

## APPENDIX

**Part A – Background**1. Characteristics1.1 History of the Organisation and Establishment

## Past

## i. When, how and why was the organisation founded?

The English Benedictine Congregation was founded in 1216. A monastic congregation is described in Canon 488 of the 1917 Code of Canon Law as follows:

“A monastic congregation is a joining of several independent monasteries under the same superior.”

The Superior of the Congregation has no remit to authorise or control the activities undertaken at any monastery. Under both the 1917 code and the more recent 1983 Code, the Abbot President is the Superior of the Congregation. The Abbot President undertakes a four yearly visitation (that is, inspection) of each autonomous monastery. The purpose of the visitation is for the Abbot President to ensure that the Rule of St Benedict and the constitutions and law of the church are being observed. However he has no involvement in or authority over the life, prayer or work of the abbey. At a visitation, the Abbot President may issue a precept. The precept is binding in canon law and under the vow of obedience. The Abbot President has no power to remove any abbot.

At no time did the English Benedictine Congregation have any control over or responsibility for the constitution, management or operation of Fort Augustus Abbey. The Congregation did not govern the abbey.

The English Benedictine Congregation cannot respond to the section 21 notice on behalf of Fort Augustus Abbey, Fort Augustus Abbey School or Carlekemp Priory School. It was not a provider of an establishment in Scotland. The Congregation had no responsibility for or control of the Abbey or its schools. However, the Congregation has access to archived material from Fort Augustus Abbey and in order to assist the Inquiry has completed the response with reference to that material. For this purpose, therefore, the organisation is Fort Augustus Abbey and the establishments are the respective schools. The schools have been dealt with separately and this document provides information relating to the Carlekemp Priory School.

Fort Augustus Abbey was founded in 1876. The monastery was founded with the aim of continuing two earlier monasteries: the Abbey of St James of the Scots in Ratisbon on the Danube (founded c1100), and the English Abbey of SS Adrian and Denys at Lamspring near Hanover (which was given to the English Benedictine Congregation in 1645). It was hoped that Fort Augustus would represent the beginning of a Scottish Benedictine Congregation.

The project of seeking a reformed way of monastic life led the community to look for help outside the English Benedictine Congregation. The help of the Scottish bishops was sought which led to the decision of the Holy See to separate Fort Augustus from the English Benedictine Congregation in 1882.

For the following 27 years Fort Augustus was not part of any Benedictine Congregation. It was immediately subject to the jurisdiction of the Holy See. Monastic life at the abbey was reshaped according to the model of the Abbey of Beuron in Germany.

Eventually the community asked that Fort Augustus be returned to the English Benedictine Congregation. The General Chapter of the Benedictine Congregation accepted Fort Augustus as a member of Congregation in 1909. It remained an autonomous monastery within the English Benedictine Congregation until its closure in 1999.

- ii. What part did the provision in Scotland of residential care (including foster care) for children play in the organisation's purpose, operation and activities?

Fort Augustus Abbey provided residential care in the form of boarding schools named Fort Augustus Abbey School ("The Abbey School") and Carlekemp Priory School ("The Priory School"). The Abbey School was opened in 1923. The Priory School opened in 1945, as the successor of an earlier school in Canaan Lane, Edinburgh, which had been evacuated at the beginning of the Second World War. The provision of residential care through the schools played a significant role in the organisation's activities.

- iii. When and how did the organisation become involved in the provision of residential care (including foster care) for children in Scotland?

The provision of residential care arose when Fort Augustus Abbey opened the Abbey School in 1923. The school was residential from its establishment.

- iv. Why did the organisation consider that it had the competence to be responsible for, and manage the care of, children in establishments?

The provision of education by religious institutions has a rich history in Scotland and elsewhere. Fort Augustus Abbey was a member of the English Benedictine Congregation. Many other monasteries of the Congregation had developed schools as part of their institutions. The monastic community was a centre for learning. The organisation considered it appropriate to formalise this into the Abbey School.

- v. How many establishments did the organisation run, where were they located, over what period were they in operation, and what were their names?

Fort Augustus Abbey ran two establishments; Fort Augustus Abbey School and Carlekemp Priory School.

Fort Augustus Abbey School

Fort Augustus Abbey School was established in 1923. It was located at the Fort Augustus Abbey in Inverness-shire. It was in operation from 1923 until closure in 1992.

Carlekemp Priory School

Carlekemp Priory School was initially run by Fort Augustus Abbey in Edinburgh at Canaan Lane from 1931 until 1939. At that time it was known as St Andrews Priory School. The school relocated to Carlekemp in North Berwick in 1945. The school closed in 1977.

- vi. When, how and why was each of these establishments founded?

Fort Augustus Abbey School

Fort Augustus Abbey School was founded by Fort Augustus Abbey in 1923. The school was established on the grounds of the Abbey. The community established a school in response to a desire to provide education on the same lines as schools already established in many of the monasteries of the English Benedictine Congregation. A school was seen as providing suitable work for members of the monastic community and fulfilling a desire to offer a Catholic education to boys in Scotland. There was also a need for an income for the Abbey and the private provision of schooling provided funds.

Carlekemp Priory School

Carlekemp Priory School was located in Canaan Lane in Edinburgh until 1939 and after the Second World War it started up again at Carlekemp House in North Berwick in 1945. The school was founded to provide primary education to Catholic children and was intended to act as a feeder school for the Abbey School. The school was run by members of the Fort Augustus community and the property in which it was housed in North Berwick was owned by the St Benedict's Abbey Trust.

- vii. In the case of any establishment which is no longer in operation, when and why did it cease operating?

