongside children and their parents as well as the clergy to keep children safe. The rewritten policy and procedure document which is clear and detailed is a testimony to the hard work of the committee.

As an overarching body for safeguarding they take responsibility for conducting annual audits of practice, identifying gaps and supporting priests and parishes to fill those gaps.

The archdiocese has been conducting audits of practice based on the safeguarding standards since 2009 and has annually prepared a report on their findings for Archbishop Clifford.

Accountable to the committee is the safeguarding co-ordinator who has been in post since 2007. The safeguarding co-ordinator on behalf of the dioceses ensures that policies and procedures in relation to the creation of safe environments are implemented at parish level. Many of those interviewed spoke highly of the safeguarding co-ordinator and her responsiveness in dealing with challenges and issues that may occur. She visits parishes on a regular basis and assists priests and safeguarding representatives in their safeguarding tasks.

The reviewers also met two safeguarding representatives and again were hugely impressed by the calibre and commitment of these volunteers. In particular the reviewers felt that these two safeguarding representatives had gone the “extra mile” in ensuring adequate safeguards, particularly in relation to supporting children to engage in Church life through school and related activities. It was evident that the representatives take their responsibilities extremely seriously.

Of particular note, the reviewers would commend the approach taken at parish level to engage the children in developing their own codes of behaviour. In discussion with the representatives there is an awareness of the need to empower children and create an awareness of risks, while at the same time not frightening them. There are examples across other Church bodies of how direct awareness raising with children through training, leaflets and other forms of empowerment have enabled the culture of safety to drill down to children.

In addition to the safeguarding personnel detailed above the reviewers met a parish priest who does not have a formal role in the safeguarding structure. The reviewers were most impressed by the compassion and concern shown by this priest towards children and their safety. He was deeply upset by the harm inflicted on children by his fellow priests, brothers and sisters and stated his determination to work alongside the safeguarding co-ordinator, parents and children to welcome children into a safe and caring Church environment.

The final member of safeguarding staff interviewed was the vetting co-ordinator who acts as the authorised signatory. He shared that vetting is a well accepted part of the recruitment process in the diocese and added that consideration is now being given to re-vetting existing staff and volunteers and to begin vetting of personnel engaged in work with vulnerable adults.

An overall assessment by the reviewers is that Standard 3 is now well embedded in Cashel and Emly. There has been significant progress since the 2012 HSE audit where the gaps in the then policy document were highlighted. Archbishop Clifford is fortunate to have such an enthusiastic and committed group of people within the safeguarding arm of his structure. All policies are now well developed. The reviewers were impressed to

see reference to visiting clergy in the policy document and requirements for temporary solemnisers. There is good work going on with children and their parents to raise awareness of safeguarding issues, to enhance practice further the following recommendation is proposed:

**Recommendation 6: The Safeguarding Committee inclusive of the Safeguarding Co-ordinator should consider how to develop child friendly awareness raising to empower children and create a greater awareness of who to go to if they have a concern about abuse within the Church setting.**

#### Standard 4

##### ***Training and Education***

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

##### **Criteria**

<b>Number</b>	<b>Criterion</b>	<b>Met fully or Met partially or Not met</b>
<b>4.1</b>	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.	Fully Met
<b>4.2</b>	Identified Church personnel are provided with appropriate training for keeping children safe with regular opportunities to update their skills and knowledge.	Fully Met
<b>4.3</b>	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.	Fully Met
<b>4.4</b>	Training programmes are approved by National Board for Safeguarding Children and updated in line with current legislation, guidance and best practice.	Fully Met

Training has been long established as an integral part of safeguarding in Cashel and Emly Archdiocese. The current safeguarding co-ordinator was the training co-ordinator since 2008 for the Munster Bishops Training initiative which began in 2005. Since then, this person, alongside a priest colleague and a lay woman have moved across to the NBSCCCI training programme and have recently been registered as trainers with the NBSCCCI. These three trainers regularly train safeguarding representatives and priests and other relevant personnel on awareness of abuse, how to create safe environments and how to respond to allegations of abuse. In addition they host annual archdiocesan training events to raise awareness of safeguarding issues and invite external people to present. Recently, at the launch of the 2013 *Safeguarding Children*, Policy and Procedures document, the Archdiocese invited a youth leader to deliver a presentation. Such an approach is an encouraging sign of the archdiocese willingness to learn about youth initiatives and how to improve practice with children and young people.

