

Scottish Child Abuse Inquiry

Witness Statement of

Brian HAROLD

Support person present: No.

1. My name is John Brian Harold, but I've always been known as Brian. My date of birth is [REDACTED] 1950. My contact details are known to the Inquiry.

Qualifications/training

2. I always felt that I was quite lucky because I was dual qualified in education and social work. I trained as a teacher at Aberdeen University and obtained a Bachelor of Education in the 1970s. I was fortunate enough to be seconded full-time to study social work at Glasgow University in the early 1980s. I obtained a Certificate of Qualification in Social Work (CQSW) in 1984. It was very unusual to have both qualifications and I was really pleased to get the chance. I also obtained a post-graduate certificate with distinction in social services leadership in 2005 through Robert Gordon University.

Employment prior to St. Philip's

3. Although I qualified as a teacher, I never actually did any teaching. I came into residential childcare after leaving Aberdeen. I've had a forty year career in that field. I've really only had two significant jobs. My first job was in the Good Shepherd Centre in Bishopton, Renfrewshire.

St. Euphrasia's/The Good Shepherd Centre, Bishopton

4. I started working at the Good Shepherd Centre in 1976. At that time, if I remember correctly, it was called St. Euphrasia's and it was run by the nuns. Later on, it changed its name to the Good Shepherd Centre. I think that was in the early 1980s. It was just a change of name but it was a continuation of the same service. It was from there that I was seconded to study social work. I was there for thirteen years, until 1989. I do remember that it was quite a wrench to leave.
5. Initially, I went to St. Euphrasia's as a basic grade childcare officer. There was a post called third-in-charge, which I think then became an assistant principal post. I was promoted to that post so I ended up as part of the management team at the Good Shepherd. I think it was funded by social work services and then latterly it might have been by Strathclyde Region.
6. I had very positive experiences at St. Euphrasia's and the Good Shepherd Centre. When I first went there, it was still being run by the nuns. For a quite long time, they continued to run the school. Over the years, they gradually withdrew. There were lots of them around when I started and very few of them around when I left. I was the first male member of staff there, which I was always quite proud of. That balance did change over time, but not significantly. It was exclusively a female client group and almost exclusively a female staff group, although the staff group balance had changed a bit by the time I left.
7. The girls were secondary school age, about eleven to sixteen. It was what was called a 'block school'. You were inside all the time, albeit in different wings. Prior to my arrival, there were two functions of the establishment, as I understand it. There was Dalbeth Approved School, which was an approved school in the old sense of the word, and St. Euphrasia's Training Centre, which was more for girls who were needing care and protection. I think that was how it was described. Over time, those two groups started to become closer together in terms of behaviour and need. The two parts of the establishment merged as one and became St. Euphrasia's, which was in effect a residential school.

8. I learned a lot there. Although I had trained as a teacher, I didn't really know a lot about childcare and residential work. I have some great memories of working there. I learned some great wisdom from some of these wee nuns, who were five feet tall but knew a lot about residential childcare. I think that I learned the importance of treating the girls properly and valuing the individual. They had something in their philosophy statement about each individual being unique. That kind of permeated everything that they did. I learned about valuing people and respect. Good quality childcare was their mantra, but it was obviously of its time. There was also an emphasis on the maintenance of standards and a development of the service during the time that I was there as things started to progress in the outside world.
9. I have to say that I didn't have one concern about St. Euphrasia's or the Good Shepherd Centre from the time that I was there. I do know that cases have come up, but I don't know a lot about them. I've heard that there were one or two court cases and investigations, but I have to say that I had no concerns at all.

St. Philip's Residential School, By Plains, Airdrie, Lanarkshire

10. I moved to St. Philip's as depute head in 1989. I was very happy at the Good Shepherd Centre so I wasn't desperate to leave, but career-wise, moving to St. Philips was a promotion. It just felt like the right time. I'd been at the Good Shepherd for a long time. It was also a chance to work with boys rather than girls, which I hadn't done before. I didn't know an awful lot about St. Philip's, although I knew of it from working in the sector. It was a bit further to travel because I lived in Bishopton. It changed from being a five minute commute to an hour and a half. It was just a new challenge.
11. Initially, my job title at St. Philip's was Depute Principal (Social Work). There were two deputies, one for education and one for social work. I was in that role for twenty years. I then became the head of St. Philip's, a role I held for seven years until I retired in 2016.

The institution/culture

12. St. Philip's was located between Airdrie and Plains. It was called 'St. Philip's School by Plains'. Its purpose was to provide care and education. It had originally been a denominational school for Catholic children. In actual fact, over time, that changed quite a lot although the label is probably still there now. It was very much still there when I first went to the school. Occasionally, someone from Strathclyde would phone up and say that they had a young person in need of care who wasn't from a Catholic family. They would ask if we would consider them and I would always say that we would of course. It wasn't a barrier as such.
13. It was termed as a junior school in those days as opposed to some of the so-called senior schools. The boys at St. Philip's were a wee bit younger, maybe eleven to thirteen, fourteen. It took me a while to assimilate the difference between working with boys and working with girls. It was so different. I knew that it would be, but I don't know if I fully appreciated how different it would be.
14. Most of the boys were from Glasgow. They were West of Scotland kids and they were quite gallus, which is a Glasgow term for being a bit bold or daring. They could be very cheeky at times, but that was okay and it was mostly good-natured. Because it was a junior school, I think there was a practice of moving boys on to other schools when they got to the age of about fourteen. That happened for a while after I arrived. We then abandoned that policy and committed to holding kids for the length of their secondary education, so from eleven to sixteen.
15. At that time, there was no day pupils but we did introduce day pupils eventually. Through the 1990s, boys who were doing well and making progress and able to go home would be encouraged to go home and come back to school. That became a pattern. When the pattern increased, we then thought it made sense to set up a day unit. There was a change in emphasis around that time, that children should remain at home where possible rather than being sent to residential schools long-term. Strathclyde and other regions were choosing to keep children at home for as long as possible. That was great, if they were able to cope. My criticism of some cases would

be that they were often kept at home for too long. We would get them in a residential placement at the age of fourteen, fifteen instead of eleven, twelve years old. They were then sometimes more damaged. Early intervention was inconsistent in those days.