Fort Augustus Abbey School

The Abbey School closed in 1993. The school was able to attract a decreasing number of pupils resulting in it becoming economically unviable.

Carlekemp Priory School

The Priory School closed in 1977 due to a decrease in the number of monks at Fort Augustus Abbey resulting in it becoming impossible to continue to run a separate school in a different area of Scotland.

- viii. If the organisation itself is no longer involved in the provision of residential care for children in Scotland, when and why did it cease to be so involved?

The organisation ceased to be involved in the provision of residential care in 1993 when the Abbey School closed, for the reasons set out above.

- ix. If the organisation was founded as a religious order by members of a particular faith or church, what was the precise relationship between the order and the religious hierarchy within that faith or church?

See answer i.

- x. Within the faith or church to which the religious order belonged, what degree of autonomy was enjoyed by the order in relation to the provision of residential care for children in Scotland?

Fort Augustus Abbey had complete autonomy in relation to the provision of residential care for children. The English Benedictine Congregation at no time had any control over, or responsibility for, the management or operation of the schools run by Fort Augustus Abbey.

- xi. In the case of establishments that were run by members of a religious order, what degree of autonomy within the order itself was enjoyed by such members?

Fort Augustus Abbey controlled the running of the Abbey School and the Priory School. The Abbot had ultimate authority over both establishments subject to the Rule of St Benedict and the English Benedictine Congregation Constitutions.

The Rule and the Constitutions provided for the way in which the Abbot must exercise his authority. He was required to appoint a Cellarer or Bursar, responsible to the Abbot for the financial running of the establishment. He was required to appoint a Headmaster for any school run by the monastery; the Headmaster was responsible to the Abbot for the running of the school. In some circumstances, there was a requirement to consult or obtain the consent of his Council or the Chapter of the Abbey before making decisions.

#### Present

- xii. With reference to the present position, are the answers to any of the above questions different?

No. Fort Augustus Abbey, the Abbey School and the Priory School are no longer in existence.

- xiii. If so, please give details.

N/A

## 1.2 Funding of Establishment

### Past

- i. How were the establishment's operations and activities, so far as relating to the provision of residential care for children, funded?

Fort Augustus Abbey had financial autonomy. All assets were held in a charitable trust founded in 1936 under the name St Benedict's Abbey Trust. The land and buildings within which the Priory School was run was owned by the community. The Priory School was a private school and was funded by fees.

- ii. Was the funding adequate to properly care for the children?

The funding was adequate to properly care for the children.

- iii. If not, why not?

N/A

- iv. What state support did it receive?

We have not obtained any information that the Priory School received any state funding.

### Present

- v. If the establishment continues to provide residential care for children, how is that funded?

N/A

- vi. What state support does it receive?

N/A

## 1.3 Legal Status

### (a) Organisation

#### Past

- i. What was the legal status of the organisation since it was founded?

Fort Augustus Abbey was a voluntary unincorporated association. On 20 May 1936 a trust deed was registered which set up the St Benedict's Abbey Trust. The beneficiaries of the trust were the members of the community. The trust deed does not make reference to the running of schools.

The land and buildings of Fort Augustus Abbey occupied by the monastic community belonged to the Lovat family who gave the right to occupy to the monastic community on a 999 year lease. The land and buildings within which the Priory School was run was owned by the community. The title was held by the Abbot, Prior and Bursar of the Fort Augustus Abbey.

When Fort Augustus Abbey was suppressed the land and buildings at Fort Augustus Abbey reverted to the Lovat Estate, while other assets and land were transferred by a Deed of Gift by Fort Augustus to the English Benedictine Congregation Trust. That occurred in 2010.

- ii. Were there any changes in the legal status of the organisation since it was founded?

Yes.

- iii. What, if any, material changes were there to the legal status of the organisation?

Fort Augustus Abbey was a voluntary unincorporated association. On 20 May 1936 a trust deed was registered which set up the St Benedict's Abbey Trust.

The Trust became insolvent and the community dispersed in 1999. There was a suppression of the monastery under Canon Law in 2001. The Trust remained in existence only to deal with any claims. The Trust was wound up by the Scottish Charities Commission in 2011. It now has no legal existence.

- iv. What was the legal basis which authorised or enabled the organisation to become responsible for the provision of residential care (including foster care) for children in Scotland?

Fort Augustus Abbey established the schools independently. They provided a service in return for remuneration from the parents of pupils. The legal basis for the provision of care to the pupils was contractual. The schools were not under the authority of a local education authority. There was no statutory legal basis which authorised the organisation to become responsible for the provision of residential care until the Education (Scotland) Act 1980 which required independent schools to be registered with the Registrar of Independent Schools. The Secretary of State appointed an officer to be the Registrar of Independent Schools in Scotland.

- v. Did that legal basis require the organisation to meet, or fulfil, any legal and/or regulatory requirements in respect of children in its care? If so, please give details.

The 1980 Act required the organisation to fulfil regulatory requirements in respect of children in its care in order to remain registered. Under s.99 of the Act it was provided that registered schools must not be objectionable on any of the following grounds:

- a) That efficient and suitable instruction was not being provided at the school, having regard to the ages and sex of the pupils attending;
- b) That the school premises or any parts thereof were unsuitable for the school;
- c) That the accommodation provided at the school premises was inadequate or unsuitable, having regard to the number, ages and sex of the pupils attending the school and;
- d) That the proprietor of the school or any teacher employed therein was not a proper person to be the proprietor of an independent school or to be a teacher in any school, as the case may be.

- vi. Did the organisation have a legal duty of care to each child in its care?

