



**Review of Child Safeguarding Practice  
in the Religious Order of**

**The Society of Jesus (Jesuits)**

**undertaken by**

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

**Date April 2015**

**CONTENTS**

<b>Background</b>	<i>Page 3</i>
<b>Standard 1</b> <i>A written policy on keeping children safe</i>	<i>Page 9</i>
<b>Standard 2</b> <i>Management of allegations</i>	<i>Page 12</i>
<b>Standard 3</b> <i>Preventing Harm to Children</i>	<i>Page 19</i>
<b>Standard 4</b> <i>Training and Education</i>	<i>Page 23</i>
<b>Standard 5</b> <i>Communicating the Church's Safeguarding Message</i>	<i>Page 25</i>
<b>Standard 6</b> <i>Access to Advice and Support</i>	<i>Page 27</i>
<b>Standard 7</b> <i>Implementing and Monitoring Standards</i>	<i>Page 30</i>
<b>Recommendations</b>	<i>Page 32</i>
<b>Terms of Reference</b>	<i>Page 33</i>

## **Background**

The National Board for Safeguarding Children in the Catholic Church (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 Child Safeguarding Practice in the religious order of Society of Jesus in Ireland* (hereafter The Jesuits) 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 Jesuits, along with interviews with selected key personnel who contribute to safeguarding within the Jesuits. The NBSCCCI believes that all relevant documentation for these cases was passed to the reviewers and Fr Tom Layden, Provincial of the Society has confirmed this.

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

## **Introduction**

The Society of Jesus was founded in 1540 by St. Ignatius Loyola and since then has grown from the original seven to over twenty thousand members today working in over one hundred countries. The Society is governed by General Congregations, the supreme legislative authority which meets occasionally. The present Superior General is Father Adolfo Nicolás.

Ignatius Loyola was a Spanish Basque soldier who underwent an extraordinary conversion while recuperating from a leg broken by a cannon ball in battle. He wrote down his experiences which he called his *Spiritual Exercises* and later he founded the Society of Jesus with the approval of Pope Paul III in 1540.

From the very beginning, the Society served the Church in Europe as well as Asia, India, Africa and the Americas. Robert Bellarmine and Peter Canisius spearheaded the Counter Reformation in Europe. Edmund Campion assisted the Catholics in England suffering under the Elizabethan persecutions. Missionaries like deNobili Claver, González, deBrito, Brebeuf, and Kino brought the Gospel to countries far and wide.

Jesuits were always deeply involved in scholarship, science and exploration. They were called the schoolmasters of Europe during the 16th, 17th and 18th centuries. During their first two centuries the Jesuits were engaged in over 740 schools.

These were all lost in 1773 when Pope Clement XIV issued his brief *Dominus ac Redemptor* suppressing the Society of Jesus. The property of the Society's many schools was either sold or taken into a state controlled system.

The Society was restored 41 years after the Suppression in 1814 by Pope Pius VII and from then onwards their number grew dramatically.

The Irish Province was founded in 1860 but there was pre-suppression involvement of the Jesuits in Ireland comprising of a series of missions, conducted under conditions of penal legislation and often savage persecution. The last of the seventeen men, who had been in the country at the time of the suppression, died just before the arrival in 1811 of Peter Kenney.

Clongowes Wood College was opened in June 1814 and Tullabeg four years later. It evolved into a preparatory school for Clongowes. Later in mid-century it became a full college in its own right.

By 1832, Catholic Emancipation had been passed, allowing the construction of Gardiner St Church. The small Hardwicke Street residence, acquired in 1816 became the Jesuits' third school opened in less than 20 years. It moved round the corner to Belvedere House in 1841.

A small retreat house at Milltown Park (opened in 1858), a day-school in Limerick (opened in 1859), and a residence and church in Galway (opened in the same year). By this time the Province consisted of 117 Irish Jesuits, of whom 60 were priests, 28 were scholastics and 29 were brothers.

Mungret opened as a college and apostolic school in 1882. Manresa Retreat House opened in 1948, to extend the work of Milltown and Rathfarnham and today is known as the Jesuit Centre of Spirituality.

As the movement for third level education acceptable to Catholics gathered pace, University College, Dublin was established by the Jesuits in 1883. They moved into Leeson St in 1910 and opened University Hall for male students in 1913. In the same year Rathfarnham Castle was opened to accommodate juniors (Jesuits) attending the university.

Three more significant enterprises were undertaken in the 1950s: Gonzaga (1950), a second Dublin day-school, the Catholic Workers' College (1954). In 1970 pioneering work in Irish ecumenism took place resulting in the establishment of the Irish School of Ecumenics.

