



**Private and Confidential**

**Review of Safeguarding Practice**  
**in the**  
**Benedictine Community, Glenstal Abbey**  
**undertaken by**  
**The National Board for Safeguarding Children in the**  
**Catholic Church of Ireland (NBSCCCI)**

**The content of this report is not to be accessed or shared without the consent  
of the Abbot**

**Date: January 2014**

**CONTENTS**

<b>Background</b>	<i>Page 3</i>
<b>Standard 1</b> <i>A written policy on keeping children safe</i>	<i>Page 8</i>
<b>Standard 2</b> <i>Management of allegations</i>	<i>Page 11</i>
<b>Standard 3</b> <i>Preventing Harm to Children</i>	<i>Page 17</i>
<b>Standard 4</b> <i>Training and Education</i>	<i>Page 21</i>
<b>Standard 5</b> <i>Communicating the Church's Safeguarding Message</i>	<i>Page 23</i>
<b>Standard 6</b> <i>Access to Advice and Support</i>	<i>Page 26</i>
<b>Standard 7</b> <i>Implementing and Monitoring Standards</i>	<i>Page 28</i>
<b>Recommendations</b>	<i>Page 30</i>
<b>Terms of Reference</b>	<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 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.

This report contains the findings of the *Review of Safeguarding Practice within the Benedictine Community* of monks at Glenstal Abbey, Murroe, Co. Limerick 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 us by the Abbot, Mark Patrick Hederman OSB, along with interviews with selected key personnel who contribute to safeguarding within the Abbey and the adjoining school and guest house. The NBSCCCI believes that all relevant documentation for these cases was passed to the reviewers, and the Abbot has confirmed this.

The findings of the review have been shared with a reference group before being submitted to Abbot Mark Patrick Hederman OSB, along with any recommendations arising from the findings.

## **Introduction**

Abbot Mark Patrick Hederman OSB Invited the National Board for the Safeguarding of Children in the Catholic Church in Ireland (NBSCCCI) to conduct a review of child safeguarding at Glenstal Abbey, Murroe, Co. Limerick. This review took place over two days, November 19<sup>th</sup> and 20<sup>th</sup> 2013 and involved the reading of case management files, interviewing safeguarding personnel and examining documents that outline the child safeguarding policy and practices at Glenstal Abbey. The reviewers received a warm welcome from Abbot Patrick, the Prior and all members of the Benedictine community who they met over the two days of fieldwork there. They are very grateful for the openness and generosity of the Benedictine community and their active participation in the review process.

The Benedictine monastic community that is Glenstal Abbey is not part of a religious order in the strictest sense of that term. The Benedictines are more loosely federated than most other congregations of priests and brothers, in that the basic unit is the individual and independent abbey or monastery and not a larger geographical unit, such as a country or a number of countries. Glenstal Abbey is part of the *Congregation of the Annunciation*, one of 20 groupings of Benedictine communities worldwide. The Congregation of the Annunciation has an elected Abbot President – the current incumbent is based in Germany. All of the 20 congregations are gathered together under the Benedictine Confederation and there is an elected Abbot Primate who presides over the Confederation for an eight year term of office. The Abbot Primate is based in the Abbey of Saint Anselm (Sant' Anselmo) on the Aventine Hill in Rome. The congress at which the Abbot Primate is elected is convened every four years to discuss Benedictine life in general and it is attended by the superiors of monasteries and congregations that make up the Confederation.

Saint Benedict was an Italian, born in the year 480. He is credited with founding western monasticism. The Rule of St. Benedict codifies his thinking and guidance about how to live the life of a monk in community. He died in the year 547.

Glenstal Abbey was founded in 1927 in a castle that had been built in the 1830s by the Barrington family. When the Barrington's decided to sell the property it was bought by a local priest, who invited the Benedictine monks of Maredsous Abbey in Belgium to settle there. Sited on farm and park land of 500 acres, the abbey has been expanded on a number of occasions since it was established. As well as a church and new monastery building, the campus has a boarding school for boys, a guest house for visitors and a number of small hermitages for people who want to be on their own in a peaceful setting for quiet prayer and reflection. The monks also operate a farm and work in forestry on the grounds. The full range of activities that take place under the auspices of Glenstal Abbey are very well explained on their website at <http://www.glenstal.org>

The secondary school at Glenstal Abbey was opened in 1932 and has grown from an initial intake of just seven boys to accommodating 205 students in the age range 13–18 years. The school enrolment policy states that:

*Glenstal Abbey School is a Roman Catholic School which welcomes male students for whom the school can provide an appropriate education. The school is a six-day teaching, seven-day all boys boarding school, with a limited day-boarding component available under certain conditions. The school aims to provide an integrated, inclusive Christian education. Glenstal Abbey School is a monastic school, dedicated to the pursuit of excellence in all areas of education. It emphasises values such as integrity, kindness and respect and aims to cultivate and maintain an inclusive climate of learning and tolerance where each child can fulfil his own unique potential. A substantial majority of the boys who come to the school are baptised Roman Catholics. However, the school also welcomes students of other Christian Churches and traditions who are in sympathy with the school's Christian ethos.<sup>1</sup>*

The existence of the boarding school on the same campus as a monastery that houses 39 professed monks and a guest house that welcomes up to 14 adults at a time constitutes the main child safeguarding challenge and responsibility to the Benedictine community in Glenstal Abbey.

