

Scottish Child Abuse Inquiry

Witness Statement of

David STANDLEY

Support person present: No

1. My name is David Michael Standley. My date of birth is [REDACTED] 1947. My contact details are known to the Inquiry.
2. I should like to put on record my profound apologies to any former pupil who was the subject of abuse during his time at the Academy. Not only am I shocked by these reports of abuse but I am also personally saddened. I had thought that there was sufficient trust between senior pupils and teaching staff that some hint or mention of the abuse would have reached the teachers of that particular time. I am sad that clearly this was not the case.

Background

3. I was educated at Nottingham High School and New College, Oxford. In 1965 I gained A Levels in math's, physics and chemistry. In 1969 I was awarded a BA in physics and in 1970 I gained a Certificate in Education at Oxford University and Malvern College under J L Lewis. In 1974 I obtained my MA at Oxon.
4. The Certificate of Education was the England and Wales qualification in 1970 for the formal training of teachers and as soon as I came to Scotland I registered with the General Teaching Council in Scotland and my qualifications were accepted as standard.

Employment with Edinburgh Academy

5. For me, I came to the Academy from university and stayed the night, with the then rector, [CH] and his sister in their house. I was offered accommodation by them. With hindsight it seems as though that was part of the interview. The next morning I walked into the school and spent the whole of the morning meeting and talking to the members of the physics department. After lunch I was taken for a walk around the playing fields by the rector. We were having a nice conversation and he asked if I had any questions so I asked about the job. He told me they didn't have any vacancies for a physicist and I looked slightly quizzical but he said that they always need young physicists who can play cricket. He then asked me if I would like a job and as it happened he was a very wise man because one of the physics staff left between my appointment and my taking up my post.
6. In terms of the formal side of the process, the interviews typical of [CH] were he probed but it was done in a very informal way. The department interview really was about physics competence. Fortunately, I was in the middle of training to become a teacher and so knew most of the answers. The Head of Science at the time was the late John McMichael who died in about 1987.
7. As far as references were concerned the standard procedure in those days would be to write to and to get two references. In my case one would automatically be from the Department of Education at the university and I am guessing, as I haven't the slightest idea, that the second would be from my former school, Nottingham High.
8. My teaching career at Edinburgh Academy began in 1970 and was exclusively concerned with the senior school. I was a teacher of physics from 1970-1985. In 1985 I was appointed Head of Science and was responsible for the work of thirteen teachers and three technicians. In 1992 I was appointed Director of Studies. My responsibilities were the curriculum and academic standards, overseeing the timetable, advising on staffing levels and admissions. I remained in that post until 1994 when I was appointed

deputy rector with responsibilities for the day to day running of the senior school, advising on staffing levels, admissions, management of the academic budget, staff professional development, project managing the school IT network and the day to day monitoring of school marketing initiatives. I retired in 2009 and took up a part time administrative assistant post responsible for the administration of public examinations at the Academy. I retired from that post in 2011.

9. I had some contact with colleagues in the junior school and no contact with the pupils in the junior school. I probably should say, given that the focus of the Inquiry is pupils in residential care, that at no stage in my career did I ever have any contact with the boarding houses or how they were run. I would go into the boarding houses from time to time for social events with the housemasters and very occasionally to look for a pupil who might be missing from a game's session. To explain, the Academy was and always was a day school so that the whole configuration of the senior part of the school was as if it was a day school. Whilst I had no involvement with the junior school it was configured in the same way. If I use the first ten years of my career as an example, I could have been in a day school because there was zero contact with the boarding side which was getting on for a mile away. The pupils walked to and from the school each day. They lived a separate existence when in the boarding houses. That meant that no teacher who had a normal appointment at the senior school would have any contact or responsibility in the sense of the residential care aspect. They would have pastoral responsibility as with all day pupils.
10. One of the reasons for me going into teaching as a career was it meant I could play cricket four times a week, so from the outset I was involved with the school in the sporting side. I ended up coaching cricket for most of the time I was there. For twelve or so years I helped coach the first cricket team. Rugby wasn't my main strength but my administration wasn't too bad so, at one stage, I was responsible for the organisation of rugby in the school. I did a little bit of coaching both at a very junior level and, for a few seasons, with the 2nd XV.
11. In the 1970's it was very strange because I think if you did not have a teaching qualification you could teach but if you failed a teaching qualification you could not

teach. There were quite a number of people who, so rumour had it, looked as if they might fail their teaching practice. Not anything sinister, but they might need to go away and learn better how to keep a class of children occupied. Those people would be advised not to sit the Certificate of Education because somebody thought they would fail the practical element. That teacher training was very theoretical. I would have lectures in subjects like sociology which I never did understand but I discovered that the man setting the exam paper had written a book, end of problem. There was also a strong emphasis on teaching methodology and the training in this respect was outstanding. There was, to the best of my recollection, no training in anything we would nowadays call child protection issues.

Policy

12. There was no training in child protection at the Academy but working from fuzzy memory up to 1992 I would think the staff meeting, in the broadest sense of the term, focussed on the academic welfare of the children. I do not recall any in-service training in the first twenty years. That changed in 1992 at which point the Academy's first ever formal Deputy Rector, Andrew Trotman, was appointed. From that time, there were regular in-service meetings, the preparation of policy statements and everything you would associate nowadays with modern good practice in schools. I would not presume to give that individual credit on his own, but he was the catalyst where a number of us had been clamouring for a more modern approach were able to come together. To explain, the second rector I served under was called Lawrence Ellis and he was an incredibly nice man, some might argue too nice for his own good, but he was born and brought up in the English boarding school system. Policy statements were not the language of that world at that time. When Andrew Trotman was appointed I had applied for that post and I can vividly remember writing a sentence in my application which when paraphrased was 'where are the policy statements which we can all contribute to and respond to'? I couldn't tell you specifically who the supporters of this were but there was a really strong bond of teachers of my vintage who were able teachers and who valued doing things as well as was possible.

13. From that time there were always four whole staff in-service days every academic year and a few years later I introduced what became known as the Staff Forum. On a voluntary basis there was a mini evening conference with dinner at the school's expense afterwards. There might be an outside guest speaker or a series of conversations and workshops which looked like a mini conference and the whole gamut of anything you would nowadays associate with sensible in-service provision started from around that time, including regular child protection meetings.

Strategic Planning

14. As I have mentioned things like policy statements were introduced around 1990 however it would be very hard to say where we started. I cannot remember what the very first policy statements were and I cannot exemplify that. At that time, I was working with an outside organisation on a voluntary basis and that had policy statements for everything under the sun. I suppose my, and others cry, was at least could we make a start? At that time we had no policy statements however ten years down the line we probably had policy statements to cover all relevant areas of our business.
15. The policies were drafted in a collegiate style which was the whole point of our in-service days and other meetings. There would not be imposition, there would be draft policy statements, little workshops looking to see what could be improved and so on.