Fort Augustus Abbey had a legal duty to protect each child in its care under common law and statute. The Children Act 1908 made it an offence for any person over the age of sixteen, having care of a child or young person, to wilfully assault or mistreat a child in such a way as to cause "unnecessary suffering or injury to health". The Children and Young Persons (Scotland) Act 1937 made clear that any person failing to provide adequate food, clothing, medical aid or lodging for a child is guilty of neglect. Later legislation retained these basic principles. Fort Augustus Abbey had a duty to care for children equal to that of any other responsible party.

Present

- vii. With reference to the present position, are the answers to any of the above questions different?

No. Fort Augustus Abbey, the Abbey School and the Priory School are no longer in existence.

- viii. If so, please give details.

N/A

- ix. If the organisation is a Scottish local authority, please provide details of the predecessor authorities for the local authority area for which the authority is now responsible, and the time periods during which these

authorities were the responsible authority for the area, or any part thereof.

N/A

(b) Establishment

Past

- i. Did the establishment have a special legal, statutory or other status?

No.

- ii. If not, how was the establishment described?

The Priory School was an independent, fee-paying boarding school.

- iii. What was the legal basis which authorised, or enabled, the establishment to become responsible for managing the care of children in a residential setting?

Fort Augustus Abbey established the Priory School independently. They provided a service in return for remuneration from the parents of pupils. The legal basis for the provision of care to the pupils was contractual. The school was not under the authority of a local education authority. There was no statutory legal basis which authorised the school to become responsible for managing the care of children in a residential setting.

- iv. Did that legal basis require the establishment, or its management, to meet, or fulfil, any legal and/or regulatory requirements in respect of children in its care? If so, please give details.

The legal basis did not require the Priory School to fulfil any legal or regulatory requirements.

- v. Did the establishment have a legal duty of care to each child in its care?

The Priory School had a legal duty not to cause harm to children in its care under common law and statute identical to that noted in 1.3(a)(vi).

Present

- vi. With reference to the present position, are the answers to any of the above questions different?

No. Fort Augustus Abbey and the Priory School are no longer in existence.



- vii. If so, please give details.

N/A

#### 1.4 Legal Responsibility

##### (a) Organisation

###### Past

- i. Did the organisation have any legal responsibility for the children in its care?

Yes.

- ii. If so, what was the nature and extent of that legal responsibility?

Please see 1.3(a)(vi).

- iii. Did any other person or organisation have any legal responsibility for the children while they were in the organisation's care?

Yes.

- iv. If so, what was the nature and extent of that responsibility?

Parents of pupils at the schools retained legal responsibility over the children derived from their common law parental rights and responsibilities.

- v. If the organisation had no legal responsibility for children in its care, where or with whom did legal responsibility lie?

N/A

###### Present

- vi. With reference to the present position, are the answers to any of the above questions different?

No. Fort Augustus Abbey, the Abbey School and the Priory School are no longer in existence.

- vii. If so, please give details.

N/A

## (b) Establishment

## Past

- i. Did the establishment, or those in charge of the establishment, have any separate legal responsibility (separate from the organisation) for children in its care?

No. Fort Augustus Abbey did not have separate legal responsibility from the Priory School.

- ii. If so, what was the nature of that responsibility?

N/A

## Present

- iii. With reference to the present position, are the answers to any of the above questions different?

No. Fort Augustus Abbey, the Abbey School and the Priory School are no longer in existence.

- iv. If so, please give details.

N/A

1.5 Ethos

## (a) Organisation

## Past

- i. What did the organisation see as its function, ethos and/or mission in terms of the residential care service it provided for children?

The Fort Augustus Abbey community saw the provision of Catholic education to the boys of the Abbey School and Priory School as a part of its mission.

- ii. If the establishment was run by a Catholic religious order, what vows were taken by members of the order and at which point in their training?

The establishment was run by a Catholic religious order. The members of the monastic community took vows according to the form prescribed by the Rule of St Benedict: stability, conversatio morum and obedience.

The monks who were destined to be priests took vows for three years after one year of novitiate. They then took lifelong vows when the three year vows expired. The monks who were destined to be lay brothers took vows for three years after a two year novitiate and then lifelong vows when their three year vows expired.

- iii. What did the organisation see as the establishment's function, ethos and/or mission in terms of the service that the establishment provided to children accommodated there?

The Fort Augustus Abbey community saw the schools as the principal means by which it was able to offer a Catholic education to boys.

- iv. Were there changes over time in terms of what the organisation saw as its function, ethos and/or mission in terms of the residential care service it provided for children?

No. Fort Augustus Abbey consistently considered its function to provide a Catholic education to pupils at both schools.

- v. If so, what were the changes and when and why did they come into effect?

N/A

- vi. Were there changes over time in terms of what the organisation saw as the establishment's function, ethos and/or mission in terms of the service that the establishment provided to children accommodated there?

No. Fort Augustus Abbey continued see the provision of a Catholic education to pupils as a part of its mission.

- vii. If so, what were the changes and when and why did they come into effect?

N/A

Present

- viii. With reference to the present position, are the answers to any of the above questions different?

No. Fort Augustus Abbey, the Abbey School and the Priory School are no longer in existence.

- ix. If so, please give details.

N/A

(b) Establishment

Past

- i. What services were provided at the establishment, in terms of care for children?

The Priory School provided education to boys from age four to thirteen. The school was residential and day pupils also attended.

- ii. Did the establishment care for children of both sexes?

The Priory School cared only for boys.

- iii. If the establishment cared for children of one sex only, what was the thinking behind that policy?