It is clear that the preparation for this review gave the impetus to the Benedictine community at Glenstal Abbey to put in place in 2012 some additional child safeguarding systems and processes. Previously Glenstal Abbey had separate policies for the monastery, the school and guesthouse, and for those in formation. These have been integrated into the new policies & procedures document. Case record systems had also been revised and improved.

### **The Review Process**

The purpose of this NBSCCCI review is described in the Terms of Reference that are appended to this report. It seeks to examine how child safeguarding practice in Glenstal Abbey conforms to expected standards in the Church. In doing so, the actions taken historically when an allegation was received, as well as actions being taken currently to better safeguard and protect children, are reviewed. This review has been conducted by the NBSCCCI in the expectation that the report produced from the review will be published, to increase public awareness of the safeguarding structures and processes that are in place, and planned for development. As one of the growing number of review reports, it is also hoped that confidence that the Church is taking appropriate steps to safeguard children will develop and strengthen over time.

The review was initiated through the signing of a data protection deed, allowing full access by staff from NBSCCCI reviewers to all child safeguarding materials held by the Benedictine community at Glenstal Abbey, including all case management records. The deed essentially appoints the reviewers to be nominated data processors of the material for the Abbot of Glenstal, for the duration of the review.

The review fieldwork process took place over two days in November 2013 when two reviewers visited Glenstal Abbey to examine all child safeguarding records and to

---

<sup>1</sup> Glenstal Abbey School Admissions Policy, Version 2.0, May 2012

interview key personnel involved in child safeguarding activities there. All case management records of Benedictines, living and dead, about whom a child safeguarding concern had been raised were read.

The reviewers also interviewed Abbot Hederman, the Prior and the two designated persons, members of the safeguarding committee, the person responsible for coordinating safeguarding training, the person responsible for the coordination of Garda vetting for the community, a priest adviser, and the person responsible for the monastic formation of men who join the monastery to become monks. In Glenstal Abbey School, the monk headmaster and the lay deputy principal act as the Designated Liaison and Deputy Designated Liaison Persons respectively. Glenstal Abbey uses the National Case Management Reference Group (NCMRG) of the NBSCCCI in Maynooth and so has ceased to use its own Advisory Panel.

The review also conducted an assessment of the Glenstal Abbey 2013 *Safeguarding Children Policy and Procedures* against the standards set down in the national 2009 *Safeguarding Children: Standards and Guidance Document for the Catholic Church in Ireland*. All other written material provided to the reviewers was evaluated for relevance and accuracy, as was the child safeguarding information contained on the Glenstal Abbey website.

Reviews into safeguarding have two objectives – to establish how concerns of clerical child sexual abuse have been managed in the past; and to evaluate the efforts that have been made to create safe environments for children to ensure their current and future safety. The seven standards outlined within *Safeguarding Children: Standards and Guidance Document for the Catholic Church in Ireland* provide the assessment framework used by the reviewers to attain these objectives. The report below discusses the findings of the fieldworkers under each standard. Conclusions are drawn regarding both the effectiveness of Glenstal Abbey's policies and practices in preventing abuse and the ability of the relevant personnel within the Benedictine community at Glenstal to assess and manage risk to children. Recommendations for improvements are made where considered appropriate.

## **STANDARDS**

This section provides the findings of the review. The template employed to present the findings are the seven standards, set down and described in the Church *Safeguarding Children: Standards and Guidance Document for the Catholic Church in Ireland*. This guidance was launched in February 2009 and was endorsed and adopted by all the Church authorities that minister on the island of Ireland, including the Benedictine community at Glenstal Abbey. 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 Church Authority 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.	Met fully
<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).	Met fully
<b>1.3</b>	The policy states that all Church personnel are required to comply with it.	Met fully
<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.	Met partially
<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.	Met fully
<b>1.6</b>	The policy states how those individuals who pose a risk to children are managed.	Met fully
<b>1.7</b>	The policy clearly describes the Church's understanding and definitions of abuse.	Met fully
<b>1.8</b>	The policy states that all current child protection concerns must be fully reported to the civil authorities without delay.	Met fully
<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.	Met fully

The Benedictine community at Glenstal Abbey produced a new *Safeguarding Children Policies & Procedures* document in 2013. This is an excellent and comprehensive document, which is available on the <http://www.glenstal.org> website. Also on this

website are the two documents that refer specifically to the Glenstal Abbey School, the September 2011 *Child Protection Procedures for Primary and Post-Primary Schools* of the Department of Education and Skills, and the Glenstal Abbey School *Child Protection Guidelines (Version 1.3)* of January 2013.

In addition to these three documents, Glenstal Abbey, as an employer, issues a 20-page *Employee Handbook* to all staff who work in the school, the monastery, the guest house and the farm. This January 2013 document informs employees of their rights and responsibilities. In doing so it sets out the values which are expected to inform the behaviour and work of all employees, including Respect. Under the heading *Anti-Harassment*, the document states that:

*We do not tolerate any behaviour which compromises the treatment of any member of the Glenstal community with dignity and respect.*

Further on in the document, under the heading *Internet and E-Mail*, the document states that:

*The use of Glenstal Abbey's internet is strictly limited to business use... We also draw your attention to Glenstal Abbey **Safeguarding Children, Policies & Procedures, Appendix IX, Information and Communications Technologies Policy, page 40.***

These emphases in the Employee Handbook are commended and perhaps in the next iteration of this important information source that *Safeguarding Children Policies & Procedures 2013* might be endorsed as required reading for all staff, irrespective of their work role on the abbey campus.