Recruitment of Staff

16. I was involved in recruitment of staff in two phases. Firstly, in the science department throughout the 1980's the process that was used was that you would advertise a job to recruit. The shortlist was drawn up by the rector and the head of relevant department responsible. In those days, and I realise and regret that this is no longer the case, every single shortlisted candidate had references taken up without exception. They would be interviewed irrespective of what those references said but clearly the

references were part of the process. There would be a formal interview with the rector and there would be a series of informal meetings and discussion with the department. The department head would probably have a formal meeting. All interviews were one-to-one but the candidate would have a fairly lengthy exposure to the department because an interview is a two-way process. You have got to have somebody who wants to come and work for you so you are giving them information as well as finding out about them. At the end of that process the head of department and the rector would sit down to discuss and come to a consensus.

17. From 1992 when Andy Trotman was appointed, there was an extra layer with a further interview so that would mean an interview with the rector and one with the deputy rector. The process with the department was as before. The wash up meeting would always then have those three elements. Generally speaking they would get approximately a forty minute interview with the rector, about half an hour with the deputy and a good hour or so with the department.
18. We never used panel interviews.
19. Latterly and right at the end of my time at the Academy a candidate would be asked to teach a lesson.
20. The process of taking up a reference is quite a vexed one. Modern practice seems to be that you only take up references for the person you want to appoint and I think that is bad. I think you need to find out things because it could condition your subsequent interview so we always took up all references. This changed right at the end of my career when there was a new rector appointed.
21. References were expected to cover first and foremost, does this candidate know their subject and can they communicate it to children. The second thing was, does this person work in a team, are they collegiate, are they supportive or are they going to rock the boat? The catch all thing you would ask would be "is there anything else you feel I should know in connection with this candidate?" This is giving the reference writer an opportunity to voice any concerns. In so far as you ask a question about the ability

to work as part of a team there is an implicit invitation to comment on character because if you couldn't work as part of a team then you would have a character who wouldn't necessarily lend itself to teaching in the intimate confines of a small school.

22. I think it was ICH [REDACTED] who said that the old school approach to references, as I have explained, was that his job in writing you a reference is to get you to an interview if he thought you were up to it. If you didn't get the interview you would be entitled to go back and ask the rector why he didn't think you were up to it. In fact the people I worked for were always honest and would say that I was reaching above my level at that time, to wait a bit or whatever. I understand that this has changed because present day references are public domain now I believe.

23. The Academy did at some point start obtaining disclosure certificates but I haven't a clue when. At some stage in the transition, and I cannot begin to guess but perhaps the late 1990's, the Academy took a policy decision it would only employ teachers who were registered with the General Teaching Council in Scotland. A condition of that registration was that Disclosure Scotland vetting was absolutely standard. As a private school being registered with the General Teaching Council in Scotland that wasn't strictly necessary. Disclosure checks had to be regularly refreshed however I cannot remember the frequency, perhaps every three years. It wasn't my area of responsibility but it is my understanding that all support staff who were in contact with pupils also were disclosure checked. For example, this would include lab technicians, front of house office secretaries and so on.

Supervision/Staff Appraisal/Staff Evaluation

24. I co-ordinated in-service training and gave a fairly significant number of talks about various aspects of training. It is a blur as far as specifics are concerned. The decision about what was included in our in-service training came down partly to need. We had a development plan by then so we may have identified something coming over the horizon. Another part was outside agencies so the Scottish Office Education Department might well force a change in our priorities. As well as the year heads

weekly meeting there would be a monthly meeting of heads of department, regular departmental meetings and there would be regular year group meetings.

25. On top of that and starting from that period in the early 1990's, there was a formal pyramidal approach to professional development needs and staff appraisal. When I say pyramidal, the senior staff would appraise the middle promoted staff who would then do their colleagues appraisal. Appraisal notes were kept centrally. Whole school matters could be identified from that as well as specific individual things. For example, if somebody had expressed a wish to be more actively involved in outdoor education, it might have appeared in their staff appraisal and we would have identified that and tried to get them on to a Mountain Leadership course at Glenmore Lodge. All of these various aspects, appraisal notes, head of department meetings, year head meetings, year group meetings provided a constant bubble of information from which is emerging what might be appropriate for the next phase of more formal staff development and the school development plan.
26. Again, the contrast between when I was finishing and when I started was that there was a designated and dedicated staff development budget which meant there was a sum of money set aside. This could be used to pay an external consultant to come in and do a whole school presentation or sending somebody on that Glenmore Lodge course. None of that existed in the seventies to nineties. That is not to say people couldn't do things. I had a lot of involvement with the professional body for science teachers which is called the Association for Science Education (ASE) and my attendance at its conferences would always be paid for by the school without demur. It was just that there was no formal budget. That was a proactive thing that I chose to do.
27. If we talk about my own professional development, as a science teacher, the ASE conferences was exclusively where I got any better advice of what to teach and so on. The ASE had another pyramid so there were local groups with science teachers across Edinburgh made up of private and public sector and once or twice a month they would meet and learn updated teaching practices about specific subjects or hear a talk about some aspect of science. There was a national level in Scotland with an annual

conference and then there was a UK wide organisation. This was the equivalent of our professional body so it had chief executive who was paid and it was a highly respected lobbying body for science education. Its annual conference would have, over the four days, four or five thousand delegates. That is where the focus and the locus of professional development was and it was virtually all subject based across the board it would be fair to say. Eventually I served as the ASE Chair on a partial secondment from the Academy.

Living Arrangements

28. I worked in the day school and was never involved in the boarding aspect which was sited away from the school.

Culture within The Edinburgh Academy

29. I have been asked for my comments on a general impression the Inquiry has gained from applicants of the school being inward looking, having had a high opinion of itself, and was one where reputation was the primary concern, including over child protection. I do not know if I can answer that. It is not that I am unwilling to comment, it is because I can't comment. I have already described what essentially is a discontinuity in culture at the school round about 1990. I was not aware of any child protection issues in those early years and therefore I am unable to say that the school valued its reputation more than child protection. It is something that is beyond my level of responsibility. The school certainly valued its reputation but I think I would like to say it was fair in valuing its reputation in that one of the things it most valued was the individual, not the school.
30. To give you an example, the science department at the Academy was extremely strong so for years we were sending more people to elite universities than any other department. One of the things that the science department did was put on what was called a science at home but I think the outside world would call it a science fair. It was

one evening where the science laboratories were open to parents, pupils and distinguished visitors. The pupils demonstrated things of scientific interest and were the lecturers for the day. I had a pupil who desperately wanted to do something at the event but his scientific skills were not of the highest order but he was a consummate actor. We came up with a way for him to be involved at a level that would be appropriate to him but would add to the evening. We got every bit of glassware we could find and connected it all together. There was a big boiling tube and he did his stuff and it went all over the place, water went to steam and the steam condensed. It dropped into a bucket and at the base of the bucket was a microphone connected to an acoustic amplifier which was secreted so no-one could see it. When this water went all the way over it landed in the bucket and made a loud vibrating sound. His demonstration was called the manufacture of heavy water. It was a complete and utter sham but because he was a good actor he spoke for a couple of hours, entertaining everybody. One of the professors of physics from the university came up to me and said that it was the most refreshing exhibit he had seen for a long time. I provide this example because if it had been an elitist establishment this boy wouldn't have got a look in. He had skills that the school was able to recognise and he was able to contribute.