16. The other thing that differentiated the boys from the girls quite starkly was their criminality. Many of them had been in trouble with the police. Many of them had picked up charges. They were almost all placed at the school by the Children's Hearing system, so they were on supervision. They often came with previous convictions. Primarily, the girls at the Good Shepherd were in trouble but many of them also had a need for care and protection. Many of them needed protection from sexual exploitation. That was quite a big difference there.
17. We would occasionally invite trainee Children's Panel members into the school as part of their training. I would have a session with them and they would have a look around the school and meet with the kids and it was an annual thing. Without fail, the first question they always asked me was how long children tended to stay at St. Philip's. My answer was always that there isn't really an answer to that question. It depended on the needs of the child, the family situation, the progress that they made, the level of offending if that's a problem, and the complexity of the case - so there was no right or wrong answer to that question.
18. If you were looking for an average length of stay I would say that it was maybe eighteen months to two years. Some boys came at eleven and stayed until they were sixteen, some left before that. There was always a drive to try and get them back to mainstream school. That was a huge pressure on the children, as much as us. That came from psychologists and social workers too. It was so difficult to get them back to a point where they could return to mainstream school. This was because if the boys had made real progress, they didn't want to go back to a place where they had failed, to then fail again. They wanted to stay on and finish their education in a place where they felt safe. Social work departments were often looking to move children on but they didn't always want to go and it wasn't always appropriate.

19. A lot of the boys that we admitted had been through umpteen broken placements before they came to us. Sometimes they'd been in numerous foster care placements because local authorities had financial constraints. Foster was often the preferred option. Eventually they would come to us then and we would do our best. They often came to us with a broken placement pattern behind them, but most of the ones who came to us stayed put and saw it through to a conclusion.
20. We had a fairly good record of sustaining kids in placement. I could probably count on one hand the number of times that we terminated a placement because of serious misbehaviour, violence or mental health issues. I'm not saying it never happened but it was very seldom. We had a good reputation with the local authority for holding onto children to get that stability and safe environment for them, so to have that as a prerequisite is important.
21. One of the things that struck me when I arrived and shortly thereafter was that St. Philip's was somehow much more clearly defined as a school with care attached, as opposed to a care establishment with education. I think that a lot of the care staff, for whom I was responsible, felt that way as well. I think that it was just the way it was set up originally and the way that it operated. There was a big emphasis on education and maybe less so on care. I'm not saying that they didn't care for the kids because they had a lot of good staff, albeit most of them were unqualified. But I would have to say that education was a big focus when I first arrived.
22. It felt as if we were all in it together and doing our best to improve the service. It was really a journey, from those early days. Part of that journey was about trying to redress the balance between education and care and make it even more child-centred. We wanted it to be a childcare establishment with education on the campus. But we also wanted to change the physical environment. That was a given, that we'd improve the quality of care by improving the environment and fabric of the buildings.
23. Beyond that, Paddy Hanrahan was the catalyst for change. I think he worked at St. John's in Springboig prior to St. Philip's. He was South African. He arrived with an in-built value base around giving children a voice, protecting them from harm and

creating a culture of transparency and openness. That came from Paddy Hanrahan, but it just so happened that coincidentally the rest of the management team were also keen to buy into that culture. We ended up with a management group of five people. We came together more or less at the same time and I would say that team drove the change process right through the 1990s.

24. The management team had a very similar value base when it came to standards and values. Over so many years, different policies and procedures were developed over a range of subjects. I wrote some of them but I didn't by any means write all of them. One of the things I did write early on was a document called 'The Essence of St. Philip's'. I have provided a copy of this document to the Inquiry. Dennis Ferrie, the depute head in charge of education, and I wrote this document together. It was all about the shared values of the organisation and the characteristics that we would expect when it came to behaviour of staff and the treatment of children. As I remember it, it was well received by most people who saw it, such as social workers, psychologists and people who came to the school. I looked through it prior to meeting with the Inquiry. For all that it was written thirty years ago, I think it was a pretty good piece of work. It almost became a seminal document for what followed in terms of change, improving standards and improving quality.

My role and recruitment at St. Philip's

25. The job must have been advertised. It might have been in *The Herald* newspaper. It required a qualification in social work. That was the main prerequisite. I submitted an application and I think I went for a pre-interview visit to have a look around. There was then a formal interview, which was fairly traditional. One of the things I do remember is that I was on a family holiday in Menorca at the time. I had to fly back for the interview. When the date was set, it wasn't going to work but they agreed to fly me home. I took a couple of days out of my holiday. It's funny how things stick in your mind, but the thing I remember most of all is that the day I flew back to Glasgow was the day that Mo Johnston signed for Rangers.

26. I was interviewed by the board of managers and I think there were four or five people there. I can't remember a great deal about the interview itself. It took place in the headmaster's office. The chairman of the board, John Smith, was there; the headmaster at the time, Bill Kane, was there; there was a man from Strathclyde Region; and there was someone from McSparran McCormick, the legal department. I can't honestly remember what sort of questions I was asked, but I think it was fairly standard for that period. There were questions about the Good Shepherd and the work I'd done there. I do remember they asked how I thought I'd manage working with boys after working with girls for so long. I tried to answer that as best I could.
27. I think I was asked to provide two references, one from the head of the Good Shepherd and one from a friend who was also an Assistant Director of Education. I'm pretty sure that St. Philip's did seek out those references, but I don't recall whether they had them on the day of the interview. I'm not aware of any vetting that they carried out. There were police checks for staff around at that time so I'm assuming they may have done a police check, but I really don't know.
28. There was an induction of sorts when I started as depute. It was nothing as rigorous as you might get nowadays. I was given a bit of time and space just to get to know the place, get to know the staff, get to know the children. Getting to know the kids was important. I was also getting to know the geography of the place. Although I was given some time and space, there was no formal induction process or training.
29. When I was depute, my line manager was the headmaster. It was Bill Kane initially. As I recall, he was there for about six months after I started and was then replaced temporarily by a man called Bill Duffy. Bill Duffy was head of St. Mary's, Kenmure. He came for a short period after Bill Kane retired, as a kind of stop-gap before Paddy Hanrahan was appointed. Paddy Hanrahan was appointed as head about a year after I arrived at the school. He was in the role from 1990 until I took over the role in 2009.

Layout and Structure

30. St. Philip's had quite a lot of grounds. One of the things that stuck out for me was moving from a block school to a school where there were fifteen different buildings on quite a big campus. It was quite strange for me and it took a bit of getting used to. The admin block, known as Beechwood House, was a big old sandstone building on the edge of the campus. I think the education department was purpose-built when St. Philip's opened, which I think was in 1970. The residential units were separate. The kids had to leave their units and walk to go to school, which I thought was quite normal. There were also staff houses and a big gymnasium. It was quite spread out.
31. St. Philip's was more modern than the Good Shepherd Centre in terms of the layout. In terms of the décor and the fabric, it wasn't quite what I had been used to. The nuns were quite fastidious about providing really good quality fabric, furnishings, soft furnishings and flowers. St. Philip's didn't have a whole lot of that kind of thing. The furniture in the units was quite functional. It wasn't uncomfortable, but it was just functional. I must say that the kids did seem happy enough with what they had. There were a lot of activities going on for them, a lot of good staff and good care.