Looking at the *Safeguarding Children Policies & Procedures 2013* specifically, it is well presented and is easy to read and to understand. All seven standards are addressed and a number of informative appendices are included. The document well meets the requirements of criterion 1.1. In his *Foreword*, Abbot Hederman accepts, endorses and signs the document and he makes it clear that:

*The contents of this publication apply to all Glenstal Abbey personnel: monks, staff and volunteers.*

Under Standard 1, the document further states that:

*Recognizing that sexual abuse or sexual exploitation has tragic consequences for those who have been abused, Glenstal Abbey adopts the following policy which is binding on all personnel and will be reviewed by the Abbot's Seniorate annually.*

(The Seniorate, is comprised of the Abbot, the Prior, the Bursar the school's Headmaster plus three other monks chosen annually). The *Safeguarding Children Policies & Procedures 2013* therefore meets the requirements of Criteria 1.2 and 1.3.

In stating that the *Safeguarding Children Policies & Procedures 2013* only partially meet the requirements of Criterion 1.4, the reviewers are essentially noting that the 2013 document is the first comprehensive and integrated policy and procedures document produced by the Benedictine Community at Glenstal Abbey, which is very welcome. This criterion will be fully met when a process of review and revision leads to the publication of an updated 2016 version of the document.

Criterion 1.5 is met fully. The two child specific activities that the monks in Glenstal Abbey engage in are the provision of a secondary boarding school and the occasional hosting of retreat groups in the guest house from sixth year classes from another secondary boarding school. Regarding the main child specific work in the Glenstal Abbey school, this is informed by both the *Safeguarding Children Policies & Procedures 2013*, and the September 2011 *Child Protection Procedures for Primary and Post-Primary Schools* of the Department of Education and Skills, along with the Glenstal Abbey School *Child Protection Guidelines (Version 1.3)* of January 2013. Appendix 3 of the 2013 *Safeguarding Children Policies & Procedures* is headed *School Child Protection Guidelines*; Appendix 7 is the school's *Policy on Supporting Vulnerable Students and Intimate Care*; Appendix 8 contains the *Anti-Bullying Policy* of the Glenstal Abbey School; and Appendix 10 deals with *School Tours*. These provisions are well thought through and clearly stated.

Persons under 18 years of age cannot ordinarily use the guest house at Glenstal Abbey and groups including under-18 year-olds can only use the guest house if they undertake to supervise the protection and welfare of these younger group members and to abide with the child safeguarding policies and procedures of Glenstal Abbey

Criteria 1.6, 1.7, 1.8 and 1.9 are comprehensively addressed and are fully met in the *Safeguarding Children Policies & Procedures 2013* document.

**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.*

**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).	Met fully
<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.	Met fully
<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.	Met fully
<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.	Met fully
<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.	Met fully
<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.	Met fully
<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.	Met fully

**Table 1**

**Incidence of Safeguarding allegations received within the Benedictine Community, Glenstal Abbey from 1<sup>st</sup> January 1975 up to up to time of review.**

<b>1</b>	Number of Benedictine monks of Glenstal Abbey against whom allegations have been made since the 1 <sup>st</sup> January 1975 up to the date of the Review.	<b>6</b>
<b>2</b>	Total number of allegations received by the Benedictine Community Glenstal Abbey since 1 <sup>st</sup> January 1975.	<b>10</b>
<b>3</b>	Number of allegations reported to An Garda Síochána involving Benedictine monks of Glenstal Abbey since 1 <sup>st</sup> January 1975.	<b>10</b>
<b>4</b>	Number of allegations reported to the HSE (or the Health Boards which preceded the setting up of the HSE) involving Benedictine monks of Glenstal Abbey since 1 <sup>st</sup> January 1975.	<b>10</b>
<b>5</b>	Number of monks (still members of the community) against whom an allegation was made and who were living at the date of the review.	<b>2</b>
<b>6</b>	Number of monks against whom an allegation was made and who are deceased.	<b>2</b>
<b>7</b>	Number of monks of against whom an allegation was made and who are in ministry.	<b>1</b>
<b>8</b>	Number of monks against whom an allegation was made and who are out of ministry but are still members of the community.	<b>0</b>
<b>9</b>	Number of monks against whom an allegation has been made and who are retired.	<b>1</b>
<b>10</b>	Number of monks against whom an allegation has been made and who have left the priesthood / community.	<b>2</b>
<b>11</b>	Number of monks 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>

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

The Benedictine Community in Glenstal Abbey is made up of 27 priests, 10 professed brothers (all of whom have taken solemn vows), and one brother who has taken temporary vows. All of these men irrespective of age or status are referred to as ‘monks’.

Of the six men about whom concerns have arisen, two are deceased. The first of these had admitted his abuse and had been referred for assessment to an appropriate clinical facility. This monk was removed from contact with children and was eventually subject to a formal Canonical Precept issued by the Abbot in 2005. He was only allowed to reside in the monastery during school holiday periods and a risk management plan was in operation. His case was referred to the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith (CDF), which determined in 2007 that he was not allowed to exercise priestly ministry. In relation to the second Benedictine monk, an allegation was received long after this man’s death. The veracity of the complaint could not be established. In the cases of both these men, the four complainants who were identified were all provided with counselling and

other supports by the Benedictine Community at Glenstal. In the case of the first monk, there were unacceptable delays in the notification of the complaints against him to the two statutory authorities, An Garda Síochána and the Mid-Western Health Board (MWHB) / HSE.