31. I could go on about the label of being elitist. The vast majority of children joined the Academy at age four and a half. You tell me how you select on ability at that age? I do not believe you can. I don't know because I was never involved but there was some such selection criteria for children to be selected and they came through the school. They can't all have been geniuses if they were selected at four and a half and yet the schools examination, sporting and music results excelled. I don't know that anyone has ever mentioned music but music at the school was absolutely staggeringly good. The children achieving these things must have been achieving them because of the dedication of the staff and the way they were valued as individuals rather than some need for the school to justify itself. I do feel passionate about this.
32. I haven't the slightest idea how the ephors were appointed in the early days but I can tell you that in 1971 the head ephor was just an outstanding young man who was neither a rugby player, a cricket player, a military person or anything. He was an

outstanding young man just as a character. There are some people who, when they come into a room, have presence. He had it and the school recognised that.

33. Moving onwards the process, like all things, changed at about the same time everything else changed. The ephors were always solely appointed by the rector and by no other person. At around the time of change in the early 1990's an indicative vote was taken so that pupils were asked to express an interest in becoming an ephor then the staff would then vote and a few years later it was introduced that the pupils would then vote. There was some sort of whole school indication of acceptance of a candidate. Around that time we then invented house ephors called division ephors. The school had groups arranged for sporting and music reasons called divisions. Whereas there may have been only fifteen or sixteen ephors below that there would be at least a dozen division ephors in each division. By that time, in the last year of school, you probably got two thirds of the school with some level of responsibility.

34. I have been asked for my opinion on comments made in witness statement provided to the Inquiry. These suggest that to be an ephor you had to be good at rugby in the top fifteen or be a top sportsman, be in the top of the cadet forces or excel in school. I recognise a description whereby ephors may have been drawn from these various organisations for sport, music or whatever but it is quite remarkable when quite a lot of them did all of these things. I can remember an occasion when I had a cricket team at Glenalmond and we had to rearrange the hours of play so we could get a minibus back for three or four of the team, who were also ephors, to play leading roles in a school concert. Often people aren't just talented in one area, they are multi-talented. A school organisation is no different from that. If you have got ninety odd pupils in a year group it is highly likely that at least half a dozen of those are the leaders of the group.

35. Although I can see where it is coming from, I would reject the notion that since it was a rectoral appointment and I think I can speak for the rectors, there would be no conscious bias. People would be chosen because they would be people who could be trusted. I don't accept conscious bias and certainly post the early nineties it was much more open and accessible to all.

36. I understand the term fagging in the context of a boarding school when someone would have a servant. I cannot conceive how there would be fagging in a day school because a bell went every forty minutes because activities changed at that time. Lunchtimes and breaktimes were necessarily restricted. I was not aware of any fagging at the Academy and if there was it would be a shock to me. I can't think what it would comprise of but I can imagine there might have been because there was a boarding element to the school. I haven't the slightest knowledge of anything to do with fagging.
37. I have been advised that in a statement that has been given to the Inquiry an applicant said that before parent's night the class master would go through everyone in the class to find out what their parents did for a living. They further said that it was obvious there was a pecking order for the parents and was probably an indication of how long the teachers spent with each set of parents. I haven't the slightest knowledge of anybody bothering with anything as trivial as that. I'm sorry but I just regard it as totally farfetched. The parent's evenings were in the dining hall with the teachers standing talking to a group of parents with a queue of parents waiting as there were no appointments in those days. It is inevitable that a teacher would talk longer to some parents than others. I could imagine saying to some parents that their child was performing absolutely brilliantly, should be doing the subject at university and not a lot more than that. I could be talking to other parents for ages and ages about the way I was trying to get their child to understand something by using multiple explanations and they were finding it difficult. It was a very imperfect system because you had those queues and so on. It was changed in the early 1990's so that the parents all had an appointment time and the queues were reduced dramatically. Why would you bother with what somebody does for goodness sake? I am sorry but I regard it as an absurd idea.
38. A subject teacher who had no sporting responsibilities wouldn't begin to know which pupil was a boarder and which pupil was not. If they were a register teacher (we called them class teachers) they would know because they were the first line contact for parents. They would know about the pupils in their class but only those. Teachers who took sport at the playing fields which adjoined the boarding houses would know who

boarders were because the boarders would come out of the boarding houses when changed from sport and not from the pupil changing rooms. That is the extent of the teaching staff's knowledge of who was and who was not a boarder.

39. Day pupils were not treated any differently from boarders in the school context. The norm was how you treated day pupils and the boarders were treated no differently.

Discipline and Punishment

40. When I consider the advice or guidance given to the school about the level of punishment that was appropriate I do not recall anything written down although there may have been something called 'standing orders'. For a long time corporal punishment of children was allowed. Pupils could be beaten both by teachers and other senior pupils. My recollection is that any case of a teacher striking a child had to be written down formally. It was a book, like a ledger, I believe. I have no recollection but presumably it couldn't have been anywhere else other than the rector's or possibly the senior master's office. Before the appointment of a deputy rector the longest serving teacher was called senior master and had an office. That would be the office where most people would go if they were punishing a child and that is why I am guessing staff would record any punishment there. It is a total guess as I have no recollection. I do not recall what kind of information would have to be recorded but by inference it would have to be who, why, what and where as there is no point in it otherwise.
41. Ephors were allowed to punish younger boys. It is hard to separate the times when I had nothing to do with any of this and when I took on a role when I did. Latterly there was an ephor duty rota and there was also, in terms of the staff, a duty rota. That meant there was always two or three members of staff who were on whole school duty for a week. Those teachers had access to a rota of what ephors were responsible for what areas of the school and at what times of the day. I haven't the slightest idea when that started but I cannot imagine that you could arrange for the sufficient supervision of the school without having such a rota. The ephors and the duty staff would be

around and about the school and the ephors were entitled to give lines and minor physical punishments which meant duties such as litter picking or worse still, to go and scrape off all the bubble gum in a part of the playground. They had a range of minor disciplinary things, and yes, they were allowed to strike a pupil. I haven't the slightest idea when that stopped but it stopped before staff corporal punishment. I haven't the slightest idea if they were given any guidance about the physical punishment they could use because during the time they were allowed to do so I had absolutely nothing to do with that side of things. I believe ephors had to record any punishments they gave, there was an ephors punishment book. I believe if it had been decided by the senior ephors that a pupil required, say three hits, each hit was done by a different person. It was never the same ephor doing all three. That is my understanding however I think an ephor would be able to give more accurate information.