Jesuit numbers in the 19th century kept on growing at a remarkable rate: 117-strong in 1860, as mentioned, the Province had 202 men in 1880, 317 in 1900, 400 in 1920, 543 in 1930. By 1970, the numbers had finally begun to fall and there has been a familiar pattern of decline since then. The increasingly sharp downturn in numbers joining the Society in Ireland (and in the west more generally) has coincided with changes across Western Europe in particular since the 1960's.

Nonetheless the Jesuits today have almost twenty apostolates in the areas of social justice, spirituality and communications, ecumenism. They are involved in education through seven schools and the recently opened Loyola Institute in Trinity College Dublin.

There are currently Jesuit Communities in: Campion House, Cherry Orchard, Cherryfield, Dominic Collins House, Gonzaga Community, John Sullivan House, Leeson Street, Leinster Road, Loyola House, Manresa Community and Milltown Community, all in Dublin. In addition the Jesuits are in Clongowes College (Kildare), Della Strada (Limerick), Galway, Peter Faber Community (Belfast) and Iona Residence (Portadown).

The Jesuits run parish ministry in Gardiner Street Church in Dublin and assist in St. Ignatius Church in Galway.

The Jesuits continue to have a high profile in Education in Belvedere College – a Catholic School under the Trusteeship of the Jesuits, Clongowes Wood College, Colaiste Iongáid an Irish language school in Galway, Scoil Iognáid (Gaelscoil in Galway), Crescent Comprehensive College in Limerick where the Jesuits are the Trustees, and Gonzaga College in Dublin.

The Jesuits also have responsibility for St. Declan's, which is a special needs school for children with emotional and personal difficulties.

**Current ministry which involves children is as follows:**

St Francis Xavier Parish, Gardiner Street, Dublin	1 Parish Priest; Local Superior and one Jesuit brother works with music
Belvedere College SJ, Great Denmark Street, Dublin	1 Spiritual Director; 1 Chaplain
Clongowes Wood College SJ, Clane, Co. Kildare	Rector; Headmaster (and BOM), 2 Priests and 1 Scholastic
Three Patrons Parish Church, Rathgar Parish, Dublin 6	1 Priest
Church of the Sacred Heart, Donnybrook Parish, Dublin 4	1 Priest
Gonzaga College SJ, Ranelagh, Dublin 6	BOM & Rector; Chaplain and BOM
Church of St John the Baptist, Clontarf Road, Dublin 3	1 Priest
Milltown Parish of Saints Columbanus and Gall, Dublin 6	1 x Priest
St Ignatius Church, Sea Road, Galway	BOM & Superior and 3 x priests
Scoil Iognáid, Raleigh Road, Galway	Chaplain
Crescent College SJ, Dooradoyle Road, Limerick -	BOM & 1 Priest
Corpus Christi, Moyross, Limerick	PP

There are therefore approximately 25 out of 145 Jesuits who have contact with children as part of their ministry.

The Jesuits currently have two Apostolates, where there is ministry with children: The Pioneer Total Abstinence Association, founded by Fr Cullen in 1894; and the Jesuit Refugee Service, founded in 1980. Its mission is to accompany, advocate, and serve the cause of refugees and forcibly displaced persons worldwide.

The review of safeguarding practice with the Society of Jesus in Ireland took place over a two day period on 27<sup>th</sup> and 28<sup>th</sup> April. Further follow up work by e-mail and telephone was conducted during the report writing stage. The reviewers met the Provincial, Deputy DLP, Advisory Panel members, who are also part of the Safeguarding Committee. In addition the reviewers met one local Superior, one Parish Priest. The Local Superior has been responsible for two members who lived in his community against whom there have been allegations of abuse. The Parish Priest ministers in Dublin and advised the reviewers of the cross referencing between diocesan policy and that of the Jesuits and how they work in tandem to safeguard children.

Telephone conversations were held with An Garda Siochana and with TUSLA Child and Family Agency, all these contacts are reported in the body of the report.

The Jesuits have Apostolates where there is ministry with children and these include the Pioneer Total Abstinence Association, which promote alcohol abstinence amongst young people starting with young children preparing for confirmation. The activities involve school work, quizzes and leisure pursuits. The Designated Liaison Person of that organization was interviewed by the reviewers and the supporting safeguarding documentation was presented. However as this was not a review of the safeguarding practice within the Pioneers, detailed critique of their policies and practices was not undertaken.

The second Apostolate is the Jesuit Refugee Service, where staff work with asylum seekers and refugees in detention centres and refugee institutions. The reviewers met with an Advocacy worker and learned of their safeguarding practices, policies and procedures. As with the Pioneers, this Apostolate was not the subject of detailed critique of safeguarding policies and practices.

It is important to recognize the co-operation of the Provincial Fr. Tom Layden and his team in the process of this child safeguarding review, NBSCCCI commends him and the deputy designated person for ensuring that the review took place and for their openness to learning so as to improve their safeguarding practice in the best interests of children.