Two former monks, against whom allegations were made and who are still alive, left the Benedictine Community at Glenstal Abbey. The first of these was quite problematic, in that the abuse of a student 14 years previously, which was subsequently admitted, took place in the precincts of the school. The monk involved was immediately removed from contact with children once the allegation had been received and he was subject to severe restrictions on the Glenstal Abbey campus. This monk was provided with appropriate therapeutic intervention. He was dismissed from monastic life and from the clerical state by Papal decree following a canonical process involving application to the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith (CDF) in Rome.

The Benedictine Community at Glenstal Abbey provided the victim in this case with a range of appropriate supports. There was a delay in the Abbot informing the Board of Management of the Glenstal Abbey School of the allegation received about the monk who had been a member of staff of the school. However, notifications to the two statutory authorities were made in a timely fashion.

The second man who left the Benedictine Community in Glenstal Abbey had made his final solemn vows. It was alleged that he abused an adolescent boy during a work trip abroad. The victim has been identified and supports have been offered but have been declined. An appropriate notification has been made to the Irish statutory authorities, which in turn have attempted through Interpol to make a notification to the statutory authorities in the country concerned. The offending monk sought and has been granted dispensation from his vows by the Congregation for Institutes of Consecrated Life and Societies of Apostolic Life in Rome. He was psychiatrically assessed and attended counselling. It is of concern that the whereabouts of this man are no longer known, although it is believed that he is not in Ireland, as he was believed to pose an on-going risk to children.

The remaining two cases examined relate to Benedictine monks who are living and who are attached to Glenstal Abbey. In the case of one of these, the allegations made by a third party have been found to have no basis in fact and appear to have been completely malicious. No complainant has been identified. Best practice guidance was followed in this case and the monk was subject to significant restrictions on his ministry while a Garda investigation was conducted and deliberations by the Office of the DPP were awaited. It has been an event of great consequence for this monk to have been the victim of a malicious allegation and the reviewers believe that he has suffered a grave injustice as a result of the actions of the third party reporter.

The sixth monk about whom child safeguarding concerns arose is retired. The matters complained of happened in another jurisdiction almost 45 years ago and have been fully investigated by the civil authorities there and full information has been shared with the

An Garda Síochána and HSE in Ireland. The monastery in the foreign jurisdiction attempted outreach support to the complainant in this case. The monk is subject to a supervision contract which restricts his movements and activities. This includes a clear direction that he is to have no involvement in school or after-school activities or in any way to interact with the school's students. He has to inform the prior of his whereabouts, and he is prohibited from wearing his clerical garb outside of the monastery. This contract and any decision to amend are discussed with An Garda Síochána, HSE and the NBSCCCI. The parents of all of the students attending Glenstal Abbey School have been informed of his presence in the community and of the restrictions under which he lives.

In general, the Benedictine Community in Glenstal Abbey has managed the concerns that have arisen well and there is no evidence that any child was placed at risk due to any inaction on the part of the various abbots involved. Delays in making expected notifications have been referenced above. When it was thought to be appropriate in the management of cases, a female designated person from another Church authority was commissioned to liaise with female complainants.

The community was assisted with the first three cases by the Advisory Committee and Designated Person of the Cashel and Emly Diocese in which catchment area the monastery is located. The Benedictine's at Glenstal now use the NBSCCCI's National Case Management Reference Group (NCMRG) as their Advisory Committee.

Returning to the criteria that measure compliance with Standard 2, the Benedictine Community at Glenstal Abbey has met all of these fully and this is a very good achievement.

The 2013 *Safeguarding Children Policies & Procedures* document is very well thought out in its format and comprehensive in its content and this supports the performance of the Benedictine Community in relation to Standard 2. The required step-by-step guidance is provided and the document is up to date with the stipulations of national policy and legislation. Appendix 2 of the document provides an excellent 3½ page description of the responsibilities and function of the Designated Officer and their role is also well depicted in the chapter on Standard 2 in the document. Based on these findings, Criteria 2.1, 2.2 and 2.3 are fully met.

The file record system for case management purposes is very well structured and files are easily followed and the files are properly and securely stored. The 2013 *Safeguarding Children Policies & Procedures*, Appendix 6 sets out very clearly the Recording Policy and the Data Protection position and the statutory requirements in relation to the generation of written records are being met. However, the reviewers are aware that these files were only completed in their current format in September 2012.

Criterion 2.5 is fully met. The Benedictine Community has given particular attention to making their Glenstal Abbey School a safe place for the children and young people. As well as following the Department of Education and Skills guidance contained in the

September 2011 *Child Protection Procedures for Primary and Post-Primary Schools* document and their own school's *Child Protection Guidelines (Version 1.3)* of January 2013, Appendix 3 of the 2013 *Safeguarding Children Policy & Procedures*, sets out the *School Child Protection Guidelines*. The headmaster (a monk) and the deputy principal (a lay woman) are the school Designated Liaison Person (DLP) and Assistant DLP respectively.

The school has also developed a very useful bookmark card for every student, which is headed *Staying Safe 1, 2, 3*, where 1 gives information on *What is abuse?*; 2 tells the student *What you should do*; and 3 gives the commitment *What we will do*. This initiative has involved the student representatives on the School Council. It is to be launched in conjunction with the start of the new RSE programme in early 2014. This initiative is commended.

The comprehensive nature of the *Safeguarding Children Policy & Procedures 2013* document ensures that Criteria 2.6 and 2.7 are also fully met. Paragraph 2.5, *Guidance on the Seal of Confession* is very well constructed and avoids clouding the issue in any way.