42. I only had to physically discipline a pupil once in my time when I used a gym slipper and I felt I had failed when I had to. I felt sad. I cannot tell you precisely when this happened but I would put it in the late seventies or early eighties when that one incident occurred. It was the only time in my career that I used corporal punishment. I do not remember anything about the incident and the only thing that sticks in my mind is that I had to do it.
43. I have a big thing about public punishment and it is certainly my understanding that in the vast majority of cases public corporal punishment of children didn't exist. It may have for one or two individual teachers but most would do it privately. This would give a moment of reflection and indeed, if the child had come along very contrite and so on I am sure the scale of the punishment may have altered. I say scale but I do not believe there was anything ever written that prescribed any sort of numbers or indeed defined the situation where it was appropriate or not appropriate. I do not recall any guidance about the number of times a child could be struck. You might have to talk to others about that. It was so alien to my nature and I couldn't begin to tell you whether there was anything formal written down.
44. I do know I had colleagues who were described as soft touches who, not infrequently, had to resort to corporal punishment because that is the only way they felt they could

get children to not mess about. I do not know if there was any support or training given to such teachers. The ones that I am thinking of would have been working in the late seventies and early eighties and I had no whole school responsibility whatsoever.

45. There was no stipulation about what instrument could or should be used to punish children. By custom and practice I believe the only person who could use a cane was the rector. I was not aware of any other teacher using a cane.
46. The school has an ancient game called hailes which is a bat and ball game. The bat is called a clacken and that is like a big flat wooden spoon so it has no hollow in it. You would bounce the ball on the big flat bit. Teachers were allowed to use that and gym slippers to strike children as well as the tawse.
47. At some stage corporal punishment was completely banned although I cannot recall the date. This was done with the complete agreement of all staff. It was a unanimous decision that we needed to move on from this. I think it would be after corporal punishment was stopped in the state sector because a law could be framed that it would affect local authority schools but not necessarily private schools. There will certainly be a record of when it stopped and my instinct is that it was in the late eighties.
48. I do not recall any formal policy concerning punishment and discipline in my early years. Again, it was only into the early nineties that we produced things like staff handbooks where all of that information would be. Latterly the staff were all given, by the school, an A5 size work diary and at the back was all the policy statements including a disciplinary policy. Teachers couldn't really exist too much in isolation because certainly twice a day teachers would all end up in their staff room and would all mingle. If you had an issue there was always someone you could talk to. In the science department where I worked it was even easier because you had a staff base where all the equipment was stored and you saw everybody literally every time there was a lesson changeover. If you had an issue you would ask.

Concerns about the School

49. I had no concerns whatsoever about any colleagues during my early career.
50. Post the nineties when I had senior responsibilities a number of allegations emerged about teachers who had left the school by then but not in the way that I needed to do anything. There were two occasions when the police were involved. I had to provide witness statements to them and they took matters on after that. I cannot think of a single occasion where abuse was alleged of a currently serving member of staff. There were individual suggestions and I refer to the Moorov principle where you get one allegation and you are entitled to treat it at face level but if you get another one you have to assume each corroborates the other. Although there was, on a couple of occasions, some suggestions there was never any second complaint. The suggestions were never about the abuse of young boys but the two incidents I can think of were about the inappropriate closeness of male teachers to female pupils. We are talking about a stage when we only had sixth form girls.
51. One of these incidents was an allegation where a teacher was demonstrating a sporting technique and his hands were maybe where they should not have been. I am desperately trying to remember what the other occasion was. I think it was in general teaching where a teacher just got too close.
52. I cannot remember how the stories reached me and I think this was before I had a senior position of responsibility and I do know in the case of the sporting context the member of staff was not given a warning as in a formal process but advised that what he had to do was make sure that he was properly distantly away from the individual. It wasn't me who gave this warning and would presume it was the deputy rector. There was never any subsequent complaint about his behaviour.

Reporting of Complaints/Concerns

53. Pupils were able to speak to teachers if they had any concerns however that has to be conditioned by the relationship that the pupil has with the teachers in the broadest

sense of the word. One of the important things we did during staff training was to say that just because you were a music teacher and just because you only see pupils in that context it may just be you that the pupil chooses to talk to because you have a trust with them that is different from some of your colleagues.

54. There wasn't anything formal but I would like to think that latterly all the staff knew that at any time someone may come and dump something on them that they would have to deal with. They knew that they had to listen, ask in a neutral way, record and pass on the information in that way. They should not deal with the situation in any way that could damage a child or any potential evidence trail. That was all part of the child protection training and was a standard child protection technique. That training happened, without a doubt, in the nineties. All this was listed in the Staff Handbook.
55. When considering if a pupil knew what to do if they had a concern, anyone who had an issue will find a way of doing whatever it is they need to do. All you can do as an institution is make sure that your staff are sufficiently prepared that if it arrives on that individuals doorstep that individual knows the correct procedures for moving forward.
56. I am not aware about any complaint about a teacher made to me that would, in any way, be described as abuse. There would be countless complaints about a teacher being unfair but unfair is like part of being in a school. Some teachers appear to be unfair but that is just because you got caught.
57. In my first twenty years I do not remember of any incident of complaint made by a parent. No-one ever told me that anyone had made a complaint about me. Subsequently I became aware of incidents where a parent made a complaint about a teacher. You would generally be able to share that with the teacher but that could depend on the nature of the complaint. Sometimes you have to run an organisation on trust and if a parent comes to you and says you need to know something but I don't want you to do anything then I would respect that and not talk to a teacher.

Trusted Adult/Confidante

58. As part of the moving forward I have previously referred to from the early-mid 1990's, as well as class teachers being responsible for first line guidance there were a number of appointments of year heads who were people with pastoral responsibility for one or more year groups. The single most important people of the pastoral team were the class teachers because they had daily contact with the children. They reported to and their work was coordinated by the year heads. The year heads were responsible to the rector. In practice, in day to day terms, they were probably reporting to the deputy rector in terms of getting things done quickly, if necessary.
59. The new pastoral team appointments who were the year heads I have referred to were teachers. The school could not afford new teachers into these teams but what it did do was take the decision to increase its internal staffing by appointing new subject teachers so that there was an open recruitment of year heads. The jobs were all advertised at the same time, people who were interested were invited to apply and to specify which year group they would be interested in. There was a formal interview process by the rector and his deputy. They would have all been class teachers so they would have all the skills of a class teacher and senior staff would know that they were effective. In terms of their development there was a course called Effective Leadership in Education run by the Industrial Society which I attended in 1997. Once the year heads were in place and reasonably established I ensured each of them went on that course which was a 4 day residential course.
60. The Academy was arranged into four year groups. What we called geits, which is the traditional name for a first year pupil, had their own year head and he was responsible for the transition from the junior school to the senior school as well as being responsible for the overall work of the geit's class teachers. He would spend time liaising with the junior school, arrange an induction day, present a few assemblies so that it was all part of the transition from little school to big school. Then there was a year head in charge of what we called seconds and thirds which, in traditional terms would be S1 and S2. There would be a year head in charge of fourths and fifths, S3 and S4, and a year head in charge of the senior pupils. That meant there was pastoral

care in place and if there was anything to pass on the line of action was through those people. The year heads and I had a regular timetabled weekly meeting to discuss overall concerns about children's welfare but also to take a communal point of view for appropriate in-service training and so on.