## **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, *Safeguarding Children: Standards and Guidance 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 Jesuits. The seven standards are:

**Standard 1** A written policy on keeping children safe

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

**Standard 3** Preventing harm to children:

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

**Standard 4** Training and education

**Standard 5** Communicating the Church’s safeguarding message:

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

**Standard 6** Access to advice and support

**Standard 7** Implementing and monitoring the Standards

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



## Standard 1

### *A written policy on keeping children safe*

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

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

### Criteria

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

The Jesuit protocols were formulated following the publication of the book *Child Sexual Abuse: Framework for a Church Response*, which came out in 1996. Earlier protocols tended to be short. This was later redrafted and reviewed following the introduction of *Safeguarding*

*Children, Standards and Guidance for the Catholic Church in Ireland* in 2009; it was reviewed again in 2012, and again in 2015.

The policy is set within the context of civil legislation in both jurisdictions on the island of Ireland and Church standards. The most recent amendments include changes in *Children First*.

Its opening statement reflects the commitment to the work of safeguarding children in Jesuits based upon Gospel values:

*“...A particular requirement of this principle is the recognition of the right of all children to be respected, nurtured, cared for and protected. This right is embedded in Gospel values, in international law and in domestic law. Arising from this, the Irish Jesuit Province has adopted a comprehensive set of Safeguarding Children policies and procedures.*

*This booklet has as its over-riding concern the safety and welfare of all children who are involved in any way in activities of the Irish Jesuit Province. The booklet includes procedures for the creation of safe environments for children, which includes prevention of abuse. It incorporates best practice for the prevention of child abuse and for an appropriate response where abuse is alleged or suspected.*

*A further concern in developing these procedures is to create a secure and supportive atmosphere in which those who have suffered abuse in the past can be assured of a sensitive, caring and compassionate response, and should be offered appropriate pastoral care for them and their family.*

*The procedures are concerned with ensuring that the rights in natural justice of a person who is accused of abuse are respected, and that appropriate pastoral care is provided for them and their family.”*

Within this short statement all important aspects of child safeguarding have been captured, including the Jesuits commitment to upholding the rights of children, caring for those abused, and their desire for a process of natural justice to be employed when responding to anyone accused of abuse.

Factsheet 3a sets out the requirement to report all allegations through the designated liaison person to the civil authority agencies.

In discussion with the Jesuit who ministers as a parish priest in Dublin, the reviewers were advised that the policy of the Archdiocese is adhered to; in addition there is a notice informing parishioners of the policy of the Jesuits which identifies the DLP and the civil authority agencies. Training is undertaken by the Archdiocesan trainer, and vetting is also undertaken by the Archdiocese. The priest advised that child safeguarding is an item on the agenda of parish council meetings. The Jesuit Provincial visits annually and conducts an audit of child safeguarding as part of this annual visit. The priest reflected that sadly there is little ministry with children in the parish, there are no children altar servers, no children’s liturgy and no

children's choir, this is in spite of the young population it ministers to. He did add that there is a monthly family mass, where children do readings and present at the altar during the liturgy.

In addition to the core ministry of the Jesuits they have two Apostolates where the staff/volunteers engage with children: the Pioneer Total Abstinence Association, and the Jesuit Refugee Service (JRS). The safeguarding practice of these organisations was not subject to review as part of this process; however, given that the overall responsibility rests with the Jesuits, the reviewers did meet staff from the Pioneers and the JRS. In 2012 the Jesuits asked the Pioneers to suspend their ministry with children until a satisfactory policy framework and associated procedures could be put in place. The policy document has been written with the support of NBSCCCI staff and meets the requirements under the 7 safeguarding standards. The JRS work by invitation in Refugee and Detention Centres. While there, the staff are required to observe and follow the policy of those centres, which are monitored by the Department of Justice. In addition, the JRS are guided by the Jesuits policy, but have a number of sub-policies which are specific to the services they run. These were not examined during the review.

Overall the Jesuit Policy is comprehensive, easy to read, and has been reviewed and amended on a regular basis. All Criteria are fully met within this standard.

## 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 the Jesuits meet 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).	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 Order 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 partially
<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.	Not 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

The Procedures set out in the Jesuits safeguarding policy document are captured under factsheet 2b which sets out the role of the designated liaison person and factsheet 3a. The procedure is clear and easy to read and follows closely the guidance in Safeguarding Children, Standards and Guidance for the Catholic Church in Ireland.

Criteria 2.1, 2.2, and 2.3 are all fully met and well detailed within the policy document.