Staff structure

32. We ended up with a management team of five people. As well as Paddy Hanrahan and myself, Dennis Ferrie was depute principal in charge of education. He and I worked very closely. Strangely enough, we were both dual qualified in care and education. At the time, that wasn't common. With that background, we were able to liaise and collaborate on a whole range of subjects. You then have a better approach to care and education and staff working together. Dennis had an assistant principal of education, Patrick McMullan. The final member of the development team was a woman called Irene Tominey. I think she may have been at the school since the beginning, but she had certainly been there for a long time. She took over the day unit, which initially was called St. Philip's Day Unit. To make a distinction, it was given a different name and became St. Francis' Day Unit on the St. Philip's Campus.

33. When I was depute, I was responsible for managing the middle management group and the care team. When I became head, I was responsible for managing the senior staff, which at that time meant the two deputies and the head of the day unit. Initially, I was in the post of head on an acting basis. I can't remember my own previous post being filled, but I could be wrong about that. I may have been covering both roles for a time. I think the first formal appointment of a head of care was a man called Jim Gillespie, who had previously worked in St. Philip's Secure Unit. He eventually went to Kibble. He was replaced by Pauline Smith, who also previously worked in the secure unit.
34. The headmaster was answerable to the board of directors. I think the members of the board were all fairly local. There wasn't a huge number of them, maybe half a dozen or so. Because St. Philip's was originally a denominational school for Catholic children, I think appointments to the board had to be given notional approval by the Bishop of Motherwell. He didn't have any further involvement in the running of the school. The members of the board were voluntary. They tended to be education based as I remember it. Over time, we managed to push for a few more social work appointees. In fact, at one time we had a former care inspector on the board. We also had people with experience of the building trade and the building world. That meant that if we had building improvements to make, we could rely on their expertise. I would say that it was a fairly tight group.
35. I felt that the attitude of staff towards children was largely very positive. In the early days, all the staff pre-dated me. They were mostly unqualified. Some of them had been there a while and learned on the job. There were a lot of good people with good hearts who needed guidance and support and a steer in the right direction. Over a period of time, some of the original staff left. They were then replaced by people of our choice. We tried to bring in people who we thought could do a good job and improve the situation and the environment. It wasn't perfect, but I never really had any major concerns about any of the staff that I can remember.
36. I thought staff had a very good relationship with the children. I think that improved over the years that I was at the school. Things changed. The environment changed. To an

extent, the client group changed and became more challenging, more needy, much more damaged in many ways. I don't know if the relationship between staff and children necessarily deteriorated, but it just became more difficult for people working at the coalface. I was conscious that the staff were often doing their best in difficult circumstances and not always with the resources they would want.

37. Finance was always an issue. We were no different from other voluntary agencies in that respect. Because we wanted to do the best job possible, we always wanted more resources than we had. By the time we got into the secure unit building in 2013, money was really tight. We had to pay off the debt that the secure unit had accrued and austerity was kicking in as well. There really wasn't a lot of money around.
38. Broadly speaking, the staff had very good relationships with the kids. I was there for a long period of time. Over the years that I was there, kids who had left the school would come back. They would maybe come in with their wife, partner or a baby and tell us that they'd done well.

Recruitment of staff

39. Over the years, I was responsible for bringing in a large number of the social care staff. Likewise, Dennis Ferrie would have done the same for education. We embarked on a recruitment programme to bring in the best folk that we could in terms of what was available. It wasn't always possible to get qualified staff. In fact, it was very difficult. You could often get staff who had a bit of a qualification or a bit of experience. It was almost more about the person sitting in front of you in the interview. What kind of person is this, what kind of character do they have, what kind of qualities do they have, what kind of integrity do they have, what are they bringing to the job?
40. I was heavily involved in recruitment as depute for social care staff, unit managers and deputes. As head, I was probably only responsible for appointing Jim Gillespie and then Pauline Smith as heads of care. As time went on, the process became more rigorous, which was a good thing. We started off with the Skinner toolkit from Angus Skinner. Over time, there was more of a requirement to make sure people had

Protection of Vulnerable Group (PVG) checks. The process became more than just sitting down for an interview. It was a question of coming almost for half a day or for a whole day in some cases. They would be given questionnaires and exercises to do on the day.

41. Candidates were required to spend time in the school and spend time with the young people. In fact, there was a period when we actually had the children interviewing new staff as part of the process. That was for care staff. I'm sure it must have been for education staff too, but I wasn't so much involved in that. By that time, we had people to help us with procedures and processes. There was a woman who was a coordinator for the Scottish Vocational Qualifications (SVQ) programme. She would often help with the interview process.
42. As time went on, we were constantly trying to ensure that we got qualified staff, if possible. I don't know that we were ever in a position to make it a requirement because we were then in danger of turning away good people who weren't qualified. In terms of the process and the interview process, we also had to be as fair as possible. It just depended on who applied for posts. All the posts were advertised externally in the press and through S1 jobs and that kind of thing. References from previous employers were obtained. We tried as far as possible to get professional references. If that wasn't possible then we tried to get references that meant something. At the tail end of my time there, we often ended up getting minimal references to say, "This person worked here for two years." You didn't really get much more than that. There was a period when we got much more detailed references. If it was a key post, maybe a management post, then there might be a need to phone the referee and have a chat about something that came up or a query.
43. The backgrounds of the care staff varied. Some of them came with childcare experience. More and more, that was what we were looking for, ideally. Often, staff came from local authority children's homes. They were often useful recruits. Occasionally, staff came from similar type schools but not very often. Occasionally, staff came from the Scottish Prison Service. People with a background in youth work or community work was also quite a good basis for taking people on.

44. There came a point when we wanted qualified staff in middle management posts, but I can't remember when that was. We would insist on that. I think on the whole we were quite lucky to get people who were qualified. They maybe didn't have a qualification in social work, although some of them did. Some of them had the old CSS qualification. Many of them were on the new career pathways, whether that be Higher National Certificate (HNC) or SVQs. That then became a normal route for people to come in.