61. When I consider why there was a recognition that there needed to be stronger pastoral care it is hard to say why. I think it would be fair to say it was recognised that there was a need to have this as an important part of the school. After there was the new appointment of a deputy rector there was a change of rector in 1992. Up until the 1980's the Academy had been static with a "I like this so why should it change mentality". I think around that time there was a general recognition that in some respects, if I wish to use jargon, that we needed to be more pupil centred. The appointment of year heads was specifically mentioned in a positive light in the inspection report of 1994.
62. I have referred to class teachers as being first line guidance teachers but they were subject teachers full time. The year heads were much closer to guidance teachers and from the late nineties we timetabled a weekly physical and social development lesson and the year heads were responsible for producing the programme for that as well as the guidance and discussion about that and a whole range of things. It was a deliberate school arrangement to catch the entire school and that allowed speakers to come in. That is one level of guidance but there was a second level of guidance that was academic, to do with careers and where and what you went to study.
63. From what I have read from the two redacted statements I have been provided by the Inquiry and information that is openly chatted about, primarily by ex-pupils, the pupils who have spoken about being most abused were very young. I think it is almost impossible to expect a child aged 7-10 years old to have any concept of how to manage that situation. My frustration, because I think I got on very well with the senior pupils, is that it never ever trickled back. You would have thought that as those little boys became bigger boys and their peers became involved, assuming the people responsible were still in position, that someone would have said something to me. It never happened. Was there any formal process? I cannot comprehend how a tiny

young child could even begin to manage their way out of that problem. A senior child, by which I mean 11-13 years old, would I guess have spoken at home. More than likely, and dare I say, to a mother rather than to a father. Again, I am not aware of anything coming back. I am frustrated beyond words because there were a number of people of a mind similar to mine who would have responded had we known anything.

64. There is an allegation of abuse that has reached the newspapers of one person who was employed on the senior school staff. That person was deemed to be odd and eccentric but there wasn't the slightest whispering of abuse at the time. I know very well pupils who have gone through that particular teacher's class and know of them in adulthood. Nobody has ever mentioned anything so I am frustrated beyond words that this wasn't dealt with. I am desperately sorry that it wasn't.

Abuse

65. I cannot recall a single incident that could be loosely described as a child protection issue with a then current member of staff in my time at the school.

Child Protection Arrangements

66. I would have become Child Protection Co-ordinator probably about 1994. In the summer of 1994 the head teacher at the junior school left and Andrew Trotman went to act as the head teacher at the junior school. He already had another appointment elsewhere however he had a year left of his contract at the Academy. At that point I became deputy rector and took over Andrew's child protection responsibilities. Those duties go with the deputy rector post.
67. The child protection co-ordinator role, as a whole, included the whole school. That would be whole staff training and so on. I do not recall there being a separate arrangement for boarding pupils and it seems to me that if you have a policy stating

your intent to protect children and committing to it, separating the boarding side of the school would be unhelpful.

68. I can give examples of the type of responsibility I had in The Child Protection Co-ordinator role and none of them involve pupil teacher situations and were more pupil parent situations. In one example, one of the office staff came into my office to speak to me. They told me that Mrs X was absolutely reeking of drink when she had dropped off her eleven year old at quarter to nine. I had a quick check with the child's class teacher because in the senior school each pupil had what you might call a register class and that register teacher was the first line guidance teacher in modern lingua. They were responsible for the child's welfare in the broadest sense of the term at a lowkey level. If things go wrong they would take advice. That teacher was aware there was an issue and was not sure what to do. I phoned the family GP as the school would have those details on record. I knew that they could not answer my questions but I described the circumstances and asked if I had given sufficient information that they could act to help the family. Obviously I couldn't interfere with patient-doctor confidentiality but on that say so I felt we could move on.
69. The other case was of a pupil who was alleging physical violence against his father. The problem we ended up with, and meant we could go no further, was that in the time that he had made the allegation and we had been discussing it and so on, he had passed the age of sixteen. In those days the relevant legislation defined a child to be up to the age of sixteen. In terms of the Act the school was not able to do anything other than help the child at an informal level by putting him in touch with the social work department. I believe it was all sorted out but in terms of invoking the full plethora of full child protection issues such as social services, if a child is gone beyond sixteen there was not a lot I could do.
70. Those are two examples, there may be others, but those are the two that stuck in mind when I was thinking about this. I do not recall anything about sharing information and best practice with staff going forward from either of these incidents. By the time of the second incident there was a much stronger pastoral team than there was when I was first recruited.

71. I can recall a lady called Sue Hamilton giving an input at one of our child protection training sessions although I couldn't begin to tell you what date. I actually think she may have come to the school at least twice. One time was certainly about abuse because it was around the time of the Orkney Inquiry and the other, which got quite animated, was in connection with school exchange trips. The tradition in most schools in the 1980's-90's was, particularly foreign language exchange trips, that pupils would go and stay en famille. I remember Sue Hamilton was essentially saying we could not do that because we hadn't the slightest way of knowing who we were sending the children to. She was unreceptive to the comment that that that would kill exposure to native foreign languages because nobody could afford an exchange programme if it had to be done in formal hostel residential care. Foreign exchange trips stopped sometime after that. I don't remember the resolution to that but I certainly remember those two specific discussions about the potential for abuse.
72. I do not recall any formal definition for what the Academy would call abuse. I do not recall us sitting down and deciding on what we would call abuse. Sexual abuse is appalling and unforgivable and should not be tolerated. Physical abuse is much more nuanced, particularly at a time when corporal punishment was allowed.
73. An individual who systematically hits children is an abuser. If they are doing that regularly and for reasons that don't make any sense then they must be an abuser. Where does corporal punishment move into abuse?

External Monitoring

74. I have a recollection of a school inspection which took place, possibly in the late seventies or early eighties, then one in 1994 and possibly either one or two more in my career. I guess there was an inspection approximately every ten years. There are two different kinds of inspections, those as I have mentioned which were carried out by HMIE and you would have lots of preparation to do in advance of their visits. There was also the Care Inspectorate who would just turn up. I couldn't tell you when they

inspected but it was sometime in the late nineties or early in 2000 for a care and welfare inspection.