The Benedictine Community at Glenstal Abbey has a council, called the Seniorate, which is comprised of the abbot, the prior, the bursar, the school's headmaster plus three other monks chosen annually. Decisions, such as restrictions on the movements of a monk, for instance, are the responsibility of Seniorate to make. The Seniorate is essentially the Abbot's *Board*. The community has developed a protocol to cover visiting monks who are not members of the Glenstal Abbey Benedictine Community. Any such visitor must sign a declaration stating that they have no criminal conviction related to any crime against children. On this basis the abbot can allow such a visitor to stay at Glenstal Abbey for up to a month, while the Seniorate has to be in agreement for visits of between one month and three month's duration. For such a longer stay the visitor must present a letter from their local Ordinary that states that they are in good standing. The reviewers consider that any visiting monk, irrespective of the duration of their stay, should be required to both sign the declaration and present a letter from their Ordinary, stating that they are of good standing. Such a requirement might be considered by some to be excessive and it might be necessary to explain its introduction in a wider communication to other monasteries and religious communities.

### **Recommendation 1**

**That all visiting monks and other clergy who come to stay in the monastery and who seek to minister in public at Glenstal Abbey should be required to sign a Declaration and to present to the Abbot a letter from their Ordinary / Superior stating that they are in good standing and that a register is developed to record that this documentation has been produced and recorded.**

A past student of the Glenstal Abbey school has written a series of letters to the Abbot and to the NBSCCCI in which he suggests a form of sexual initiation which he believed was used in the past in the school as well as in other boarding schools in Ireland, but has

not made any allegations. This correspondence has been given to An Garda Siochana for follow up and the writer has been invited to come forward to share any information he might have about alleged historical abuse at Glenstal or indeed anywhere else.

### **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 Church Authority 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.	Met fully
<b>3.2</b>	The safe recruitment and vetting policy is in line with best practice guidance.	Met partially
<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.	Met fully

#### **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.	Met fully
<b>3.5</b>	There is guidance on expected and acceptable behaviour of children towards other children (anti-bullying policy).	Met fully
<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.	Met fully

*Review of Safeguarding Practice in the Benedictine Community, Glenstal Abbey*

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

**Criteria – Operating safe activities for children**

Number	Criterion	Met fully or Met partially or Not met
<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.	Met fully
<b>3.11</b>	When operating projects/ activities children are adequately supervised and protected at all times.	Met fully
<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.	Met fully

The reviewers interviewed the monk who has responsibility for Garda Vetting and also the monk who is the Director of Formation, who has responsibility as Vocations Director and for the spiritual formation programme for men who enter Glenstal Abbey to become monks. The relevant support documentation was also examined.

Criteria 3.1 and 3.3 are met fully. The *Safeguarding Children Policy & Procedures 2013* document is excellent in relation to the whole process of safe recruitment, including a recruitment checklist. All candidates for employment, volunteering or selection for religious life at Glenstal Abbey complete a declaration form as part of the recruitment process. Acceptance to join the monastery is a complex and lengthy process and only mature candidates who have completed a thorough screening and selection process are invited to begin their monastic formation at the Abbey.

Six monks have positions in the Glenstal Abbey School and all have been Garda vetted. At the time of the review fieldwork the process of vetting monks who are long standing members of the Benedictine Community at Glenstal Abbey was not fully complete, but the reviewers ascertained that vetting was up to date for all monks who have a role in

relation to children, such as teachers or house masters. On this basis it was deemed that Criterion 3.2 was only partially met. Vetting of school staff is done through the offices of the Joint Managerial Body (JMB), which represents the interests of the voluntary secondary schools sector.

### **Recommendation 2**

**That the Abbot ensures that all Garda Vetting of the monks, including longstanding monks of Glenstal Abbey who have public ministry is brought up to date as quickly as possible and is renewed in a timely fashion as required.**

In all other respects, the criteria that underpin Standard 3 are fully met by Glenstal Abbey.

The *Safeguarding Children Policy & Procedures 2013* document in the section on Standard 3 contains a detailed *Code of Behaviour*, and Appendix 8 is a very comprehensive 5½ page Anti-Bullying Policy, an exemplar of its kind. Appendix 11 of the same document sets out the Whistle-blowing Policy, which complements guidance and information in the Employee Handbook that is issued to all staff at Glenstal Abbey. On the basis of these findings, Criteria 3.4, 3.5 and 3.6 are met fully.

Reference was made earlier to Appendix 7 of *Safeguarding Children Policy & Procedures 2013*, which iterates the policy on Supporting Vulnerable Students and Intimate Care. In fact four of the five pages of this section deals with the causes of vulnerability in children who are away from home, distress in children, self-injurious behaviours etc. It shows a degree of sensitivity towards and understanding of the emotional and psychological needs of children and young people. Combined with the Anti-Bullying Policy and the no-corporal punishment rule, the Glenstal Abbey School and the Benedictine Community that supports and oversees it have put in place an excellent network of important and connected policies and procedures to keep children safe.

The headmaster of the school has weekly contact with the parents of all of the students through an emailed newsletter and parents are strongly encouraged to become involved with the school and its activities. This openness to the families of the students provides a further level of safeguarding for them.

Based on these comments, Criteria 3.7, 3.8 and 3.9 are fully met.

The *Safeguarding Children Policy & Procedures 2013* document has in its Appendix 9 an *Information and Communications Technologies Policy*, and in Appendix 10, a *School Tours Policy*. Both policies are clear and easily understood, as well as being fit for purpose. The school broadband internet access is filtered to ensure that inappropriate material is not viewable by students or staff. Supervision of students is shared between the school management and staff and the complementary housemaster and nursing staff who are responsible for the welfare and protection of students out of school hours.