Supervision/appraisal

45. When I was head of the school, strictly speaking I'm not really sure that I had a line manager as such. As head, oversight, management and governance really came from the board of directors. I suspect that it was the same for Paddy. I was directly answerable to the board and specifically to the chair, with whom the head had close contact. It would be wrong to say that there was any sort of formal supervision in the accepted sense of that word, but there was certainly oversight.
46. As a depute, I wouldn't attend board meetings. Paddy Hanrahan would do that as head. When I took over from Paddy, I followed the same pattern. I would attend the board meetings. I would have fairly regular contact with the chair of the board by telephone, if not in person. The last four or five years of my tenure, the aforementioned Bill Duffy supported me on behalf of the board in a kind of consultancy capacity. That was throughout the time when we moved into the secure unit building, which I think happened in 2013. He was around as an additional support and a liaison person between me and the board. He had a lot of advice and knowledge about the system.
47. When it comes to appraisal, things were different at the start of my time at St. Philip's than they were at the end and they would vary in the middle. That is similar to many areas of policy at St. Philip's that might be of relevance to the Inquiry. When I was depute, there was a kind of ongoing appraisal. It certainly wasn't formalised in the early days. My office was right next door to Paddy's. We saw each other every day and there was a lot of contact. I would get feedback from Paddy, although we didn't have a formal sit-down appraisal. Latterly, that did become a bit more formal but it certainly wasn't at the start. It felt as if we were all in it together and doing our best to improve the service.

48. When I was depute, I was responsible for managing the middle management group and the care team. That included the unit managers and the senior night-care staff. I therefore managed about six people. Sometimes, the time for regular supervision suffered because of time constraints. Supervision was perhaps not as regular as it should have been, but we worked hard to achieve this. Occasionally, inspectors would pick up on that and tell us that we needed to do a bit more. However, in terms of operational contact, I used to meet with them as a team on a weekly basis. I felt that I had quite a strong working relationship with the mid-management group.
49. Eventually, over time, we got more of a structure into the department between the unit managers and depute unit managers. There was a chain of command. I would manage the managers and they would manage their deputies and their staff team. I would hold regular meetings with the managers to discuss how their roles were going.

Policy

50. Along with Dennis Ferrie, I was involved in drafting 'The Essence of St. Philip's'. It was all about the shared values of the organisation and the characteristics that we would expect when it came to behaviour of staff and the treatment of children. I was involved in many policies at St. Philip's. Admissions were an important part of my remit as depute. It was down to me to manage the admissions of children and young people. I felt that it had to be formalised a bit more, the whole business of admitting kids and processing the referral. It was a big part of the job for me. It grew and developed into more than it had been previously.
51. We started holding pre-admission interviews and visits to the school. We would give children and their families a chance to come and talk to us and have a look at the place. I was conscious that the Children's Hearing could send anybody where they wanted and had the authority to do that. However, I had an ethos that if a boy didn't want to come to St. Philip's then I wasn't keen to take him. Part of that admissions process was to enter into a relationship and a dialogue with the boy and encourage him to say yes. They might say that it wasn't where they would choose to be but that they were happy to come and give it a try. I would say that was the basis for how

virtually every placement started. Because of that process, I always felt that I got to know the boys before anybody else did, which was nice.

52. In general terms I would try and cover our systems of behaviour and managing behaviour. If parents were there, they seemed pleased to hear about how we would deal with behaviour and the consequences. As and when the boys were admitted they would learn more about the processes from staff and other children. I can't remember making any specific reference to accessing a children's rights officer. However, I'm pretty sure we covered, in general terms, what access the kids had to additional support and the social workers would mention that too. There was written information given to both children and parents. It was all about what we do, this is how you'll be treated, this is what our expectations are and if you want to come here we'll be happy to have you. We were trying to get them to buy into what was on offer. Very occasionally there was an educational issue for some parents who didn't want their child coming to a Catholic establishment. In such cases, we would support that decision.
53. Everything else just followed on from the admissions process, such as complaints procedures, equal opportunities, recruitment and staff development. The management of challenging behaviour was a really important one for us. We had our own specific ways of working which I think were peculiar to St. Philip's. I don't know that they were practiced anywhere else. For example, we had a system of what we called 'day support', which was for young people who were struggling with or withdrawing from the education programme. They would get support from mainly social care staff but occasionally teachers as well. We had a very stylised way of managing behaviour. We had a 'time out' system. We placed a lot of emphasis on the importance of language. We had a particular system of dialogue which we taught staff to use so everybody would talk to kids in crisis more or less in the same way, with the same words and in the same tone. There was an emphasis on teamwork.
54. The policies and procedures originated in those early days after Paddy Hanrahan became head. They were initiated, introduced and then maybe tweaked and developed along the way.

Strategic Planning

55. I was involved in strategic planning at St. Philip's. There was a period when we tried to write a development plan for the whole school. It would maybe have been every two or three years. It was about moving the place forward, driving policy and practice, taking account of the big picture in terms of the buildings and property. Over time, that tended to get devolved back down the line to individual teams. They would then manage their own development plans, rather than a whole school plan. Any changes we made had to be run past the board of directors. We had a certain degree of autonomy but we couldn't just go and do what we wanted.
56. I'm sure that the potential of abuse featured in strategic planning in terms of overall child protection. Child protection became an evolving issue. In the early days, it was barely on the radar formally. Gradually, as child protection came in policies were developed. In our minds, there would always have been an awareness of the need to take into account those issues. For example, that might have meant changes to residential units, toilet facilities and things like that. We also held training programmes for behaviour management and Therapeutic Crisis Intervention (TCI). It was always there, but I'm not saying that there would have been a heading on each plan that said 'Child Protection' or 'Child Abuse'. It wasn't a tick box, as such, but I would say that it permeated everything at the school.

Training

57. One of the things that we did maintain and that proved invaluable to staff development was an annual staff development training programme. It was my idea to introduce the course because I'd experienced that at the Good Shepherd. I was pushing an open door with the other members of the management team. We were one of the few schools to do that. We did some great work through that over the years. Initially, it was a residential programme. We would take staff down to a place in Dumfries to introduce new concepts, programmes and practices. People were finding it hard to get away from home for two days so we brought it closer to home. We went to a place in Newmains and made it a two day course rather than a residential course.