The policy of caring for boys only was a result of the rules of enclosure that members of the Fort Augustus Abbey adhered to. The Abbey was a monastic community. The Priory School was a feeder school for the Abbey School, which only took boys.

- iv. Were any special child care, or child protection measures, taken in the light of that policy? If so, please provide details.

We hold no information regarding special care or protection measures taken in the light of that policy.

- v. What was the daily routine for boys/girls cared for at the establishment?

We do not hold information as to the daily routine for boys at the Priory School.

- vi. What were the on-site activities for children cared for at the establishment?

The on-site activities for children attending the school varied through time. Activities offered included:

Sports, including rugby, hockey, cricket, swimming, football, athletics, gymnastics;  
 Music, including singing and instrument lessons;  
 Clubs, including woodwork, chess, bridge, photography, board games, first aid and homecraft;  
 Magazine/Newsletter journalism.

- vii. What were the off-site activities for them?

Off-site activities for children attending the school also varied through time but included:  
 Sports fixtures at other schools;  
 School trips and pilgrimages;

- viii. Did children work manually, either at the establishment, or externally (e.g. farming work or other labour), or both?

We hold no records of pupils doing manual work.

- ix. If the establishment was run by a Catholic religious order, were any prospective members of the order who were in training permitted to care for children?

We hold no evidence that prospective members of the order who were in training were not permitted to teach children in the Priory School, nor do we hold any evidence that prospective members of the order were ever living at Carlekemp, although they lived at St Andrew's in Edinburgh before 1939.

#### Present

- x. With reference to the present position, are the answers to any of the above questions different?

No. The Priory School is no longer in existence.

- xi. If so, please give details.

N/A

#### 1.6 Numbers

##### (a) Organisation

Past

- i. How many children did the organisation accommodate at a time and in how many establishments?

Fort Augustus Abbey accommodated children in its capacity in running both schools. We do not hold records as to the number of children accommodated by the Priory School. We hold incomplete records as to the number of children accommodated by the Abbey school per year. The approximate numbers per year are listed below:

1993 – 52  
1992 – 63  
1991 – 61  
1990 – 62  
1989 – 63  
1988 – 66  
1987 - 78  
1986 - 85  
1885 – 83  
1984 – 93  
1983 – 113  
1982 - 123  
1981 - 130  
1980 - 133  
1977 – 52  
1976 – 53  
1975 – 54  
1974 – 78  
1973 – 68  
1972 – 65  
1971 – 73  
1970 - 69  
1969 – 69  
1968 - 68  
1967 - 69  
1966 – 72  
1965 – 70  
1964 – 67  
1963 – 67  
1962 -69  
1961 – 67  
1960 -74  
1959 – 73  
1958 - 91  
1957 – 85  
1956 – 66  
1955 – 64  
1954 – 75  
1953 – 73  
1951 – 68  
1944 – 48 (prep school – 39)  
1935 – 11

- ii. Please provide details of any material changes in numbers of children, or numbers of establishments, and the reasons for those changes?

The Abbey ran two schools from 1945 until the Priory school closed in 1977. We do not hold records for the numbers of children at the Priory school. The number of children at the Abbey school increased after the closure of the Priory School, reaching a peak in the early 1980s. Following that time the numbers decreased until the school was closed due to economic unviability arising from a lack of pupils in 1993.

- iii. How many children in total were accommodated by the organisation?

We do not hold records for the total number of children accommodated in the schools.

- iv. What numbers (if any) were placed in foster care by the organisation?

We hold no information of any child being placed into foster care by Fort Augustus Abbey.

- v. In general terms, was the main service provided by the organisation the provision of residential care for children in establishments, or was it the provision of foster care?

Fort Augustus Abbey ran the Abbey school and the Priory school which provided residential care for children through its boarding facilities.

#### Present

- vi. With reference to the present position, are the answers to any of the above questions different?

No. Fort Augustus Abbey, the Abbey School and the Priory School are no longer in existence.

- vii. If so, please give details.

N/A

#### (b) Establishment

##### Past

- i. How many children did the establishment accommodate at a time?

We do not hold information as to the number of pupils at the Priory School.

- ii. Did this change, and if so, what were the reasons?

See previous answer at 1.6(b)(i).

- iii. How many children in total were cared for at the establishment?

See previous answer at 1.6(b)(i).

- iv. What accommodation was provided for the children?

At the Priory School accommodation was provided within Carlekemp House. The accommodation consisted of dormitories

- v. How many children occupied a bedroom/dormitory/house?

We do not hold information as to the number of children per room for the Priory School.

#### Present

- vi. With reference to the present position, are the answers to any of the above questions different?

No. The Priory School is no longer in existence.

- vii. If so, please give details.

N/A

#### 1.7 Children's Background/Experience

##### Past

- i. Did the children admitted to the establishment generally have a shared background and/or shared experiences?

The children admitted to the Priory School generally had a shared background of a Catholic faith. They were mostly from the UK. They were generally from the middle classes as the school fees required parents to have a degree of assets. We believe there were some bursary places to allow children from more deprived economic backgrounds to attend.

- ii. Were children admitted into the care of the organisation as a whole, or were they admitted into the care of a particular establishment?



The children were admitted into the care of one of the schools.

- iii. If children were admitted into the care of the organisation, did the organisation decide which establishment they would be admitted into?

No. Parents applied to the respective schools depending on the age of their children.

- iv. Who placed children with the organisation?

Pupils were placed into the schools by their parents.

- v. From 15 April 1971 (the date on which the Children's Hearing system was introduced), did the organisation/establishment receive children mainly from the Children's Hearing system?