In relation to criterion 2.4 there is guidance about recording keeping, however, the case files did not demonstrate good and full record keeping. The information relating to allegations was not all held in the case file, for example, the important advice offered by the advisory panel was stored separately with the advisory panel minutes. In addition the records were brief and the author was not identifiable. This meant that at times the reviewer was unable to follow the flow of actions. The files could be significantly be improved by following the National Board's template for recording, having detailed narrative accounts of all actions taken, having separate third party sections for complainant information and support offered, and by having the author clearly identified through placing the name at the end of each page and having the records signed.

The reviewers noted that the Jesuits had the case files audited in 2010, when issues of better recording should have been raised. The Provincial reviews the case files and meets the designated person when new allegations emerge, and liaises on a regular ninety day basis to be briefed on all developments. Some of the older files appear to stop in 2012. These relate to members who are out of ministry and where the reviewers expected to read notes of monitoring visits.

### **Recommendation 1**

**The Provincial should ensure that all records relating to case management are consolidated into the appropriate case file and that in future all records are assembled according to the NBSCCCI template with authorisation clear on all records.**

Criterion 2.5 is not met. The Jesuits explained that their ministry with children is limited to parish ministry or ministry in schools, where the priests follow the child safeguarding policy of the Diocese or the Department of Education; within the Pioneers who have their own policy, and within the JRS who also have their own policy. Cross reference should be made within the Jesuits policy document of these other documents and complaints procedures.

Criteria 2.6 and 2.7 are fully met. Contact information relating to An Garda Siochana and PSNI is detailed as is website information which directs the reader to the appropriate TUSLA (Child and Family) and Health and social Care office in Northern Ireland. This contact sheet also provides information and contact details for other organisations which may offer support to complainants.

**Table 1**

**Incidence of Child Safeguarding allegations received within Jesuits from 1<sup>st</sup> January 1975 up to time of review.**

1	Number of Jesuits (Priests and Brothers) of the Jesuits Society against whom allegations have been made since the 1 <sup>st</sup> January 1975 up to the date of the Review	<b>36</b>
2	Total number of allegations received by the Jesuit Society Since 1 <sup>st</sup> January 1975	<b>79</b>
3	Number of allegations reported to An Garda Síochána involving Jesuits 1 <sup>st</sup> January 1975 – this figure includes some allegations that were notified by the Gardai to the Jesuits	<b>57</b>
4	Number of allegations reported to the TUSLA/HSE (or the Health Boards which preceded the setting up of the HSE) involving members of the Jesuits since 1 <sup>st</sup> January 1975: This figure includes some allegations that were notified by the health services to the Jesuits	<b>33</b>
5	Number of Jesuits (still members of the Society) against whom an allegation was made and were living at the date of the review.	<b>8</b>
6	Number of Jesuits against whom an allegation was made and who are deceased	<b>27</b>
7	Number of Jesuits against whom an allegation was made and who are in ministry	<b>2</b>
8	Number of Jesuits against whom an allegation was made and who are “out of ministry” but are still members of the Society	<b>2</b>
9	Number of Jesuits against whom an allegation was made and who are retired “out of ministry”.	<b>4</b>
10	Number of Jesuits against whom an allegation has been made and who have left the Society.	<b>1</b>
11	Number of Jesuits who have been convicted of having committed an offence or offences against a child or young person since 1 <sup>st</sup> January, 1975	<b>0</b>

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

There have been thirty six Jesuits against who there have been safeguarding concerns or allegations. Eight of those are living, twenty seven are deceased and one has left the Society. All cases involving living Jesuits were examined by the reviewers and files of six deceased were also read.

Reference has already been made to the case file recording and the need for all information to be located within the respondents’ case file. The absence of complete records in some files made the assessment of current situations difficult. For example, there were limited preliminary investigations following the conclusion of civil inquiries and the status of the Jesuits ministry

was not clear on the file. Verbally, the Provincial advised that all but two of the eight accused were out of ministry, however that was not evident from the case file. In the cases of these six Jesuits there are no written precepts, restrictions, or safety plans on file. However, again in discussion with the Provincial, deputy DLP, and one local Superior, it is clear that there are restrictions in some cases and tight management regimes. Each case will be detailed alongside issues which emerged relating to the cases of deceased Jesuits.

### **Case 1**

This relates to a member where a concern was expressed by a family member about inappropriate behaviour and boundary violations in 2003. There were further concerns expressed on two other occasions of a similar nature. The Standing Committee at the time (now Advisory Panel) offered good advice and contact was made with the civil authorities to establish if this was child abuse and whether it should be reported. The response was that it did not meet the threshold for reporting. The Jesuits however removed the member from ministry.

In the opinion of the reviewers, the third incident relating to the Jesuit is most certainly a situation of child abuse. On this occasion the allegation is that the Jesuit touched the child's breast, unlike the previous allegations which was hugging and inappropriate conversation. The correct action has been taken in removing this Jesuit from ministry. Given his age, he is unlikely to return to ministry. The behaviour happened in 2003/4 and the Jesuit was removed from ministry in 2004.