58. We managed to keep that course going. Sometimes I had to argue with the board of directors, who would ask whether we could afford it and whether it was valuable and worthwhile. I would tell them that it absolutely was. Aside from the practice learning that took place, we brought in some great contributors and speakers. There was learning but there was also the bonding between the staff. It was one of the few times that care staff and education staff were able to get together. It really was invaluable.
59. I wasn't hugely involved in the training of staff. I was from time to time in certain areas. Certainly, in terms of our own systems, I would show them how to use the systems that we had prescribed for them. As time moved on, we had other people assist with staff training. When the TCI system came into place we had a TCI trainer. We also had a training team based in Bishopton at what was called the CORA Learning Training Centre. They took on a growing responsibility for training staff across our sector. By that, I mean St. Philip's, St. Mary's Kenmure, St. John's Springboig and the Good Shepherd Centre, which were the so-called Catholic schools at that time.
60. CORA was a management group who oversaw this group of schools. It was like an umbrella organisation acting under the auspices of the church, albeit each individual school had its own board of managers or directors. The name CORA came from America. Some of the board members went to look at facilities in New York and/or Philadelphia. They were part of a group called CORA, which I believe stood for 'Care Or Residential Assessment'. I think the board members agreed on this name and brought it back.
61. Based in Bishopton, CORA had a training team under a training manager. It started to do work in all of the schools and then formalised the SVQ programme as well under that umbrella. Individuals from CORA would come out to St. Philip's and staff also went to Bishopton for training. Eventually they took on the mantle for SVQ training, child protection and broadband headings, in relation to teamwork and operational issues.
62. As time went on, staff started to get their own personal development plans. Many of these things were gradual over my time at St. Philip's so it's hard to say when this

started or that started. From a basic commitment to staff development, eventually people had their own personal development with staff who managed and looked after that. It became a big thing. Eventually, I did feel that across the board staff were appropriately trained and qualified. Also by the time that TCI was being delivered and people were being trained to the TCI standard, I felt that staff were adequately trained in safe-holding. TCI was formally introduced at St. Philip's around the late 1990s.

Personal influence

63. By the time I became head in 2009, in many respects it was a case of continuing what was already in place. Systems had been built up over a number of years, which appeared to be working. As far as we could tell, they were pretty effective in terms of managing the school, managing the staff, developing the staff, providing as best quality of service to the children as we could. At the time, I felt that it was a fairly seamless change, albeit there was a lot going on externally in the world outside the school. In terms of influencing the school, I'm not sure that I did anything differently than I did as depute. I suppose it's almost inevitable when you reach that point, but the one difference that I do remember feeling at the time was that I was dealing more with external agencies rather than internal issues. I began to feel that I had slightly less contact with the kids and the staff than I had when I was depute. That was just part of the territory.
64. I did feel that I had operational autonomy when I was head, although there were some things that I always had to run past the board. The one area where I didn't have much autonomy at all was in relation to finance. It was very tightly managed. That was partly to do with us inheriting a debt of around £5 million from the secure unit when it was closed. Permission had to be sought for items with a value of more than around £500. Finances were very tightly managed and scrutinised, which was fair enough. In terms of operational matters, I did feel that I had autonomy. I also felt that I was able to choose what the tight budget was used for.
65. When Scotland Excel came into being, procurement became an issue. We had to develop a relationship with them. Scotland Excel was the procurement agency which

I think was set up by the Scottish Government. They laid out a framework through which residential schools in particular had to operate. It was a budgetary framework introduced from about 2012. Any increases in spending on the care of the children or increase in staff salaries, had to be included in the budget and approved by Scotland Excel. There were lots of very difficult discussions early on when that organisation first came on the scene, not just for us but for a lot of other schools as well. They were really trying to keep costs down to a minimum. Our finances effectively came from local authorities who placed the young people. When they placed a young person in the school, they agreed to pay the fee for that young person.

66. From 2012 onwards, money was tight. Budgets were tight. Local authorities were often trying to spend as little as possible. Scotland Excel was an organisation that seemed to be driving that process. That's when it became a bit more difficult in terms of managing finances.
67. In terms of policies, practices and procedures, I don't think that I introduced anything dramatic or significant. I think it was a case of continuing what we were doing and trying to maintain the balance of the school moving forward. The context was that when I had taken over from Paddy Hanrahan in 2009, there was a national debate going on about the relevance of secure care, the appropriateness of it, the funding of it and the provision of it. By that time, we had a secure unit on the campus. Although I didn't have any involvement in the secure unit, I was very conscious of the debate and the ramifications of the debate on St. Philip's open school. I tried to protect the area that I was responsible for from all of this outside noise. Up to a point, I think we did that fairly well.
68. After extensive discussions at government level, it was decided that one of the secure units was going to close. The one that closed was St. Philip's. From my position as head of the open school, I was having to manage the impact of that on staff and children. Although the services shared the same grounds, there was no crossover of staff and children in the open school and the secure unit. The only constant was the board, which managed both establishments, but they were both managed separately and there was no operational contact between the two.

69. When the secure unit closed, I don't know that we fully realised the impact of it until it was made clear to us. We had to absorb its debt and it was going to be very difficult for the open school to survive. A decision was then taken to close the open school as well. That was a hammer blow for everyone. Through 2011 into 2012, we had to accept that we were going to close after about forty years. There was then a consultation process with the staff. People had to be made redundant and we had to start the process of closing the school and moving young people on to other establishments. It really was horrible.
70. Eventually, I think it was at the start of 2012, we came up with a rescue plan. Myself and Dennis Ferrie worked hard to save the school financially. It had to be saved financially before it could be saved physically. We put together a plan and we took it to the board. At the eleventh hour, we managed to get the board to agree to go with our plan and our budget. We had to reduce the numbers and make people redundant. We tried to keep going until we were able to restructure. That was basically what happened. We managed to save the school. That would have been my most notable achievement as head.
71. There was then a whole process of deciding to move from the existing campus to the secure unit building, decommissioning the secure unit building from its previous secure function. We made it fit for purpose as a residential school and then began the process of relocating staff and young people. We almost re-established the school from scratch in a new building with a totally new environment. That was a 24/7 job, but having come through the threat of closure and reached the point where we could at least try and move on, things began to feel a bit more positive.
72. When it comes to what I did personally to ensure that, as far as possible, no child admitted to the school experienced abuse, it's probably more about a whole school approach. What I always did was to try and make sure, in as far as it's ever possible, that systems were in place, that the right staff were in place, that the right staffing ratios were in place on shift, that we had good people working in the establishment, that we continued to do what we'd always done, which was to model good behaviour

for staff and kids, and to treat people with respect and dignity. It was really more of the same rather than anything different.