No.

- vi. If not, how generally did children come to be admitted into the care of the organisation?

Children came to be admitted to the schools after parents applied to the school for their child's entry. Applications were considered by the schools and references, exam results or interviews may have been required before acceptance.

- vii. Was there a gender or other admission policy or practice operated by the organisation or any establishment run by it?

Only boys were admitted to both schools.

- viii. What was the policy/procedure and practice regarding admission of siblings?

We hold no information as to policy/procedure and practice regarding admission of siblings.

- ix. How long did children typically remain in the care of the organisation?

The length of time the children attended the schools varied. The Priory school provided education for boys from age 4 to age 13.

- x. Were children moved between different establishments run by the organisation?

Yes.

- xi. If so, in what circumstances?

Children moving from primary school to secondary school moved from the Priory School to the Abbey School if continuing their education there.

- xii. Generally did children typically stay in one, or more than one, establishment?

Whether the children stayed in more than one school depended on whether they began their education at the Priory and continued to the Abbey School. That was the intended route for Priory pupils and generally was the case.

- xiii. What provision was made for contact between siblings while siblings were at the establishment?

We hold no information as to provision made for contact between siblings.

- xiv. What provision was made for contact between children and their parents and wider family while children were at the establishment?

We hold no information as to provision made for contact between boys and their parents and wider family.

- xv. What provision was made for information sharing/updates about the children to their parents?

Parents were provided with school newsletters and magazines from the Priory School to share information about the children to their parents.

- xvi. What provision was made for information sharing/updates about parents to their children?

We hold no information as to provision made for contact between boys and their parents.

- xvii. What provision was made for the celebration of children's birthdays, Christmas and other special occasions?

We hold no information as to provisions made for the celebration of special occasions. We understand that the children would not have been at the school at Christmas.

- xviii. What was the process for review of children's continued residence at the establishment, in terms of whether they continued to require to be there?

Pupils attended the Priory School until they reached an age and attained the level of education required to graduate to secondary school. In circumstances where there was doubt as to whether a pupil had obtained the educational attainment required to move up a grade discussions would be taken between teachers and the headmaster and parents would be notified of concerns.

- xix. When children left the care of the establishment, what was the process for discharge?

Children graduated from the school.

- xx. What support was offered to children when they left the care of the establishment?

We hold no information as to support offered to children by the Priory School after they left. There were former pupil societies for the Priory School which was not directly connected with the school but which had a relationship with the school and the Abbey.

- xxi. What information was sought by the organisation and/or establishment about what children leaving its care planned to go on to do?

The Priory School sought to obtain information as to what children leaving the schools planned to go on to do. The Priory School obtained information as to what schools children were moving on to.

- xxii. Was such information retained and updated?

Generally a limited amount of information for each pupil was retained.

- xxiii. What was provided in terms of after-care for children/young people once they left the establishment?

We hold no evidence of any after-care for children once they left the Priory School.

#### Present

- xxiv. With reference to the present position, are the answers to any of the above questions different?

No. The Priory School is no longer in existence.

xxv. If so, please give details.

N/A

## 1.8 Staff Background

### (a) Organisation

#### Past

- i. How many people were employed by the organisation who had some responsibility for residential care services for children?

Fort Augustus Abbey employed persons with the responsibility for residential care services in their capacity as running the Abbey school and Priory School. The number of people employed by the organisation with responsibility for residential care services for children fluctuated throughout the history of the schools. In each circumstance the monastic community undertook a significant amount of the care services. The abbey school had additional teaching staff of around eight persons on average from the 1960s onwards. Prior to the 1960s the average number of persons employed was four. We do not have information as to the number of staff employed at the Priory school.

- ii. How many people were employed by the organisation at any one time who had some responsibility for residential care services for children?

See above.

- iii. What experience/qualifications did such staff have?

Teachers in the schools were not required to have teaching qualifications. The schools had a policy of employing staff with knowledge and expertise to teach their chosen subject. The policy was to employ staff with both academic and teaching qualifications but those without teaching qualifications would be appraised and assisted to achieve the required experience. In the 1980s and early 1990s around half of teachers had teaching qualifications. Members of the monastic community working in the schools did not have teaching qualifications.

- iv. If the organisation is a religious order, how many members of the order had a responsibility for residential care services for children provided by the organisation in Scotland?

Members of the order had a central role in running the schools. On average there were eight members of the order working within the Abbey school, but the number diminished in later years as the number of monks decreased.

- v. What experience/qualifications did such members have, to equip them to discharge their responsibilities?

Members of the order did not have teaching qualifications but did have significant academic experience.

#### Present

- vi. With reference to the present position, are the answers to any of the above questions different?

No. Fort Augustus Abbey, the Abbey School and the Priory School are no longer in existence.

- vii. If so, please give details.

N/A

#### (b) Establishment

##### Past

- i. How many persons were employed in some capacity at the establishment?

We do not hold records providing for staff numbers for the Priory School. However records held by the order suggest that there were usually three or four members of the Fort Augustus community resident at Carlekemp, and it is reasonable to assume that they would all have been engaged in some capacity or other in the school.

- ii. How many of those persons had the opportunity of unaccompanied access to a child, or children, cared for at the establishment?

There is no evidence of any person employed by the Priory School being restricted in their access to pupils.

- iii. How many were involved in the provision of care to children accommodated at the establishment (child care workers)?

All were involved in the provision of care to children accommodated at the Priory School to some degree.

- iv. What experience and/or qualifications, if any, did the child care workers require to have?

Teachers in the Priory School were not required to have teaching qualifications.