### **Case 2**

This relates to abuse which is alleged to have taken place in the 1960s. The information was notified directly from the complainant to the Gardai who conducted an investigation but the DPP decided against prosecution. The priest remained in ministry but was removed four months after the allegation was received in 1999. Following the DPP decision not to prosecute in 2002, the Standing Committee (later Advisory Panel) met and recommended that the priest should not have contact with children and that the Jesuits should reach out to the complainant. The Panel stated that it was clear that DPP decision was not a "declaration of innocence". The priest retired from all public ministries in 2003. Contact and support was offered to the complainant who was clearly traumatised by the abuse from the Jesuit. There was no evidence of a written management plan on record; however he is managed by the local superior and by the visits of the provincial leader.

### **Case 3**

This allegation was received at the end of January, 2010 directly by the Society and was reported promptly to the Gardai and HSE in February 2010. There was some question mark over the location where the abuse took place and the identity of the abuser. The Gardai investigation resulted in a decision not to prosecute. Advice was sought from NBSCCCI and the Society's Advisory panel and it was felt that due to the uncertainties surrounding the case and the fact that the Jesuit's ministry was not with children that he could remain in public ministry. There are no records on file since 2012 and the status of the Jesuit is unclear from the records. Within the file there is no evidence of any preliminary investigation or conclusion as to whether the allegation reaches the threshold of a "semblance of truth". There is correspondence about civil action on

the file, but again this seems to not have been drawn to any conclusion. There have been no other concerns about this member.

#### **Case File 4**

An initial allegation was received about this Jesuit in 1991. The same allegation was repeated in October 1994 and in November 1994. After the allegation was made for the second time the Jesuit was removed from ministry and a preliminary investigation was established. A decree was issued in 1994 initiating the preliminary investigation under Canon Law. The auditor found the complainant to be credible and suggested checking out and reporting the matter to the appropriate Board. The Jesuit attended for assessment in a well-recognised clinical facility. There was advice elsewhere, when a psychiatrist involved in the case at the time, advised against reporting the matter to the Gardai. The Jesuits however notified the Gardai in 1995 and a decision was made by the DPP not to prosecute. This Jesuit was then returned to ministry.

In 2002 the Standing Committee (now Advisory Panel) advised that this Jesuit should not be in ministry with minors. It pointed out that the DPP decision was neither a declaration of innocence or guilt. Therefore in July 2002, he was asked to restrict his work to adults. At that time also, the Society felt they had missed the opportunity for outreach to the complainant and felt they should offer support through the family. A letter was written to the family and an offer of support was made. In 2004 there is a letter on file stating that the Jesuit was in good standing which confused the reviewers, given the restrictions on his ministry with children.

In 2008 there was concern expressed about the quality of the supervision he was receiving. In 2009 he was removed from all public ministries. However, in 2010 he resumed part time public ministry with full information shared.

In August 2010 an allegation was made by a second complainant directly to An Garda Síochána. Once received by the Jesuits they notified the HSE. The DPP directed no prosecution. On foot of the allegation the Order removed him from public ministry.

As with the other cases there is no evidence of a management plan in place or written restrictions, but supervision and oversight is the responsibility of the local Superior.

#### **Case file 5**

This relates to a member who is in ministry. The allegation was made in 1992. At the time the parents did not want the matter reported to the Gardai. There was an internal investigation and it was deemed that the allegation was “false”. The member, who had been removed from ministry, was allowed to resume his duties. In 1995 there was a Garda investigation and a file forwarded to the DPP with a recommendation of no prosecution, and the DPP agreed with this determination. The member received counselling for being falsely accused. There have been no other concerns about this member.



**Case File 6**

This case also relates to a member in ministry. An allegation was made in 2006 about abuse in 1993/4. The priest was withdrawn from ministry. The Gardai were notified, they investigated the complaint, and the DPP decided that there should not be a prosecution. Upon conclusion of the criminal investigation the member was allowed to return to ministry.

In 2006 the Advisory Panel advised that the Society needed to conduct its own inquiries. Since then, there are records relating to the need for an assessment to be carried out, but no evidence of either an investigation or an assessment having been undertaken. In the opinion of the reviewers, the correct course of action is for a preliminary investigation under canon 1717 to be conducted to establish if the allegation reaches the threshold of a semblance of truth. It is not appropriate to conduct a risk assessment until it has been established that the allegation is credible.

**Case File 7**

This complaint was received by the Society in 2011 and relates to abuse having taken place in 1976. The complainant was offered counselling. The member was removed from ministry, forbidden to wear clerical clothing, and required to inform local Superior of his whereabouts. The complainant did not proceed with a statement to the Gardai but the matter was reported promptly to the Gardai. A financial settlement was agreed. The member remains out of ministry on restrictions, but this is not written within a safety plan.