75. There was a whole school inspection at some stage in the academic year 1994-1995. I tried in preparation for meeting with the Inquiry to try and find out whether those inspection reports existed in the public domain but I could not locate them. I suspect they are with the Scottish Archive somewhere. I do know that one of the things that the inspectors congratulated the school on was a whole school development plan which was incredibly detailed. It had been produced not only in consultation with the staff but at a late drafting stage with the parents, by parent's meetings, and also conversations with senior pupils. That was commented on very positively by the inspectorate. Given that I knew the focus of the conversation with the Inquiry is the reason why I wanted to find that document. I would recommend that the Inquiry see if they can get hold of it, is that I am certain that there was a section in the development plan on child protection.
76. As a junior teacher I had an inspector in a class I was teaching and he said that what I was teaching was too difficult for the boys. I did the lesson and he said that he told me a quarter of the class didn't understand what I was saying so I said something like 'please, can I rest my case because three quarters of the class understood something you said I shouldn't be teaching'. I am using this anecdote to show that the inspection was a two way process.
77. From 1994 onwards, whenever there was an inspection then I was involved, in a sense, as the school manager of the inspection. I was the point of liaison so when the inspectors said they wanted to do something I would have to arrange the timetable for them to do that.
78. They did speak to the children. An inspection team was normally four or five strong, one of which was a lay inspector. Questionnaires would go out to all parents. They were not personalised so parents could say what they thought anonymously and send them back to a separate Inspectorate address. The inspectors would ask to meet and interview groups of children. The lay inspector would be key in organising this. They

would also organise groups of staff and there were no senior management present at any of these meetings. Indeed, there were no staff present at their meetings with the pupils. The school supplied a list of who was free, for both pupils and children, and the inspectors decided who they wished to see. They would be free to ask whatever and those in the interview focus groups would be free to respond as they wished. These groups were separated into pupils, teaching staff, non-teaching staff as well as subject inspections of teaching in a particular discipline. They also looked at senior management meetings and the whole gamut of basically how the school was organised.

79. Looking at the inspection report produced after the 1994/95 inspection alongside the school development plan you could see, in my professional opinion, that at that time the school was on the right track in every respect and that is endorsed by the inspection report. There were things that needed improving but nothing that was throw it away and start again. One of the things that was suggested for improvement was security. The Edinburgh Academy site is difficult to defend so the inspectorate made a comment about how it could be made more secure. They have made it more secure nowadays but I am not sure how successful it is. That is an example, they would have made other recommendations but I cannot remember the detail.
80. The Scottish Inspectors of schools, unlike in the south, had a very good modus operandi and they regarded themselves as a vector for sharing good practice. They would go into a school and measure it against whatever standards they measured it against but they would see something that was out of the ordinary that was good and they would then take that to the next inspection they were doing. They were acting as a vehicle for moving good practice around Scotland. Not explicitly but through osmosis. If you see good things you write them down, remember them and share them.
81. The Inspection report always ended with bullet points. The first three were good and the next three were try to do better.
82. The care inspection would have visited the boarding houses and that would have been almost its sole focus because you would not have a care inspection of a day school. I

was not involved with the care inspection only, in so far as, things about child protection. The boarding houses were at the point of closing.

Record Keeping

83. Record keeping about pupils was all done centrally in the rector's office. Each pupil had a file, everything went into the file including all the pupils end of term reports and the like, including any correspondence with parents. If a teacher had correspondence with parents I suppose it was up to the teacher, at an unpromoted level, to share as and when appropriate. Certainly, year heads and senior staff would all feed centrally to the file. I don't suppose anyone examined forensically everything that went into a pupil's file but everything should have been collected.
84. I am working from slightly faulty memory regarding records concerning the boarding houses however there was a written report completed at the end of every term. In those end of term reports there would be an extra section from a housemaster and that would be kept in the central file. I would guess that housemasters would have their own individual pupil files about emergency contacts and so on but I haven't the slightest idea about that.
85. Any information about a child would be filed centrally as far as I am aware and that would include information about any discipline or complaints made. I don't know how you would describe adequate but I think it would be best to describe the record keeping as of its time. There was no reason, as a junior and unpromoted member of staff, for me to think that the record keeping was in any way inadequate.
86. In a written report about a child you might get a comment from the class teacher about how a child presented or any change in their demeanour. Any changes in a child's demeanour I would expect the class teacher to be in contact with the child's parent at the point of the change rather than at the end of a term. As an anecdote, an invigilator noticed that a pupil was writing their exam and kept looking at a piece of paper. It turned out to be a picture of their granny who had just died so that was an example

that you need to communicate. The school would have put in a special circumstances form to the examining board for this child who was doing a public exam.

Investigations into Abuse – Personal Involvement

87. I was never involved in any investigations. By investigations I mean trying to find out the circumstances and that would have gone against my training in any case because if there was an allegation of abuse the one thing you do not do as a school is investigate. You establish the facts as alleged and then you notify the appropriate authority to do the investigation. That was from the child protection training we had at the school.

88. When it comes to investigations about inappropriate behaviour then yes I did investigate but the justification for my approach, and what I considered to be the right approach, was that it appeared not to have happened. If there was a suggestion of inappropriate behaviour, for example, somebody getting too close to somebody or somebody whose actions might be misinterpreted, the right approach is not to brush the thing under the carpet. The right approach is to thank the child for letting me know and I would apologise if they had been made to feel uncomfortable, I would speak to the named party. I would then tell the child after I had spoken to the person who made them feel uncomfortable. I wouldn't investigate.

89. One of the hardest things for any workplace and it is not a school or anybody's preserve, if somebody says they do not like what you are doing, you are wrong. That is really hard for a lot of people to take. You have to work from the principle that it is not for the person who feels uncomfortable to adapt to that behaviour or for them to be told they have to get themselves together, or to be told they are being mardy, a cry baby or whatever. Somebody is doing something that somebody doesn't like and it has to be addressed. That is not investigation because there is no point in investigation. You can only do that if you have the permission of the person who made the allegation. You can't do it otherwise because there is always concern about afters.

Reports of Abuse and Civil Claims

90. I was never involved in reports of abuse of civil claims made by former pupils.

Police Investigations/Criminal Proceedings

91. There was a former chemistry teacher, Iain Storie, who the police were investigating and who I believe was eventually put on the sex offender's register. There were never allegations that I was aware of made about him whilst he was working at the Academy, nor indeed did the police have any allegations about him at the Academy. This enquiry concerned an internet trawl discovering the exchanging of images of children. Essentially he got caught up in a bigger thing and was identified through IP addresses and other police enquiries. The teacher had retired and the police had no evidence that his image gathering pre-dated his retirement from the school. The police contacted me while I was still at the school.
92. After I retired I received a visit from a police investigation unit who were investigating the activities of an individual who had briefly been a [REDACTED] teacher at the Academy in the seventies. He had gone on to various Scottish schools and had eventually been prosecuted and is, or was, serving a custodial sentence. This was a chap called IPT [REDACTED]
93. Other than the matters I have already provided details about I have not been involved in any other reports of abuse made to the police.