- v. What was the child care worker/child numbers ratio?

We do not hold records for the numbers of children or care workers at the Priory School.

- vi. What was the gender balance of the child care workers?

The majority of employees at the Priory School were male however in the school a female matron was always employed. Her role was to maintain the health of the children as well as providing pastoral care.

- vii. Was any attempt made to employ child care workers in looking after children of the same sex as those workers?

The children were all male.

#### Present

- viii. With reference to the present position, are the answers to any of the above questions different?

No. The Priory School is no longer in existence.

- ix. If so, please give details.

N/A

## 2. Organisational Structure and Oversight

### 2.1 Governance

#### Past

- i. What were the governance arrangements within the organisation?

The Abbey was governed by the Abbot of Fort Augustus Abbey. The Abbot had ultimate control over the schools. The Abbot appointed headmasters of the schools after consulting his Council. The school headmasters had overall control of the school in all aspects save for finance which was controlled by the Bursar.

- ii. How were the members of the governing body selected?

The Abbot was elected by the community of the Fort Augustus Abbey. At some times during the existence of Fort Augustus Abbey there was no abbot and instead there was an Administrator appointed by the Holy See.

- iii. What qualifications and/or training, if any, did the members require to have in relation to the provision of residential care services for children?

The members did not have any formal training or qualifications in relation to the provision of residential care services to children.

- iv. Did the members receive remuneration?

The members did not receive remuneration.

- v. What was the nature of the accountability and oversight regime between the organisation's governing body and the establishment?

The Abbot had oversight over the establishments. The headmasters of the schools were accountable to the Abbot.

- vi. What visits were made by the governing body to the establishment?

The Abbot resided at Fort Augustus Abbey and visited the Priory School..

- vii. What was the purpose of such visits?

The Abbot visited Carlekemp to exercise his role as the head of the monastic community and also to exercise general oversight over the school.

- viii. How frequently did these happen?

We do not know how often the Abbot visited the Priory School.

- ix. Were children interviewed, or spoken to, by members of the governing body during such visits?

We have no information about whether children were interviewed or spoken to by the Abbot.

- x. If so, were establishment staff present while children were interviewed or spoken to?

We have no information about whether establishment staff were present if the abbot interviewed the children.

- xi. Were reports of such visits made and discussed by the governing body?

The Abbot did not produce formal reports of his visits. The Abbot would discuss his visits with the Headmasters of the schools and other members of the community.

- xii. Did visits result in changes to the organisation's policy, procedure and/or practice? If so, please give examples.

Visits might result in changes to the organisation's policy, procedure or practice. We do not know of changes that happened as a result of the Abbot's visits to the Priory School.

#### Present

- xiii. With reference to the present position, are the answers to any of the above questions different?

No. Fort Augustus Abbey, the Abbey School and the Priory School are no longer in existence.

- xiv. If so, please give details.

N/A

## 2.2 Culture

#### Past

- i. What was the nature of the culture within the organisation?

Fort Augustus Abbey was a member of the English Benedictine Congregation. The culture was rooted in the religious observance that membership represented.



- ii. Was that culture reflected in the organisation's policies, procedures and/or practice in relation the provision of residential care services for children?

Yes.

- iii. How can that be demonstrated?

The schools were run on the foundation of the Catholic faith. This is clearly demonstrated by the daily timetable of observation of aspects of monastic life.

- iv. Did the running of establishments reflect the organisation's culture, policies and procedures?

Yes.

- v. If not, please provide a representative range of examples and explain, by reference to those examples, why particular establishments were not, in material ways, run in accordance with the organisation's then culture, policies and procedures and what, if anything, was done to change that state of affairs?

N/A

- vi. When and why did any changes in the culture of the organisation come about?

There were no significant changes to the culture of the organisation. It remained rooted in the culture of the monastic community.

- vii. Were any changes in culture driven by internal influences, incidents, experiences or events within the organisation, or any of the establishments run by the organisation?

No.

- viii. Were there any changes in culture that were driven by abuse, or alleged abuse, of children cared for at the establishment?

No.

- ix. If so, when did they occur and how did they manifest themselves?

N/A

- x. Were any changes in culture driven by any external influences or factors and if so what were those influences or factors?

No.

#### Present

- xi. With reference to the present position, are the answers to any of the above questions different?

No. Fort Augustus Abbey, the Abbey School and the Priory School are no longer in existence.

- xii. If so, please give details.

N/A

- xiii. To what extent, if any, has abuse or alleged abuse of children cared for at any establishments caused, or contributed to, the adoption of the current policies, procedures and/or practices of the organisation, in relation to the provision of residential care services for children including the safeguarding and child protection arrangements applying to its current establishments?

N/A

### 2.3 Leadership

#### Past

- i. How was the establishment managed and led?

The Priory School had a tiered management structure. The Abbot had ultimate control over the school as the head of Fort Augustus Abbey. The school headmaster had overall control of the school in all aspects save for finance. They required to answer to the Abbot on all matters. They made decisions on all matters of general policy whether educational or disciplinary. The Bursar had overall financial control of the school. The deputy head was in charge of organising the curriculum and allied matters.

- ii. What were the names and qualifications of the persons in charge of the establishment? Please include the dates for when each of the persons was in charge.