**Case File 8**

This is a case which is still in progress and therefore details will not be disclosed within the report. It has been reported to the civil authorities and the member has been removed from ministry.

In addition to the allegations against living members six files were examined relating to deceased members. All of these have been reported to the Gardai. Of these cases one is significant, as it relates to a large number of allegations against one member made by children.. When the first allegation emerged the member remained in ministry, but was removed 2 years later when a second allegation was notified. There then followed eight other allegations. Consideration was given to conducting a penal process under Canon Law, but the member was considered mentally unfit to participate. He is since deceased. Following the failure of the canon law process, the Gardai and HSE were informed in 2002.

In conclusion, the cases demonstrate a development in safeguarding practice over time. At one time allegations were dealt with through internal processes and then reported to the civil authorities. That practice changed after 2002 and since then all allegations have been promptly notified to An Garda Siochana.

The deficits relate to the actions of the Society following the decision by the DPP not to prosecute when preliminary investigations should have been initiated. In addition, there needs to be evidence on the file of the written safety plan.

There was evidence of counselling being offered to complainants and in some more recent cases, the offer of pastoral support.

### Standard 3

#### ***Preventing Harm to Children***

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

Compliance with Standard 3 is only fully achieved when The Jesuits meet 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).	Partially 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.	Not 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.	Partially Met
<b>3.9</b>	Policies include guidelines on the personal/ intimate care of children with disabilities, including appropriate and inappropriate touch.	Partially 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.	Not 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

*\*Limited or no applicability within the Jesuits*

As Jesuits, the Society has limited direct contact with children and in reality only provides services through other organisations. Each of those organisations: schools, Pioneers, JRS, and diocesan ministry, all have dedicated child safeguarding policies and procedures which are aimed at preventing abuse and which any Jesuit working in that area is required to follow.

This section therefore is for the most part assessed against their written policy; Most of the criteria are fully or partially met in the written guidance. There is clear well documented recruitment procedures and all priests who are in active ministry are required to have a celebret signed by the Provincial to indicate that they are priests in good standing. The reviewers while interviewing one of the Jesuits examined his celebret and was satisfied that it meets the required standards. The Jesuits employ a number of lay people and there is a HR manager who deals with recruitment and personnel issues in place. The child safeguarding policy has a detailed section on dignity at work which covers issues relating to equal opportunities, bullying and non-discrimination. It is,

however, adult focussed and it would be useful to apply the same principles to any ministry with children as required under criterion 3.5 and 3.8. The reviewers accept that the Jesuits provide limited services to children and therefore are not required to amend their policy document at this stage, given that new standards and guidance are being introduced in 2016 by NBSCCCI.

Criterion 3.6 relates to whistleblowing and as this is an important aspect of child safeguarding it is appropriate for the Jesuits to draft a policy and familiarise all Jesuits and lay staff with it.

## **Recommendation 2**

**The Provincial must ensure that a whistleblowing policy is developed and all Jesuits and staff are inducted in its use.**

There is a short section in the policy which outlines care of children with special needs, and references the need for guidance on intimate care. The policy does not go on to detail what that guidance is, so this is assessed as being partially met. However, given that the Jesuits have no direct ministry with children, the reviewers again are not going to require the development of this policy until the development of the new standards in 2016.

Criterion 3.10 references risk assessment in taking children away on trips; this is not detailed in the policy and does not apply to the Jesuits.

The central structure under standard 3 is the safeguarding Committee. Traditionally the functions of this Committee within the Jesuits were undertaken by the Advisory Panel. This panel has now been extended with additional members and with a dedicated remit to cover the tasks associated with those identified with a Safeguarding Committee in “Safeguarding Children, Standards and Guidance for the Catholic Church in Ireland, 2008”. The documentation associated with the Jesuits Advisory Committee has identified the following functions:

- a) Setting up a Safeguarding Plan for the year,
- b) Implementing best practice in the area of Safeguarding Children.
- c) Assessing and implementing training within the Province. d) Drawing up a state of the nation re safeguarding children annually.
- e) Checking with the safeguarding representatives re concerns.
- f) Monitoring Safeguarding within all works in the Province.

The reviewers believe that this committee is at an early stage of development and could benefit from training to clarify their role. Further references about the Committee will be made under standard 4, where they have responsibility for the oversight of training and again under standard where the committee has responsibility for any communication strategy.

**Recommendation 3**

**The Provincial should consider accessing training for the safeguarding Committee to assist in their development of role, terms of Reference and work plan.**

There are the few Jesuits who are engaged in care and oversight of children. Any contact is through other organisational activities. Jesuits, in addition to following their own policies and codes of conduct, which includes no unsupervised contact with children, are required to observe the policies in relation to the prevention of abuse, of the organisation in which they work. The reviewers assess therefore that Standard 3 is reasonably well met but should be enhanced with the development of a whistleblowing policy as recommended above.