At the time of the review fieldwork the Glenstal Abbey school was being expanded through the building of further 18 classrooms, 3 science laboratories, additional study spaces and administrative offices. The impact of such a large building programme with the allied traffic of non-Glenstal Abbey staff through the campus on an on-going basis has led the school to introduce new security systems and procedures to ensure that no persons who do not have a legitimate role in providing services to students can have access to them, including a security ID card swipe system and these systems will be retained in the new school accommodation when it is all in service. A register is to be introduced to record all visitors to the school.

There is an acceptance on the campus that strangers can be asked by any member of the Glenstal Abbey community, including students, what their business is. The Designated Person explained to the reviewers that it would be a matter of note and concern if someone staying in the guest house was seen in the company of a student from the school. The *Glenstal Abbey Safeguarding Children Policies & Procedures 2013* document has in Appendix 5 a *Policy for Guests*. This sets out for people coming to stay in the guest house the rules about their movements and behaviours while at Glenstal. It is specifically mentioned that no guest may visit the school unless they have sought permission from the headmaster through the guest-master. Students are not permitted to be in the guest house.

Evidence has been provided to indicate that Criteria 3.10, 3.11 and 3.12 are fully met.

**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.	Met fully
<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.	Met fully
<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.	Met fully
<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.	Met fully

The Training Log that was provided to the reviewers lists 24 separate training events or initiatives in which members of the Benedictine Community and/or Glenstal Abbey school staff have taken part since June 2009. This is in addition to the briefing that staff and volunteers receive as part of their induction. One monk has overall responsibility for training in the community and school, and he works closely with the headmaster and deputy principal in this task. Attendance by the monks in the community at any child safeguarding training that is made available for them is mandatory.

At the time of the review, Relationship and Sex Education (RSE) training for the school teachers who will be involved in teaching that new area of the curriculum was on-going.

Training to date has been provided by the NBSCCCI, by HSE staff, by the Joint Managerial Body (JMB), the Department of Education and Skills Social, Personal and Health Education (SPHE) Anti-Bullying Coordinator, Child Watch Ireland, the Temple Street Children's Hospital Northside Inter-Agency Project, CORI, and the Limerick Sports Partnership, as well as by two monks who themselves have undertaken NBSCCCI training.

The Glenstal Abbey School is particularly interested in dealing with all forms of bullying and with adolescent sexuality, both of which are issues to be expected for the age group of boys attending the school. Training in these areas has been sourced and provided to school staff and to monks, as applicable and advice was sought from the reviewers on accessing further relevant information and advice in these areas.

The monk who has overall responsibility for training also has charge of any volunteer who comes to work in the abbey campus in any capacity. This task includes ensuring that these people are properly inducted regarding child safeguarding.

As a next step in the developing of training and support for staff, a group supervision arrangement is being put in place for housemasters, of whom there are six, two per house. This way of organising the residential side of the school into three houses is an attempt to give the students an experience of a smaller living unit where they are with peers of the same age group. This is explained on the school website as follows:

*The school is divided into three distinct houses – the Junior House for 1st and 2nd Years, the Inter House for 3rd and 4th Years and the Senior House for 5th and 6th Years. Each house is supervised by a Housemaster and an Assistant Housemaster. The housemasters are particularly concerned with the pastoral care of students and also have responsibility for supervision and maintaining discipline outside of class time.*

*[<http://www.glenstal.com/school-life/boarding/>]*

The reviewers are satisfied that all four criteria that need to be met under Standard 4 have been fully met. In order that Child Safeguarding Training over the next three years in Glenstal is planned and structured to a greater degree than heretofore, the following recommendation is made:

**Recommendation 3**

**That the training co-ordinator conducts a Training Audit with all monks, school staff and other lay staff to identify their Child Safeguarding Training needs, on the basis of which a Three- Year Child Safeguarding Training Plan is developed and implemented.**

**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.	Met fully
<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.	Met fully
<b>5.3</b>	Everyone in Church organisations knows who the designated person is and how to contact them.	Met fully
<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.	Met fully
<b>5.5</b>	Church organisations establish links with statutory child protection agencies to develop good working relationships in order to keep children safe.	Met fully
<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.	Met fully

On the Home page of the Glenstal Abbey website, the following notice was posted in advance of this review being conducted:

*The NBSCCCI is undertaking a routine safeguarding practice review of all dioceses and religious orders in Ireland. Glenstal Abbey is currently being reviewed as part of this process. We invite anyone who has experienced abuse and has not yet come forward to do so either to the Designated Officer(s), the Gardai, or the HSE.*

The names and contact details were also given for the two designated officers and contact details were also given for the relevant An Garda Síochána and HSE offices.

The Child Protection Policy statement, along with the same contact details that were placed on the website, is prominently displayed in the reception area of the monastery, in the school, the church porches and in the guest house on the campus.

The *Safeguarding Children Policy & Procedures 2013* document is available on the Glenstal Abbey website as part of a Safeguarding page that is well signposted on the Home page.

Mention has already been made about the specially designed bookmark that has been developed for the students in the school to give them easy to understand safeguarding information. The reviewers were made aware that the students are encouraged to approach a teacher or housemaster if they have a concern about any issue. The monk responsible for the management of the residential part of the boarding school addresses the new First Year students each year on child safeguarding matters and provides them with the information that they need to be aware of situations of risk and of how to report concerns about their own or other students' safety and welfare.