Convicted Abusers

94. I know of one convicted abuser, IPT [REDACTED], who previously worked at the school who I have given details of.

Specific Alleged Abusers

95. The Inquiry has made me aware that there are allegations made against a number of former staff from the Academy. The nature of those allegations has not been disclosed to me.
96. The list contains names that I simply do not recognise from my time at the Academy. These are IEG, IEH, IFO, IQO and Mr IGF.
97. The list contains the names of eleven former teachers at the Junior (preparatory) School. Of those eight either retired, resigned or died before 1993, thirty years ago, when I first had any senior management responsibility. I have never worked at the Junior School. I have never worked with any of these eleven individuals or seen any of them working with children. No reports of abuse of children by them ever reached me. Their names are IGG, John Brownlee, IBL, Mr IHE (teacher), Mr IHC (teacher), ICG, ICA, ICP, ICP, IGT, IDP and IQA.
98. The list contains two names on non-teaching staff. I have never worked with either of these individuals or seen any of them working with children. No reports of abuse of children by them ever reached me. Their names are Mr IFS (staff) and Mr IDV (staff).
99. The list contains the names of nineteen teachers who were former colleagues of mine at the senior school. Fourteen of them either retired, resigned or died before 1993, thirty years ago, when I first had any senior management responsibility. All nineteen were well respected and many were particularly highly regarded. None of them were from my department and therefore I have never seen them teaching. I have collaborated with eight of them in extra-curricular activities for the pupils. All were thoroughly professional in their behaviour towards the pupils. No reports of abuse of children by them ever reached me. Their names are IBP, IDR, IDR, ICR, IFR, IEF, IFP, IBW,

ICH, IDZ, IFN, IBU, ICL,
IDQ, IDX, IDY, IDO, IDT and ICQ

IPT

100. IPT was on the staff from 197-197. He was appointed direct from Cambridge University. I refer to my earlier conversation explaining my appointment. IPT was a rugby blue and a and that meant he was bound to be appointed. He was a far better rugby player than he was a teacher. His serious weakness as a teacher was that he was too easily distracted and once the pupils got wind of this they would get him involved in a question about the they were doing while the rest of the class misbehaved. The were all interconnected so the noise was definitely noticeable to the rest of the teaching staff. It was fairly clear during year one that it was not working but you always try and help people so he got lots of advice. At the start of his third year it was clear it hadn't got any better and I went to see the Rector who I think was Ellis. I told him my concerns and said that he had to go. Ellis told me that I would have to spell this out to IPT
101. I told IPT that I was sorry but he needed a complete fresh start. He had the makings of a good teacher because he was a caring individual. He was a good sportsman so he had good rapport with the children. He was a reasonable but not an outstanding but the chattering classes of the pupils had now given him a reputation for ill-discipline for which he would never recover. That was what he was told. By ill-discipline I meant his lack of control. That was the only reason why he was asked to move on. There was no suggestion during his time at the Academy of anything that could be remotely described as abuse that came anywhere near me.
102. I think he went to in Aberdeen next and I haven't the slightest idea what references were written. I don't even recall whether I was asked and it is probably not the case. Certainly, as far as I was concerned, his lack of class discipline was the only reason he was asked to leave. Therefore, when the police

visited me I was really rather surprised because he appears to have evolved into a serial abuser. By serial I mean at more than one school.

103. I haven't a clue of the characteristic of an abuser but when you observe somebody teaching you get a feel for that person. What I got from observing [IPT] was a feel that he was somebody who was interested in individuals but not in any way that was a prelude to abuse. That is why I considered it a surprise.
104. I saw him in no other context because I didn't see him on the sports field. I saw him as someone working in a laboratory. I was married and had three young children and he wasn't so there was no social contact whatsoever.
105. I have been told that in the report by the rector to the Court of Directors the reason behind six staff leaving at the end of the summer term 1979, was *"one retiral, two promotions, one following his wife who was a career diplomat, one who he had agreed needed a new environment, and one who wished to move south to be nearer his own and his wife's parents"*. I have also been advised that from other records, Chronicle of Autumn 1979, the staff member who "needed a new environment" appears to be [IPT] [IPT]. As far as I am concerned [IPT] needed a new environment because of his teaching skills and lack of control. I am adamant and wish it on record that there was no suggestion that [IPT] had been abusing children. Had there been any hint of abuse then I would have been contacting authorities. You cannot have someone like that teaching and you can't be passing them on. It would be absolutely wrong.
106. In 197[], if I had a concern about [IPT] initially I would have shared concerns with other peers and senior colleagues. By peers I mean those at my stage and my age and it would have been a conversation to find out what we should be doing about it. My conversation with those more senior would be to confirm how we manage this, is it you or is it me, would be the conversation but eventually someone has to go to the Rector because there was no school hierarchy. It would be him who would decide the course of action. There is no point in speculating whether or whether not any conversation happened about any member of staff that the Inquiry has or has not had any allegations about because I simply don't know. I could not pretend to guess how

Lawrence Ellis, who was the Rector at the time, would have responded in these circumstances. I can't make comment on what would or would not have been reported to the police. I can only think of circumstances later on in my time where we would have had good relationships with the local beat officers from the police and who we would be able to talk to off the record to ask them what they wanted us to do about a given situation. I just don't know what happened in the seventies. I regret to say that I am not sure any of the people from that time are still alive or compos mentis if they are alive.

Ian Wares

107. I am asked about a specific complaint made by a pupil's mother made against Ian Wares who was told by Mr [REDACTED] the Rector at that time, that it would be unhelpful to complain and that her son must have an over fertile imagination. The reaction is that that was a nonsense and I can't say how sorry I am to read that sort of thing. You cannot dismiss that, it is not even a Moorov principle, it is a situation where you have to do something fairly quickly. I cannot see any justification in the Rector's response. I do not know the full circumstances however I do want to stress that if the response by the school was as described, and we only have a witness statement that that was the schools response, then I am saddened. It would be wrong for me to be seen to be criticising the school when there is no supporting evidence presented to me that that was the response given by the school. There is no defence for the abuse of any child received from Ian Wares. It clearly should have been handled more appropriately by the school than is emerging now. I was not aware of the complaint made against Ian Wares. I was only peripherally aware of his existence because he worked at the junior school and I was aware that he had left the junior school in 1973. The circumstances of which I haven't the slightest idea to this day. Whether he chose to go, whether he was asked to go or what the circumstances were, I am afraid I cannot help.
108. One of the applicants whose redacted witness statement I have read contacted me as I was retiring. That was the first time I had seen specific chapter and verse about Ian Wares. I have no idea how that type and level of abuse could have gone undetected in the school. That is the bit that is frustrating me beyond words. The senior pupils of

that era and who would have been at the junior school when Wares was there would have left the Academy round about 1980. There are a number of those that I regard as friends and there was absolutely nothing that came back. What I can't comprehend that it was public and nothing was said. If it was private I totally understand how a little boy would not report it, not even to his mum because they would be scared and not understand what was happening to them. If it was public, and there seems to be a suggestion that it was, why did it not get back? Somewhere there would have been a boy that was not being abused who you would have thought would have said something. I cannot get my head around that although I accept fully that the abuse that has been reported has happened. I simply don't understand it.