#### 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 Deputy designated person within the Jesuits is a trained trainer registered with NBSCCCI. He has delivered training across the society to members. He also attends training with NBSCCCI on a regular basis as does the designated person, to enhance their knowledge and skills in managing allegations.

The Provincial has also attended training with the NBSCCCI on Leadership in safeguarding in the Church.

The reviewers discussed training with two of the local Superiors and the safeguarding Committee. One local Superior has been trained but felt that training took place a number of years previously and would welcome some updated training. The second had been trained by the Dublin archdiocesan trainer, as he is responsible for a parish within the Archdiocese.

In discussion, with the Safeguarding Committee there was a sense that training for Jesuits was taken care of by the organisation in which they ministered. In addition, training for the Pioneers was sought from NBSCCCI when their policy was drafted. The reviewers however believe that it is important to keep the whole area of child safeguarding relevant

by regular updates, briefings and training sessions. Since the training took place across the Society in 2010 there have been significant developments in all aspects of child safeguarding, including in legislation, vetting, better preventative methods, and in recent years improvements in the pastoral response to complainants. A training needs analysis across the Society should be undertaken to assess which member requires specific training, awareness raising or other forms of improving their child safeguarding practice.

**Recommendation 4**

**The Training Manager should conduct a training needs analysis and consult NBSCCCI to assist with the development of a training plan to meet the needs of all members of the Society.**



## 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.	Not Met
<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.	Not Met

Information regarding child safeguarding is displayed on the Jesuits website. In anticipation of the NBSCCCI review a notice was posted on the website announcing the review and inviting any complainant who has not disclosed their abuse to come forward.

There are posters in all Jesuit Communities and Churches advising of their child safeguarding policy and directing people to the civil authorities and the designated liaison person if they have a concern, with full contact details.

The Jesuits do not deliver many services to children so have not established any mechanism to encouraging feedback from children, therefore criterion 5.2 is not met.

As part of communication within the Society the Provincial visits every Jesuit Community once a year and meets with every Jesuit. Child safeguarding is highlighted during these visits and the Provincial conducts an audit during the visits.

The reviewers discussed with the Provincial and the Deputy designated liaison person the need to have a more formalised structure of communication, perhaps through a newsletter or regular correspondence, highlighting current safeguarding issues. This could be developed as part of their communications plan which to date has not been developed and falls within the remit of the safeguarding committee.

**Recommendation 5**

**The Provincial should ensure that the safeguarding committee develops a communication plan so that all members of the Society and anyone engaged in ministry from the Jesuits are informed of their safeguarding messages.**

**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 Partially
<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 Partially
<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 Partially

The reviewers examined fourteen case files during the course of the fieldwork. Contained within the files are varying degrees of evidence of advice and support. The failure to record all contacts made it challenging for the reviewers to assess the full extent of advice sought in managing a case or in the amount of support offered to both the complainant and respondent.

There is some evidence of contact from professionals, including lawyers, psychologists and other experts in the field of child protection. As already stated, the previous advisory panel referred to as a standing committee appeared to offer very good advice and guidance, particularly in relation to offering support to complainants and their families. This reflective approach is also evident in the records of the previous designated person who appeared to deal very sensitively and earnestly with all allegations. His concern for

survivors of abuse was clear and his desire to do the “right thing” is shown in records where he considered whether the assessment undertaken was sufficiently robust.

While the reviewers were advised that there are nominated support people for complainants and advisors for respondents, there was no evidence on file of these role holders offering support. It would appear that all contact with the complainant and respondent was through the designated liaison person. This approach was clearly difficult for some complainants, particularly given that the DLP is a Jesuit priest. In a couple of case files there was good evidence of the current Provincial reaching out to offer support to complainants and their families and that was well received.

The Reviewers held discussions with An Garda Siochana and TUSLA; the former agency stated that they had no concerns about the Jesuits and the latter stated that they had met with the DLP on a few occasions and that he has kept them informed about the movements of respondents.

In terms of the respondents, there was no evidence of safety plans or monitoring in the written record. However the reviewers met a local superior who has had responsibility for two Jesuits accused of child abuse living in his community. The reviewers were extremely impressed by the gentleness of this local superior, his absolute concern for survivors of abuse and his desire to place tight restrictions so as to ensure that risk was prevented in the future. To assist him in his work there should be a written plan which is monitored by the case manager in each case of a respondent who is out of ministry.

Standard 6 needs some development, in terms of aspects, advice and support.