During the Apostolic Visitation which took place in the Archdiocese on 12.1.11- 4.2.11, the visitators attended such an archdiocesan training event and expressed their satisfaction with the work around education and awareness raising. The Safeguarding Co-ordinator in addition to delivering formal training, carries out informal visits to offer advice and support to priests and safeguarding representatives. The reviewers wish to acknowledge the significant amount of work that is taking place at both diocesan and parish level to raise awareness of child abuse and to

ensure preventative action through the implementation of good practice procedures. Evidence to support this was seen in detailed records provided by the safeguarding co-ordinator of her meetings, training sessions and visits to parishes.

## 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**

<b>Number</b>	<b>Criterion</b>	<b>Met fully or Met partially or Not met</b>
<b>5.1</b>	The child protection policy is openly displayed and available to everyone.	Fully Met
<b>5.2</b>	Children are made aware of their right to be safe from abuse and who to speak to if they have concerns.	Partially Met
<b>5.3</b>	Everyone in Church organisations knows who the designated person is and how to contact them.	Fully Met
<b>5.4</b>	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.	Fully Met
<b>5.5</b>	Church organisations establish links with statutory child protection agencies to develop good working relationships in order to keep children safe.	Fully Met
<b>5.6</b>	Church organisations at diocesan and religious order level have an established communications policy which reflects a commitment to transparency and openness.	Fully Met

In addition to *Safeguarding Children* – the policy document for the archdiocese, the reviewers were provided with a list of all types of communications that exist to demonstrate that Standard 5 is met. This included a copy of the policy and procedure document; the safeguarding leaflet which sets out what the archdiocese is doing to safeguard children; the archdiocesan safeguarding newsletter; and posters in English and in Polish.

Information on safeguarding, the policies and procedures and how to report a concern are clearly detailed on the website. Prior to the reviewers arriving in the archdiocese, Archbishop Clifford posted a notice about the review and inviting victims who had not yet come forward to do so.

The NBSCCCI reviewers were advised that when children become altar servers as part of their induction, both they and their parents are invited to a meeting to learn of the safeguards that are in place to prevent abuse and to promote the positive engagement of children in Church life. This initiative is commended, but the reviewers would encourage the development of child friendly literature which could be made available to a wider audience of children who participate in Church liturgies. (see Recommendation 6 above).

## 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**

<b>Number</b>	<b>Criterion</b>	<b>Met fully or Met partially or Not met</b>
<b>6.1</b>	Church personnel with special responsibilities for keeping children safe have access to specialist advice, support and information on child protection.	Partially Met
<b>6.2</b>	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.	Fully Met
<b>6.3</b>	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.	Fully Met
<b>6.4</b>	Information is provided to those who have experienced abuse on how to seek support.	Partially Met
<b>6.5</b>	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.	Partially Met

It has already been noted that response to victims could be significantly enhanced through the introduction at an early stage in the disclosure process of a victim support person. The reviewers have been advised that a person has recently been appointed to this role and that induction and training will be arranged to support her in carrying out her work in a manner that is responsive to the needs of the victims. The reviewers accept that there needs to be greater clarity around when and how to introduce the support person and would recommend that a protocol be introduced to identify role and purpose of the victim support person, when and how this person could be introduced to complainants who present with allegations. While all victims of abuse within Cashel and Emly are offered counselling through *Towards Healing*, each victim has different needs and therefore the support that they require will depend on an assessment of the impact of the abuse on them. The introduction of a support person to assist them in identifying their



needs and communicating that to the archbishop would enhance the response offered and may go some way towards assisting with their healing.

**Recommendation 7: The designated person should promote the services of the support person amongst existing and new complainants, and consider developing a protocol for support services.**

Those priests who have been accused of abuse have been offered priest advisors, but not all have availed of this offer. While the Church does not endorse the behaviours of those who have harmed children, there is a recognition that to prevent further abuse that there is a need to offer guidance and support to perpetrators. The Archdiocese of Cashel and Emly have recognised their responsibilities in this area, as evidenced by the support visits to priests out of ministry and by the recently developed safety plans. The archdiocese does however face certain challenges in cases where the offending priests do not live locally. There was evidence of attempts to introduce monitoring arrangements at a distance with civil authorities and personnel from other dioceses.