The headmaster of Glenstal Abbey School has weekly contact with the parents of all of the students in the school, through an emailed newsletter and the school website contains updated information on school activities. In 2011 it was reported to the Board of Management of Glenstal Abbey School that a monk who was involved in after-school activities with some of the students had been withdrawn from any contact with children due to an allegation in another jurisdiction more than 40 years previously. The chairperson of the Board of Management wrote to all of the parents of the students to inform them of this and to invite any concerned parent to contact him to discuss the situation. This action showed a high level of openness and transparency.

The Glenstal Abbey Communications Policy is contained in Standard 5 in the *Safeguarding Children Policy & Procedures 2013* document, and one monk, who is also the headmaster, is responsible for communications for the community and the school.

The Benedictine Community at Glenstal Abbey has developed good working relationships with the relevant HSE Children and Family Services. When the community informed HSE in 2005 of allegations against two monks, which notifications were overdue, this led to HSE recommending changes in child protection practices at Glenstal Abbey, including speedier notification, the enhancement of Garda Vetting and improved risk management in relation to any monk about whom a child safeguarding concern might exist. HSE began an audit exercise at that time, but no final report of this was ever produced. A draft document was issued to Glenstal in 2009 and this is on file alongside a detailed response document from the then designated person. However, the outcome of this attention and correspondence was a steady improvement in child safeguarding at the abbey

An important interagency meeting took place at Glenstal Abbey on October 13<sup>th</sup> 2011, attended by representatives of HSE, An Garda Siochana, the NBSCCCI and the Benedictine Community. Ten people in total were present at this meeting. All outstanding concerns related to child safeguarding were discussed at this meeting and detailed minutes of decisions and agreed actions were subsequently produced. This meeting led to the Benedictine Community at Glenstal Abbey reviewing its policies, procedures and practices in the light of the advice and direction provided and in an effort to comply with the NBSCCCI's 2009 Child Safeguarding Policy and Procedures which had recently been published.

The senior managers in HSE and An Garda Siochana who were contacted by the reviewers have informed them that they are satisfied with the level of openness and cooperation that exists between their statutory agencies and the Benedictine Community at Glenstal Abbey.

The six criteria that need to be met in order for Standard 5 to be fully complied with have been met.

**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.	Met fully
<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.	Met fully
<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.	Met fully
<b>6.4</b>	Information is provided to those who have experienced abuse on how to seek support.	Met fully
<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.	Met fully

The Benedictine Community at Glenstal Abbey has a number of links with specialist practitioners who can support and assist them in relation to child safeguarding. One of their two designated persons is a lay man who has a professional training and background in the mental health services and he has retained contact with a network of people who work in the human services. In June 2013 he arranged for a senior clinical psychologist to work with the community in relation to better understanding the dynamics of child abuse. The community has developed and maintains an excellent working relationship with the NBSCCCI and can readily source information as required.

HSE West Children and Family Services and the Benedictine Community at Glenstal have worked on the building up of a working relationship based on trust and openness and this will be sustained. The community also links well with An Garda Síochána

at both a local and a national level. On the basis of these findings, Criteria 6.1 and 6.2 are met in full. The next two criteria relate to an awareness of the needs of complainants and the importance of child centeredness in the approach of the community to its responsibilities, especially those related to its child safeguarding obligations.

The reviewers met the monk who has the task of responding to the needs of the ten people who have complained of being abused by a Benedictine monk of the Glenstal Abbey community. While the written records are not as well maintained, it was clear from the discussion with this man that he was keenly aware of all of the people who have made a complaint of abuse and he has communicated with and met with any of them who was open to such contacts. Information about the availability of counselling through the *Faoiseamh / Towards Healing* service is provided to all identified victims. He has also ensured that any persons who live outside the jurisdiction receive outreach support from the appropriate resource in their locality. Overall, the reviewers were impressed that the monastic community at Glenstal are aware of and take seriously their responsibilities towards any person who has been identified to them as having been abused at any time by one of their number.

As mentioned earlier, the Glenstal Abbey website carried a notice of this NBSCCCI review, including an invitation to anyone with a concern to contact the Designated Person, or HSE or An Garda Síochána. No one has come forward as a result of this notice. The reviewers were also informed of the initiatives taken in the Glenstal Abbey School to inform the students of how to flag any concern that they might have about their own safety and welfare. The communication channels between the school and the parents of its students are also well established. Criteria 6.3 and 6.4 are deemed to be met in full.

The final criterion under Standard 6 relates to the ways in which a Church Authority ensures that any cleric about whom a child safeguarding concern exists is assisted through the provision of appropriate assessment, treatment and management, as well as the required Canon Law processes. Under Standard 2 above the six members of the Benedictine Community about whom child safeguarding concerns were identified were discussed. In the case of one of these men, no information was known while he was alive. In the case of another man the concerns were established to be without any foundation in reality. The reviewers are satisfied that the Benedictine Community at Glenstal Abbey properly intervened in relation to the other four men and did so in a manner that did not compromise the safety and welfare of children and young people. Criterion 6.5 is therefore met in full.

The reviewers interviewed the monk who has undertaken the role of Advisor (support person) to two monks about whom there had been child safeguarding concerns. He clearly understood his duties in this role and conscientiously fulfilled these. He would benefit from more supports from both the Benedictine Community and from the NBSCCCI in terms of professional supervision and training. This is an isolating and burdensome task and it needs to be seen as an essential element in the overall child safeguarding project at Glenstal Abbey.