Abbots of Fort Augustus Abbey

Abbot Leo Linse – 1888-1909

Father Hilary Willson was Administrator of Fort Augustus from about 1909 to 1912

Abbot Sir David Oswald Hunter-Blair – 1912-1917

Father Hilary Willson was Administrator of Fort Augustus from 1917 to 1919

Abbot Andrew Joseph Macdonald – 1919-1929

Abbot Wulstan Knowles – 1929-1939 and 1944-1952

Father Anselm Rutherford was Administrator of Fort Augustus between 1939 and 1944

Abbot Oswald Eaves - 1952-1959

Abbot Celestine Haworth - 1959-1968

Abbot Nicholas Holman - 1968-1991

Abbot Mark Dilworth – 1991 until 1998

Father Francis Davidson was Administrator of Fort Augustus from 1998 until the closure of the Abbey in 1999.

Headmasters of Carlekemp Priory School

1945 – 1952 Dom Oswald Eaves

1952 - 1959 Dom Ethelbert McCombes

1959 – 1962 Dom Thomas McLaughlin

1962 – 1965 Dom Edmund Carruth

1965 – 1968 Dom Anselm Richardson

1968 – 1977 Dom Thomas McLaughlin

This information about the headmasters of the Priory School is the best that we have, but we cannot be sure of its complete accuracy. Some of the dates may be a year out.

All Abbots and Headmasters were Benedictine Monks. Their qualifications arose from that office.

- iii. What was the oversight and supervision arrangements by senior management within the establishment?

The Abbot had general oversight over the Priory School. The headmaster oversaw and supervised the running of the school with the assistance of the deputy headmaster.

- iv. What were the oversight arrangements by the organisation, including visits by or on behalf of the organisation?

The Abbot of Fort Augustus oversaw the Priory School through direct supervision. The Priory School was frequently visited by the Abbot. The headmaster reported to the Abbot.

It seems that from 1962 to 1967, the Abbot of Fort Augustus appointed a Prior of Carlekemp, who was the head of the monastic community. During those years, the headmaster would probably have reported to the Prior, as well as to the Abbot.

## Present

- v. With reference to the present position, are the answers to any of the above questions different?

No. The Priory School is no longer in existence.

- vi. If so, please give details

N/A

2.4 Structure

## Past

- i. What was the structure of the organisation?

The Fort Augustus Abbey consisted of a community of monks under the governance of an elected Abbot.

- ii. What was the structure of the establishment?

The Priory School was governed by the Abbot of the Fort Augustus Abbey who had overall oversight. The headmaster had authority over all school matters. A bursar was in charge of the financial affairs of the school. The pupils were split into houses each of which was led by a housemaster. The housemaster was in charge of religious and moral matters regarding the pupils. Teaching staff provided classes. The Abbot and Headmaster were always monks but housemasters and teaching staff could be non-clergy members. Other staff included maintenance, grounds, cleaning and catering staff.

## Present

- iii. With reference to the present position, is the answer to the above question different?

No. The Priory School is no longer in existence.

- iv. If so, please give details.

N/A

2.5 Hierarchy and Control

## Past

## i. What was the hierarchy within the organisation?

The Abbot was the highest ranking member of the community. He had control over Fort Augustus Abbey. He was assisted by the Prior, who deputised for him when he was absent, and by a Council, which advised him. The Abbot would appoint, after consultation with the Council, the Headmaster of the School, the Bursar (or Cellarer) and any other officials of the monastery. The Prior, the Headmaster, the Bursar and the members of the Council were all monks.

## ii. What was the structure of responsibility within the organisation?

The Abbot was ultimately responsible for the organisation. He appointed those who held offices of responsibility, who in turn were answerable to him.

## iii. What were the lines of accountability?

The community constituted an autonomous monastery. That meant that the Abbot bore ultimate responsibility, subject only to the duty of the Abbot President to carry out a Visitation every four years and to the higher authority of the Holy See.

## iv. Within the organisation, who had senior management/corporate/organisational responsibility for the managers/management teams/leadership teams who managed the establishment on a day-to-day basis?

The senior responsibility for the management of the Priory School was held by the Headmaster of the Priory School, but the Abbot retained ultimate authority over the school, and it was open to him to intervene directly if he believed it prudent to do so.

## v. What were the reporting arrangements between the establishment and the organisation?

We understand that the Headmasters of the Priory School also occupied the office of Prior of the monastic community at Carlekemp, except between 1962 and 1967. Except during that time, therefore, there was no intermediary between the Abbot and the Headmaster of the Priory School, so the headmasters of the Priory School would report to the Abbot. He would inform the Abbot of the activities of the school and answer to him in all decisions regarding the school.

From 1962 to 1967 the Headmaster would have reported to the Prior of Carlekemp for matters relating to the life in the Priory, and both the Prior and the Headmaster would have reported to the Abbot.

- vi. Within the establishment itself, who had managerial responsibility for, or was in overall charge of, those employed there, including in particular those who were involved in the day-to-day care of children, and any other persons who had contact with the children?

Within the Priory School managerial responsibility was held by the headmaster who would be in overall charge of those who had care of the children. We do not know if there was a separate Bursar of Carlekemp; if there was, he would have been in charge of the maintenance of the buildings and grounds, and it would be quite likely that he would have had managerial responsibility for those employed in those areas, who might well have had contact with children.

- vii. To whom were child care workers within the establishment directly responsible?

We understand that the staff caring for children within the Priory School were responsible to the Headmaster. In addition, there were house masters. We have no detailed information on the lines of reporting between those caring for the pupils, the house masters and the head master.

- viii. Who, within the organisation, took decisions on matters of policy, procedure and/or practice in relation to the establishment?

The headmaster took decisions on matters of policy, procedure and/or practice in relation to the Priory School.

- ix. Who, within the organisation, was responsible for the implementation of, and compliance with, the organisation's policies, procedures and/or practices at the establishment?