The archdiocese has good working relationships with HSE and An Garda Síochána, in whom they consult on case related and other relevant issues. The designated person frequently consults with NBSCCCI and keeps the office informed of developments in relation to notifications of abuse and management of men out of ministry. The archdiocese also consults the National Case Management Reference Group (NCMRG) appropriately. All of these efforts by the designated person are good signs of his transparent approach to dealing with allegations.

In conclusion the reviewers felt that while all aspects of advice and support are not fully implemented that there is a real willingness to share ideas, learn from best practice and reflect on how to improve the services offered to victims and perpetrators of abuse. There is an openness to develop good relationships with external agencies and seek advice appropriately.

## 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**

<b>Number</b>	<b>Criterion</b>	<b>Met fully or Met partially or Not met</b>
<b>7.1</b>	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.	Fully Met
<b>7.2</b>	The human or financial resources necessary for implementing the plan are made available.	Fully Met
<b>7.3</b>	Arrangements are in place to monitor compliance with child protection policies and procedures.	Fully Met
<b>7.4</b>	Processes are in place to ask parishioners (children and parents/ carers) about their views on policies and practices for keeping children safe.	Fully Met
<b>7.5</b>	All incidents, allegations/ suspicions of abuse are recorded and stored securely.	Fully Met

The Safeguarding Committee are a key element of achieving Standard 7 – *Implementing and Monitoring Standards*. They meet every six weeks to review and monitor all safeguarding issues in the archdiocese. Annual parish audits have been conducted since 2009 and reports made by the Safeguarding Co-ordinator to the committee and Archbishop Clifford on the audit findings. The Safeguarding Co-ordinator, alongside members of the Safeguarding Committee visit parishes to support them in implementing change.

It is very evident that safeguarding is a live issue in Cashel and Emly. The policies and procedure document was redrafted in 2013 and was updated in line with national legislation and Church guidance. Having a full time co-ordinator has helped to instil enthusiasm for safeguarding. This was reflected in the discussions held with the parish priest who detailed the importance of the work of safeguarding children in the Church; his sadness at the history of abuse, and the damaging effects on children and on the Church was palpable. There was also evidence from discussions held with the trainers, including a priest trainer who understood completely the need to keep children safe; all are to be commended for the efforts they make to train and support other priests and lay people in this most important Church work.

There was no sign of complacency in the archdiocese. While inevitably there was a degree of preparation and perhaps anxiety at the review being undertaken, there was also evidence that safeguarding has consistently been on the agenda of Archbishop Clifford and his safeguarding personnel for a number of years.

In summary 4 key themes arising from this audit:

- There is strong leadership shown by Archbishop Clifford who is very well supported by his designated person, safeguarding co-ordinator and safeguarding committee.
- There needs to be greater formality of Church processes.
- The engagement and participation of children is to be applauded and should be developed further.
- Support for and profile of victims in the work needs to be developed and formalised.

## **Recommendations**

### **Recommendation 1.**

The designated person from Cashel and Emly Archdiocese should consult his colleagues in the metropolitan area with a view to developing a process flowchart to guide action in all cases where there is an allegation of child abuse.

### **Recommendation 2:**

The designated person should employ the NBSCCCI case file template for future cases, ensuring that a narrative account of all actions is recorded.

### **Recommendation 3:**

Archbishop Clifford must initiate all Church action through formal decrees and ensure that there are written precepts on file outlining the restrictions on a priest's ministry.

### **Recommendation 4:**

Archbishop Clifford must ensure that the newly appointed support person is offered induction and support in her role and that a written protocol is developed which clarifies how this role will assist complainants.

### **Recommendation 5:**

Archbishop Clifford should develop a written agreement with all religious congregations within his archdiocese whereby he is informed of information that a member of the religious order has been removed from ministry following an allegation/concern of child abuse.

### **Recommendation 6:**

The Safeguarding Committee inclusive of the Safeguarding Co-ordinator should consider how to develop child friendly awareness raising to empower children and create a greater awareness of who to go to if they have a concern about abuse within the Church setting.

### **Recommendation 7:**

The designated person should promote the services of the support person amongst existing and new complainants, and consider developing a protocol for support services.

## **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 1<sup>st</sup> January 1975 up to time of review, 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 1<sup>st</sup> January 1975 up to time of review, 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 1990<sup>2</sup> 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.

### ***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

---

<sup>2</sup> 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.

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 1<sup>st</sup> January 1975 up to time of review 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.