Living arrangements

73. When I arrived, quite a few of the staff actually lived on the campus, including the headmaster. Bill Kane and his family lived in a flat [REDACTED]. There were also five individual bungalows on the campus, where individual staff and their families lived. I never lived on the campus, but I did stay overnight when I was the on-call manager because of the distance involved in travelling from my home in Bishopton. It felt as if I was working all the time, especially on evenings and weekends. At first, I think I slept in a flat at the back of one of the residential units. There was then a gatehouse, which was converted so I was able to stay there. Many years later, the board bought a house just down the road which was for senior managers who were staying overnight. It would be used by other people, as well as myself.
74. Overnight, we had a waking night care team. They were a separate team from the care staff on duty during the day. For a long time, there was a kind of open door policy in the residential units. People were able to walk in and out and that seemed quite normal. It was a policy of welcoming people into the unit as and when they were visiting the school or wanting to speak to staff or kids. There was never any security on the perimeter of the school. I'm not sure whether the residential units were locked at night, but I like to think that they would have been. Of course, we eventually realised that wasn't particularly good practice. We got keypads fitted on the doors and it became more secure.

External monitoring

75. There was monitoring from the board of managers, who became the board of directors, but it's fair to say that was occasional. They met monthly and they would sometimes walk around the school. I wouldn't attach an awful lot of importance to that. More frequent monitoring came from visits from social workers. They would come to visit

kids who were on their caseload. Social work staff would be on the campus quite often. They would speak to children individually outwith the presence of staff. Within the childcare review system, social workers and others would come for a review meeting, which would be formal and secluded. Separate to that, ongoing contact with social workers wasn't always as frequent as we would have liked. It varied depending on the worker and which team they came from. Broadly speaking, social workers came to visit kids and would speak to them on their own, if not with a keyworker.

76. Up until local government reorganisation in 1996, there was a kind of arm's length responsibility for Strathclyde Region to keep an eye on the school. To be fair, they did do that from time to time. I seem to recall that a couple of people from Strathclyde Regional Council would come out from time to time and check that things were okay. Again, I wouldn't say that it was rigorous but they did hold us to account if they identified concerns.
77. When it came to formal inspections, Her Majesty's Inspector of Education (HMIE) would come in every four or five years to inspect the education provision. They would have done that even prior to my arrival at the school. After the mid-1990s and prior to the Care Commission, there was a period when there was a link with North Lanarkshire who came out to inspect the school. That was the start of more rigorous and formal regulation. The Care Commission started around 2002 and then the Care Inspectorate was introduced further down the line, around 2011. By this time, the practice of joint inspection with HMIE had been introduced every five years or thereabouts. However, the Care Commission carried out inspections at least annually. That was when it became much more rigorous, intense, regular and specific. The reports would be there to document those inspections.
78. We didn't always get advance notice of inspections. Some of them were announced and some of them were unannounced. The inspectors would speak to the children individually and in groups. There was usually a team of about two or three inspectors and they would quite often take a responsibility for a particular section of the school. We always got feedback from the inspectors. We would get verbal feedback when the

inspection was over but before the report was written. Occasionally, they would put things in the report that they hadn't said verbally at the time.

79. By in large, it was a system that I would have to say worked pretty well. It just became the norm. In the early days of inspection and regulation, people were a bit anxious about the inspectors coming. I would say we got to the point that it was the accepted norm. They would come and inspect and take us how we were. I found it quite constructive.
80. I can't recall any specific concerns being raised by inspectors about the way children were being treated at St. Philip's. I'm not saying that there weren't individual queries about something happening here or there or that we could do something better. I'm not saying those conversations didn't take place. What I'm saying is that I can't remember any serious concerns being raised about staff or the organisation or the behaviour of people towards the children. If the inspectors did raise an issue then we would deal with it as soon as possible. We would get the report with recommendations and requirements so sometimes it was more of an insistence to deal with particular issues that needed urgent attention. They would get priority. The way I remember it is that we would work through the inspection reports and make sure that we attended to the issues that were raised. They would then come back the next time and see how you were doing.
81. On the whole, I thought at the time and I think looking back, the inspectors recognised that we were doing a decent job. I was disappointed we never got the top mark in the inspection reports. I think six was the top mark. We got five quite often but I was always looking for six.

Record-keeping

82. When I arrived I do remember seeing a punishment book in my office. It was like a big ledger and a record of so-called punishments from years ago. I don't think I particularly delved into it, looking for stuff. I think it was more a record of sanctions and responses to misbehaviour rather than punishment as such. It was historic and would have gone back to the beginning of the establishment. It's probably still there. The other thing

which might be relevant is that corporal punishment was in schools until the mid-1980s. I would imagine that there might have been reference to that in the punishment book. The book was no longer used by the time I arrived at the school.

83. I don't remember an awful lot about records at St. Philip's prior to my arrival in 1989. I do know that there had been a system of individual files for children. To be fair, there was a system. I do remember seeing old files from the period long before I'd been there. For its time, I think the system for keeping records were reasonably good. There were records about education and care. Each residential unit had what they called a daily diary at that time, which was like a logbook of events. There were previous logbooks stored away. There was a system in place, but we were looking to improve that as time went on.
84. I thought that our record-keeping was pretty good. Again, it developed over time in terms of evidence of complaints, child protection issues, care planning and training. I would say that we had a very extensive system of record-keeping. I have been asking myself whether we actually had a policy on record-keeping. I can't remember and I can't visualise it in my head. I would be surprised if we didn't, but I just can't remember seeing it anywhere. In terms of the reality, I would say that our records were pretty good on the whole.
85. I have a feeling that records were kept centrally in the admin office. I think they were held somewhere a bit more secure than the residential units. Those records contained anything in relation to background reports on admission, the beginnings of care plans, school reports, health records and that kind of stuff. The day to day detail about events, appointments and behaviour would all have been in the logbooks, which were kept in the office of the residential unit. That logbook would cover all the children in that unit. Later on, there may have been a logbook for each child but there wasn't initially.

Day to day running of St Philip's

86. When I was depute I was more involved in the day to day running of the place than when I was the head of the school. As a depute I was around more, involved more

and saw more of the kids and staff. At that time I was more involved in policies and training of staff, taking part in training weekends away.

87. Broadly speaking, I was confident enough that if there was abuse occurring it would have come to light but how confident can you ever be? We tried to be as vigilant. Up to a point I was confident, but you can only put the systems in place that allow for issues to come to light. The practice of giving children a voice, complaints procedures, meetings with key workers and social workers, children's rights officers coming into the school more often, 'Who Cares? Scotland' coming into the school and talking to the kids and adults across the school, being aware of what was going on and what the issues were. I couldn't say for sure that abuse couldn't have gone undetected but we had processes in place to try and prevent it.
88. When I became the head, I had no involvement in the admission of children and had less involvement with them day to day. Paddy Hanrahan had introduced an assembly in the gymnasium every morning and if he wasn't there, one of us would take it on his behalf. When he left, I became responsible for it, or Dennis in my absence. It was a marker for the day. It was a chance for me to meet all the kids, to take stock, see who was there and who wasn't, to have a chat with them, to say a prayer and to make announcements about events that were coming up within the school. I remember it as a nice way to start the day and it was a gathering of everybody.
89. It was my chance to see everybody and I had a practice of counting everyone there as I liked to know how many were in. We were all in the secure unit by that time so I think there were thirty or up to thirty-six residential pupils on the roll. Separate to that, there were a further dozen or so day pupils. Counting them was a bit of a game really, I'd go round and count them all and I'd notice if someone was missing and ask about them.
90. Beyond that my day would be more formal, attending some meetings if required. I would be around the place informally but at that stage in my role, I was often out of the school more than I was in. I'd be delegating to other staff to do the jobs, making

sure they had the equipment to do that. Naturally, I had less interactions with the children.