The headmaster was responsible for the implementation of and compliance with the Fort Augustus Abbey's policies and practices at the Priory School.

#### Present

- x. With reference to the present position, are the answers to any of the above questions different?

No. Fort Augustus Abbey and the Priory School are no longer in existence.

- xi. If so, please give details.

N/A

## 2.6 External Oversight

## Past

- i. What were the arrangements for external oversight of the organisation and the establishment?

The Fort Augustus Abbey ran the Priory School autonomously.

The English Benedictine Congregation did not have external oversight over the Priory school but did have oversight functions over Fort Augustus Abbey. The Abbot President of the English Benedictine Congregation normally visited Fort Augustus Abbey every four years, but he might come at other times if he believed it necessary. At visitation, the Abbot President could issue a precept which was binding in Canon Law and under the vow of obedience. When the Abbot President carried out visitations he would visit the monastery but not the schools.

The Abbot of Fort Augustus was responsible for visiting the monastic community at Carlekemp.

The Archbishop of St Andrews and Edinburgh, as the local Bishop, did not have the right to carry out a Visitation of the monastic community at Carlekemp, but he did have the right to carry out a visitation of the schools of his diocese; we do not know whether the Archbishop ever exercised these rights at the Priory School. He also had the right to supervise public liturgical celebrations.

- ii. Who visited the organisation and/or the establishment in an official or statutory capacity and for what purpose?

We have no information as to parties visiting Fort Augustus Abbey or Priory School in an official or statutory capacity.

- iii. How often did this occur?

Please see answer 2.6(ii).

- iv. What did these visits involve in practice?

Please see answer 2.6(ii).

- v. What involvement did local authorities have with the organisation and/or the establishment in respect of residential care services for children?

The local authority relevant to The Fort Augustus Abbey was Highland Regional Council. The local authority relevant to the Priory School was East Lothian Council. The council had limited involvement with the residential care services. Fort Augustus Abbey ran the Priory School as an independent school.

- vi. What involvement did local authorities have with the organisation and the establishment in respect of the children at the establishment?

The council had limited involvement in respect of the children at the establishment.

- vii. If the establishment was run by a Catholic religious order, what actual involvement and/or responsibility, whether formal or informal, did the Catholic Hierarchy/Bishops' Conference have, either directly or at diocesan level, in the creation, governance, management and/or oversight of the establishment?

The Catholic Hierarchy/Bishops Conference had no direct involvement in the creation, governance, management or oversight of the Priory School. Fort Augustus Abbey was an autonomous monastery, and part of the English Benedictine Congregation, which is classified in Canon Law as an Institute of Pontifical Right, which means that it is under the care of the Holy See, not of the local Bishop.

- viii. What was the nature and extent of any pastoral care provided to the establishment, if it was run by a religious order?

Pastoral care was an important aspect of the education provided by the Priory School. We do not have enough information about the pastoral care to be able to give any details.

#### Present

- ix. With reference to the present position, are the answers to any of the above questions different?

No. Fort Augustus Abbey and the Priory School are no longer in existence.

- x. If so, please give details.

N/A

#### Part B – Current Statement



### 3. Retrospective Acknowledgement/Admission

#### 3.1 Acknowledgement of Abuse

- i. Does the organisation/establishment accept that between 1930 and 17 December 2014 some children cared for at the establishment were abused?

The Fort Augustus Abbey St Benedict's Trust became insolvent and the community dispersed in 1999. The monastery was suppressed under Canon Law in 2001. The Trust was wound up by the Scottish Charities Commission in 2011. It now has no legal existence. The Priory School closed in 1977. Neither the Abbey nor the Priory School exists so as to be able to comment on abuse sustained by children in their care.

The English Benedictine Congregation had no authority over or involvement in either school. It is not the relevant organisation in respect of the schools as establishments. It has no remit or authority to acknowledge or accept abuse on behalf of the former Fort Augustus Abbey.

Two former pupils of the Priory School have approached the Abbot President of the English Benedictine Congregation and have told him that they were abused.

- ii. What is the organisation/establishment's assessment of the extent and scale of such abuse?

Please see former answer in section 3.1(i).

- iii. What is the basis of that assessment?

Please see former answer in section 3.1(i).

#### 3.2 Acknowledgement of Systemic Failures

- i. Does the organisation/establishment accept that its systems failed to protect children cared for at the establishment between 1930 and 17 December 2014 from abuse?

Please see former answer in section 3.1(i).

- ii. What is the organisation/establishment's assessment of the extent of such systemic failures?

Please see former answer in section 3.1(i).

- iii. What is the basis of that assessment?

Please see former answer in section 3.1(i).

- iv. What is the organisation/establishment's explanation for such failures?

Please see former answer in section 3.1(i).

### 3.3 Acknowledgement of Failures/Deficiencies in Response

- i. Does the organisation/establishment accept that there were failures and/or deficiencies in its response to abuse, and allegations of abuse, of children cared for at the establishment between 1930 and 17 December 2014?

Please see former answer in section 3.1(i).

- ii. What is the organisation/establishment's assessment of the extent of such failures in its response?

Please see former answer in section 3.1(i).

- iii. What is the basis of that assessment?

Please see former answer in section 3.1(i).

- iv. What is the organisation's explanation for such failures/deficiencies?

Please see former answer in section 3.1(i).

### 3.4 Changes

- i. To what extent has the organisation/establishment implemented changes to its policies/procedures and practices as a result of its acknowledgment in relation to 3.1 – 3.3 above?

Fort Augustus Abbey and the Priory School are no longer in existence.