## **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.	Met partially
<b>7.2</b>	The human or financial resources necessary for implementing the plan are made available.	Met fully
<b>7.3</b>	Arrangements are in place to monitor compliance with child protection policies and procedures.	Met fully
<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.	Met partially
<b>7.5</b>	All incidents, allegations/ suspicions of abuse are recorded and stored securely.	Met fully

The Prior, who also has the responsibilities of Child Safeguarding Coordinator, has undertaken an annual audit of compliance for the years 2010, 2011 and 2012 and the reviewers were able to examine the records of these exercises. This approach will be continued for 2013 and future years. The 48 criteria which underpin the seven standards in the NBSCCCI 2009 *Safeguarding Children: Standards and Guidance Document for the Catholic Church in Ireland* are used in undertaking this annual internal audit. Criterion 7.3 is fully met.

The results of this audit exercise then provide the targets for achievement for the following year, and these are recorded by the prior and inform his child safeguarding work. However, this approach to planning needs to be structured and formalised. It is for this reason that Criterion 7.1 is deemed to be met partially rather than fully, and that the following recommendation is made.

#### **Recommendation 4**

**That the Prior, as a member of the Safeguarding Team, brings the results of his annual audit of compliance to that forum as early as possible each year so that a formal written Child Safeguarding Plan for Glenstal Abbey can be generated and published annually.**

The reviewers are of the view that the Benedictine Community at Glenstal Abbey is prepared to expend all resources necessary to ensure that all child safeguarding structures, systems and practices are supported and developed. On this basis, Criterion 7.2 is judged to be met fully.

Glenstal Abbey is not a parish or a public community of worship. Its main on site activity that involves the public is that of running a secondary school. In addition it provides a guest house for people who wish to come on some form of spiritual retreat and it manages a farm. While some members of the public do come to Glenstal Abbey to attend Mass in the monastery's church, they do not constitute a stable congregation. In examining compliance with Criterion 7.4 therefore, the reviewers have restricted their considerations to the initiatives in place to elicit the views of the students and their parents regarding optimal child safeguarding on the Glenstal Abbey campus. While all of the channels for effective communications with both constituencies are in place and are effectively used, there is insufficient evidence yet available that people's best thinking about child safeguarding has been facilitated. On this basis, Criterion 7.4 is met partially.

#### **Recommendation 5**

**That the Safeguarding Team develop a programme of consultation with the Students of Glenstal Abbey School and with their parents on how best to optimise child safeguarding in the school and on the wider Abbey campus.**

The reviewers saw the filing system for child safeguarding case management files and examined all files contained therein. On the basis of this, Criterion 7.5 is considered to be fully met.

There are a small number of additional observations that the reviewers wish to make, which do not fit exactly under any of the seven Standards.

There is a Safeguarding Team in Glenstal Abbey, comprised of the abbot, the prior, the school headmaster and the designated person. This is an active and effective group that had responsibility for developing and publishing the excellent *Glenstal Abbey Safeguarding Children Policies & Procedures 2013* document. It meets four or five times per year, or more often if required. While there is a written agenda kept for all meetings of the group, formal minutes are not recorded and filed, while drafts of documents that are works in progress are retained, and individual group members keep their own notes. The reviewers advised the Safeguarding Team to record and retain formal minutes of all of their meetings and this was readily accepted and agreed. For completeness, this advice is repeated here in the form of a recommendation.

#### **Recommendation 6**

**That the Safeguarding Team adopts the practice of having an agreed taker of minutes who records, types up and places on the Safeguarding Team meetings file a formal minute of all meetings of the group.**

## **Recommendations**

### **Recommendation 1**

**That all visiting monks and other clergy who come to stay in the monastery and who seek to minister in public at Glenstal Abbey should be required to sign a Declaration and to present to the Abbot a letter from their Ordinary / Superior stating that they are in good standing, and that a register is developed to record that this documentation has been produced and recorded.**

### **Recommendation 2**

**That the Abbot ensures that all Garda Vetting of the monks of Glenstal Abbey is brought up to date as quickly as possible and is renewed in a timely fashion as required.**

### **Recommendation 3**

**That a Training Audit is conducted with all monks, school staff and other lay staff to identify their Child Safeguarding Training needs, on the basis of which a Three-Year Child Safeguarding Training Plan is developed and implemented.**

### **Recommendation 4**

**That the Prior as a member of the Safeguarding Team brings the results of his annual audit of compliance to that forum as early as possible each year so that a formal written Child Safeguarding Plan for Glenstal Abbey can be generated and published annually.**

### **Recommendation 5**

**That the Safeguarding Team develop a programme of consultation with the Students of Glenstal Abbey School and with their parents on how best to optimise child safeguarding in the school and on the wider Abbey campus.**

### **Recommendation 6**

**That the Safeguarding Team adopts the practice of having an agreed taker of minutes who records, types up and places on the Safeguarding Team meetings file a formal minute of all meetings of the group.**

**Review of Safeguarding in the Catholic Church in Ireland**

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

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

As well as examine

- Communication by the Church Authority with the Civil Authorities;
- Current risks and their management.

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

**Accompanying Notes**

**Note 1: Definition of Child Sexual Abuse:**

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

“While definitions of child sexual abuse vary according to context, probably the most useful definition and broadest for the purposes of this Report was that which was adopted by the Law Reform Commission in 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.”

---

<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.

**Note 2: Definition of Allegation:**

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

**Note 3: False Allegations:**

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

**Note 4: Random sample:**

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

**Note 5: Civil Authorities:**

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