109. The Inquiry has made me aware of the comments made about Ian Ware's abuse which were in a newspaper article in 2001 and I am not aware of any action taken by the Academy as a result.
110. The Inquiry has made me aware that in 2001 a lot of incidents of abuse at Loretto came to the fore. I am told that they reacted by contacting and reaching out to all of their staff and former pupils and I am asked why I think The Edinburgh Academy did no such thing. I recollect no conversation, so at what level the 2001 allegation came into the school, I have no recollection of that. I remember no conversation in 2001 that entered any debate as to what should happen about these allegations.
111. In 2008 I was emailed by a former pupil about Ian Wares and the abuse he perpetrated. There was nothing done to share that information to other staff members however I replied to that individual to explain that I was leaving and not in a position to do anything with it. I cannot remember the context but have a vague recollection that it was shared in confidence and therefore couldn't be passed on for that reason. In my response I advised that if they wanted to take it further they should contact the school authorities because I had retired by then. Also, if they did that would be the signal they were making a formal approach. That is my speculation on this email correspondence but I simply don't remember the full details. I do recollect the event. I recollect being shocked and I recollect sending a reply which seems to have been a

bit of a surprise to the individual concerned. It was certainly not passed on by me that I can recollect. I am sorry that I cannot be any more specific than that.

Hamish Dawson

112. Hamish Dawson was a history teacher and a junior class teacher for 12-13 year olds. At one stage he was a housemaster in one of the boarding houses. I know now that there have been a number of allegations of abuse by him but I never heard any of these allegations of abuse during his time at the academy. Certainly zero in terms of sexual abuse. I would also say that there a number of former pupils who are close contacts of me and my family who went through his class as 12-13 year olds and never ever has there been any suggestion of sexual abuse ever come out.
113. His eccentricity, and it was really eccentricity, was that he had developed a character whereby he had instruments of correction. He had lots of little sticks in his classroom which were used to punish minor and possibly not so minor infringements. He would have portrayed it at the time as fun and part of his way of engaging with pupils. Clearly others did not regard it in such a context but it is interesting to note parenthetically that when he retired his "instruments of torture" were auctioned for charity and fetched quite good prices.
114. I became aware of there being allegations against Hamish Dawson after I left the school and although I couldn't begin to be certain when. I heard nothing about his behaviour towards the children while I was at the school.
115. I never saw him disciplining children.
116. As far as Hamish Dawson in the boarding house is concerned it does appear, and again there seems to be a degree of verification, that he was a sexual abuser at the boarding house but I have no idea about that. Since I had absolutely no contact with that boarding house I am afraid I can't help the Inquiry.

117. In one of the redacted statements provided to me the witness commented that Dawson did not abuse him physically or otherwise but that he witnessed him striking pupils with bits of wood and throwing the board rubber at them. He said that Dawson was the most overtly violent teacher he saw at the school when he was there. I have talked about the instruments of correction and that was common knowledge. He had bits of wood that had names like the “enforcer” and so on. I would not say he had a reputation for being physically violent. He had a reputation for physical correction but tapping a boy on the shoulder with a bit of wood, abuse or beating? Nothing emerged at his time at the school which caused any of us, and I mean us who were teachers at the time, to have concerns. Nor did pupils who went through his class report anything that was in any sense worthy of taking any action.

Iain Storie

118. I have already spoken about Iain Storie. He was the chemistry teacher who the police came to visit the school about the inappropriate images he possessed.
119. There was never any suggestion of concerning behaviour whilst he worked at the Academy. After Mr Dawson retired Iain Storie continued taking the boys on a canal boat trip which Dawson had done. I am sure something would have come back from the pupils who went on canal trips with both Dawson and Storie as one of the people who went on those trips with both Dawson and Storie was a Church of Scotland minister. I cannot imagine, he, with all his child protection training would not have said something had something been obvious.
120. There were no rumours or whispers about his behaviour.

Craig Hamilton

121. My memory is very sketchy but I believe that there was a junior schoolteacher called Craig Hamilton, who was also a boarding house tutor. If my memory is correct he was discovered with inappropriate images on his computer. I believe that the police were involved but have no recollection of what happened subsequently.

Final Thoughts concerning Named Abusers

122. I am really sorry that the list contained so many names although I understand that you have to take whatever witnesses say. I think my concern is now amplified that the disaffected are getting confused with the genuine. How you weed out the genuine, which have to be weeded out, investigated and followed through, is a task I cannot see how you achieve.
123. Presumably while the Inquiry is investigating, if in its evidence and witness statements, it becomes clear that you have a real criminal action to be followed through it will have to be referred to the police.

Specific Allegations Against Me

124. I have been shown two redacted statements which contain comments about me.
125. A former pupil has stated in his statement to the Inquiry *"In the physics class we had a Van der Graaff generator which consists of a big metal ball which is plugged in and it generates static electricity and when you put your hands on it your hair stands on end. If someone touches you when you are touching it there is a big bang and you pull the static off them and get a shock.* [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] *It was very unpleasant"*
126. This refers to a former pupil's dislike of their experience with an experiment on a Van der Graaff generator. This was a standard school physics experiment. To the best of my knowledge it was recommended in the Nuffield O level physics teachers guide (the course followed by the Academy at the time) and in Jim Jardine's book *Physics is Fun*, which was the standard physics text used in Scotland at that time. The experiment is referred to on the current University of Oxford Physics website.

127. Any pupil is entitled to dislike his or her experience with any experiment but the expression of dislike of a standard experiment is not evidence of abuse. It is a single, unsupported complaint.
128. This is not abuse and the Inquiry should clearly indicate that.
129. The Inquiry lawyers have confirmed that the second witness statement contains a criticism but not an allegation.
130. It is made on behalf of a third party who has not complained. The statement is uncorroborated.
131. Any close inspection of the details of this witness statement, insofar as it affects me, will show that it is at best ill-informed and at worst might be considered to be mendacious.
132. Given that the Inquiry lawyers agree this is not an allegation it falls outside the remit of the Inquiry and the part which affects me should be struck from the Inquiry record.
133. I have never been the subject of any complaints in relation to the alleged abuse of children at the school.

Leaving the School

134. I left my job to retire. I didn't quite leave my job, I left to retire in 2009 but was re-employed by the school as an admin assistant to set-up and integrate a new examinations software package into the schools management process. I was able to negotiate going from full on flat out to an office job working 9-5 three days a week, followed by two days a week for a final six months.

Lessons to be Learned

- 135. On reflection, I think that boarding schools may have, in the past, undervalued the need for the proper training of those in charge of the children in their residential care. I am certainly not aware of any courses specifically designed for boarding school staff although it is quite possible that SCIS ran some sort of training.

- 136. I strongly recommend that the Inquiry undertake a thorough evaluation of the training of adults who have responsibility for the care of children in a residential context (both traditional boarding schools and elsewhere). Does a qualification of the nature of a Scottish Qualification for Leadership (Children in Residential Care) exist and if so is it still fit for purpose in 2023?

Other information

- 137. I have no objection to my witness statement being published as part of the evidence to the Inquiry. I believe the facts stated in this witness statement are true.

Signed..... 

Dated..... 01 August 2023