The reviewers met the current Advisory Panel which also doubles as the Safeguarding Committee with additional members for this second role. The reviewers believe that the two functions of advice and prevention should be separated and that the Advisory Panel should be strengthened. Currently there is a civil lawyer, canon lawyer, social worker and deputy DLP as members with the DLP presenting. In addition consideration should be given to having members who have experience of supporting complainants and those with expertise in working with people who sexually abuse children.

#### **Recommendation 6**

**The Provincial should consider separating the Advisory Panel from the Safeguarding Committee and strengthening the skill base of the latter.**

#### **Recommendation 7**

**The Provincial must ensure that an advisor is offered each time a member is accused of child abuse and that this role holder forms part of a management plan which is monitored by the case manager.**

**Recommendation 8**

**The Provincial must ensure that complainants have access to lay support personnel, who can assist them with accessing all counselling and advice that is needed or appropriate.**

## 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>
7.1	There is a written plan showing what steps will be taken to keep children safe, who is responsible for implementing these measures and when these will be completed.	Met Partially
7.2	The human or financial resources necessary for implementing the plan are made available.	Met Fully
7.3	Arrangements are in place to monitor compliance with child protection policies and procedures.	Met Fully
7.4	Processes are in place to ask parishioners (children and parents/ carers) about their views on policies and practices for keeping children safe.	Met Partially
7.5	All incidents, allegations/ suspicions of abuse are recorded and stored securely.	Met Fully

The Safeguarding Committee have recently developed a strategic safeguarding plan which focuses mainly on two of the Jesuits apostolates, JRS and the Pioneers; with more limited reference to the ministry of the Jesuits. The plan should cover all aspects of child safeguarding relating to the Jesuit Society, including prevention, training, communication, and audit and review. This is important given that Jesuits have contact albeit limited with children as part of their overall ministry. The reviewers identified that there is a lack of clarity around the purpose of such a plan, and would suggest that training, as already recommended should help the panel consider their role more clearly and assist with the development of a plan which will have the impact of better practice across the Jesuit Order.

Criterion 7.3 is partially met and has limited applicability; any feedback from parishioners is managed through the Archdiocese of Dublin or the Diocese in which the Jesuits provide ministry within a parish.

The reviewers were impressed with the monitoring role carried out by the provincial who visits each Jesuit community annually. Prior to his arrival the local superior is required to fill out a survey relating to child safeguarding and this is discussed during the visit. It would be helpful if in addition to this very positive initiative the Safeguarding Committee

developed an annual report reviewing all aspects of child safeguarding, with input from the DLP on case management issues.

**Recommendation 9**

**The Safeguarding Committee should produce an annual report for the Provincial on the developments in safeguarding across the Society including review of safeguarding and case management.**

In conclusion, the reviewers are satisfied that there is a commitment to safeguarding children within the Jesuits.

In terms of case management, reporting is now prompt, removal from ministry is always considered, and co-operation with the civil authorities is in evidence. This aspect of work could be improved with the introduction of monitoring plans and dedicated personnel to support the complainant and respondent. The records should be improved to demonstrate more fully all actions in cases.

Prevention is generally good, the developing awareness within the Society is positive and given the level of ministry with children, most aspects in policy terms have been considered and pursued in practice. Recommendations to improve this further have been made.

## **Recommendations**

### **Recommendation 1**

**The Provincial should ensure that all records relating to case management are consolidated into the appropriate case file and that in future all records are assembled according to the NBSCCCI template with authorisation clear on all records.**

### **Recommendation 2**

**The Provincial must ensure that a whistleblowing policy is developed and all Jesuits and staff are inducted in its use.**

### **Recommendation 3**

**The Provincial should consider accessing training for the safeguarding Committee to assist in their development of role, terms of Reference and work plan.**

### **Recommendation 4**

**The Training Manager should conduct a training needs analysis and consult NBSCCCI to assist with the development of a training plan to meet the needs of all members of the Society.**

### **Recommendation 5**

**The Provincial should ensure that the safeguarding committee develops a communication plan so that all members of the Society and anyone engaged in ministry from the Jesuits are informed of their safeguarding messages.**

### **Recommendation 6**

**The Provincial should consider separating the Advisory Panel from the Safeguarding Committee and strengthening the skill base of the latter.**

### **Recommendation 7**

**The Provincial must ensure that an advisor is offered each time a member is accused of child abuse and that this role holder forms part of a management plan which is monitored by the case manager.**

### **Recommendation 8**

**The Provincial must ensure that complainants have access to lay support personnel, who can assist them with accessing all counselling and advice that is needed or appropriate.**

### **Standard 7**

### **Recommendation 9**

**The Safeguarding Committee should produce an annual report for the Provincial on the developments in safeguarding across the Society including review of safeguarding and case management.**



**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 1<sup>st</sup> 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* (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>1</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

---

<sup>1</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.

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 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.