91. Apart from in a formal review setting where we needed evidence or information, I can't ever remember going up to a child and asking them if they'd been abused. When I was speaking to the children in general, I would be checking in with them, asking them how they were getting on or how they were feeling.
92. Whilst it was a Catholic establishment in name, religion played a fairly minor role. This was further diluted over the years as there became less of a need for it. In the early days before I arrived, there was an expectation that the children would go to church, but I'm not sure whether that was locally or in house. After Paddy arrived and I was there, there was a period where occasionally we would have a voluntary religious service in the school for example, for a feast day or a celebration or if there'd been a bereavement. Initially they were well attended but that tailed off and eventually we did away with them. The morning assembly and prayer at the start of the day was a constant though and that remained throughout my time there.

Discipline and Punishment

93. We never used the word punishment during my time at St. Philip's. The word discipline was seldom used, but as a concept it was always around. There was a need to exercise control and have children exercise their own self-control. After I arrived, the management team started to put together a system of our own for working with children, treatment of children, dealing with children, dealing with situations and dealing with behaviour. That probably became the accepted system of discipline if that's the word you want to use, but we didn't speak about discipline. We spoke about consequences.
94. The thing we really emphasised was 'child-sized consequences'. That was what we were about. Child-sized consequences for misbehaviour and incidents that arose. There was a graduated system of sanctions, if you want to use that word. It was all

child-centred and non-punitive. It was meant to be helpful to children and helpful to staff. It wasn't really a system of discipline as such.

95. We introduced a system of 'time-out'. If children mis-behaved, to whatever level, we would ask them to sit quietly to reflect on their behaviour. That was the concept behind time-out. It was about giving them time to stop and often to move them away from a crisis situation if things were tough. It gave them the opportunity to sit with a member of staff for a prescribed period of time, whereby they would sit quietly and reflect on what had happened. There was then a life-space interview at the end of that to follow up and get them back into the programme.
96. As an example, our practice and our habit was to try and deal with everything that arose, even the smallest of incidents. If a boy was seriously swearing, we would ask him to sit quietly, say for thirty seconds. He had to buy into the system and actually had to ask for it to begin. When we first started using that system, I thought that the kids would never buy into it. However all of them did, almost without fail. If a child started swearing at a member of staff, the member of staff would say something along the lines of, "You've maybe lost control a bit there. I would like you to sit for about thirty seconds. Does that feel okay?" The child would then be asked when they wanted the time to start. The boys could sit anywhere for time-out. They could be in the unit, the classroom or right where it had happened. If it was a bit more serious then we might decide to move them. If, for example, the swearing was more premeditated, we might ask them to sit for a minute.
97. It was a prescriptive system of children sitting, reflecting on their behaviour, for anything from thirty seconds up to thirty minutes. Thirty minutes was the maximum. For something really serious, such as starting a riot, it might be more than that. It was extremely successful and worked really well. The boys bought into it really quickly and it became the established norm.
98. Part of the time-out process was about the conversation. The conversational tone of the member of staff would change. The member of staff might say something along the lines of, "What's coming up for me is that wasn't really like your normal self." He

or she might speak to another member of staff on shift at the time to check about fairness. The member of staff might talk to the child and say that their colleague thought the suggested length of time-out was fair and then question the view of the child. If the child thought that a minute, for example, was too long then there might be further discussion. That was the system that was in place, that was the system that the staff were expected to use and it was in place for years. It worked a dream.

99. Not every single time-out would have been recorded on a child's notes. It could happen ten times a day. If it was a more serious incident then it would be recorded as a serious incident rather than a time-out. I can recall one occasion when some work was being done in the school. The workers had left a JCB on the grounds. One of the boys managed to get into the JCB, to start it up and was driving towards the education block with damage in mind. The JCB ran out of petrol, which was a stroke of luck. More serious incidents like that would be dealt with more seriously, but no differently in terms of tone, response, demeanour, dialogue.
100. We had a system of dialogue where the language was very specific. It was almost like a foreign language, but it was English. We would give the staff what we called sentence stems. One of the most famous phrases almost became like a euphemism for everything that we did. If there was a problem going on in a unit, I would maybe walk in as a senior member of staff and say, "This looks like a bit of a situation. Can I tell you what's coming up for me here?" That was one of the stock phrases. I would go on to say something like, "What I'm seeing here is Johnny's not managing, Jimmy's in the corner and he's not happy, Danny's over there. There's a bit of an atmosphere I'm sensing." You were talking through the situation that had arisen and how it might be dealt with, mostly in front of the kids. It was very prescriptive. Children would be encouraged to be part of that discussion and dialogue as well.
101. That was the system of time-out, dialogue, child-sized consequences, use of language, modelling of behaviour. That was what we expected from the staff team and that's what they did. We insisted on it.

102. The words segregation and confinement jar with me. Confinement implies that someone was locked away somewhere. Nothing like that happened at St. Philip's. Segregation was not used in the sense that you normally use that word, but kids could be moved from A to B to deal with a situation, if it was appropriate. They might have a time-out somewhere else, but they were never alone and without a member of staff.
103. For serious misbehaviour, such as serious violence, there would be child-sized consequences. There would perhaps be a withdrawal of certain privileges or access of movement roundabout the campus. Those incidents would be recorded on the child's records and discussed at any review of the child's care. Eventually, we introduced a system of serious incident reports to record all of that. I think that was in the late 1990s or early 2000s. They were a recognition that something more serious than the norm had arisen, whether it was a violent incident against another boy or a violent incident against a member of staff, damage to property, things like that which were outwith the norm. We introduced a pro forma and it evolved over the years. Initially, they were held in the office of the unit that the boy lived in. I think as time went on a copy of it went into the child's personal file.

Running away/absconding

104. The response to children running away changed over time and rightly so. In the early days, when kids absconded, there seemed to be a practice of them losing home leave as a consequence. That was the practice as I remember it. We very quickly moved away from that. Absconding was an occupational hazard. It happened from time to time. Sometimes it happened a lot and sometimes it didn't happen at all, sometimes it happened infrequently. It would often depend on the boys who were resident and the emotional state they were in.
105. There was a difference between boys absconding from the school because of a situation that arose or something that they didn't like, and failing to return from home leave. We tried to distinguish between the two. In terms of reporting to the police, there wasn't really a difference. The police just saw it as absconding and we were obliged to report it.

106. In terms of sanctions for absconding, we tried to move away from the previous practice as much as possible. If there were particular reasons why we had to act in order to protect the child from himself, then that was considered. We might also attach closer supervision to him to try and prevent absconding. There was a period of time where, if children tried to abscond, the staff would try and prevent them from absconding and would do everything possible to stop them. I can remember situations where I've blocked a door. I'm not saying whether that approach was right or wrong, but as the years went by I think there was an acceptance that children would abscond and you could only do so much to try to prevent them. I'm not sure what the records would show, but it may be that they would show a greater level of absconding from St. Philip's as time went on.
107. If a child was absconding, he would always be asked why he was absconding. The answer was almost always the same. You might be able to get them to say why they absconded and they might be able to talk about the lead up to absconding but you could virtually never get them to say where they had been, what they had been doing or what happened while they were away from the school. It almost didn't matter whether it was a member of staff talking to them, who they had a relationship with, or a policeman coming in from outside to ask them where they had been or what they had been doing. The answer was almost always the same. They virtually never shared that information. It was strange because all the boys seemed to do the same thing. I don't know why that was, but it was almost like a code of conduct.

Restraint/safe-holding

108. Therapeutic Crisis Intervention (TCI) came from Cornell University in New York State around the mid-1990s. Before that, there was no formal position on control of challenging behaviour at St. Philip's, other than people trying to do their best with good intentions. There was no real system and therefore no specific training. I think we were starting to introduce behavioural management systems, underpinned by our value base, before TCI started. The two things then came together. We sent Dennis Ferrie to London to train as a TCI trainer. I think he was one of the first TCI trainers if not in Scotland then certainly in our sector.

109. For a while, TCI was unofficial. We had contact with Cornell University through Dennis and his links. After TCI became accredited, it was a requirement to deliver it for all staff. I seem to recall that the initial TCI training for new staff was a week long course. It took place at the school. Sometimes it might have been spread over two or three weeks, but it was a five day course. The training folder was very thick. When it became formalised and accredited there was a system of measurement to see whether staff were doing it properly. There was an obligation that staff receive ongoing refresher training in TCI in order to maintain the Cornell accreditation. I believe the requirement was that refresher training take place once a year. The annual refresher training did take place and after accreditation it would have been recorded.
110. Even before TCI, our mantra for children was that safe-holding should always be a last resort. We virtually never used the word 'restraint'. Our mantra was underlined when TCI came in. It confirmed that model and that way of practice. It reflected what we had already been doing, which we found encouraging. The whole process of de-escalation of difficult behaviour was the main part of TCI. A lot of people forget that. It was about prevention. Holding was the end of the process and it was only ever meant to be a last resort.
111. As I remember the TCI manual, I think there were five sections to it. I wasn't a trainer so I'm not an expert on it. As I recall it, the first four sections were all about de-escalation. It was only the last section that was about safe-holding. De-escalation was all about trying to lower the temperature, communication, dialogue, interaction. Our system of time-out started to dovetail with the form of systems which were being brought in. That was quite encouraging because it meant that we were doing something right. I would say that a lot of effort went into de-escalation and it was only when things got completely out of control that kids were held.
112. The other system around at that time was CALM technique, which was introduced by someone called David Leadbetter. TCI and CALM were almost in competition with each other. We decided to stick with TCI, although I know that other places adopted the CALM method.

113. After the TCI system was introduced, I don't think I ever restrained anyone. I did in the early days when people weren't having to be accredited. There were a few times when I had to do it, very often because I just happened to be in a certain place at a certain time where an incident was kicking off and a member of staff needed support. That would normally be the background to it. I don't ever remember restraining someone alone. It would have been in the early 1990s. We would do it as best we could and to minimise any harm to the child. Often, the physical act of trying to get a child onto the floor was the most difficult part. They were being held there, very often against their will.
114. When TCI was brought in but before it was fully accredited, there was then the opportunity to use their systems. By that time, Dennis Ferrie had trained as a TCI trainer for us. As time went on, there was the option for one person to hold one child. There was a system for doing that, but it didn't happen very often. It could happen if the child wasn't very big and wasn't very aggressive. By and large, TCI was what they called a 'two person hold', whereby someone would be responsible for the top of the body, the head and the arms, and someone would be responsible for the legs. They would be trying to bring the child down as quickly and as safely as possible.
115. I never carried out a survey or a measurement of this, but my feeling always was that most of the complaints we received from children were in relation to safe-holding. They stemmed from incidents where it didn't go to plan, there was more aggression than normal and/or the child had a grievance against a person because of the way that it happened. I always felt that a lot of complaints and allegations, which then became abusive, arose as a result of those situations where people were trying to do their best and kids just couldn't cope with it.
116. After TCI was put in place and we trained staff to do it, I would say that the system worked fairly well on the whole. It was never pleasant. There was always a life-space interview after the event. The child who had been held would be interviewed and so would the staff who had been involved. That would be the first stage in the process of reintroducing the child back into the programme.

117. In terms of the frequency of boys being held, if you were in the place, working in the place, it could happen ten times a day or no times a day. It could happen in one unit but not another. It could happen with some boys and not with other boys. It just depended on the extent to which kids lost control. If and when that happened, you just went into TCI mode. It happened regularly but it wasn't happening all the time every day.
118. I never had concerns that it was being used excessively. I think that by and large staff worked really hard to de-escalate according to the instructions. I'm sure there must have been occasions when people maybe acted too quickly and jumped the gun. They might have done this if they thought they were protecting the child from getting into a worse situation. There was always a balance to be struck about how far you should let it go before you intervened. That was always a tough one. You can always point to instances of poor practice when things could have been done better, but I have to say that I never saw anything where TCI was being abused as a system or children were being hurt deliberately.

Concerns about the institution

119. I never had any concerns about St. Philip's.
120. There wasn't much solvent abuse other than in the early days. When I was at the Good Shepherd in the 1980s it was an issue, but it started to taper off in the early 1990s. It then just disappeared as an issue.
121. Over the piece, during my whole time at St Philip's we never really had a drugs problem. I think that comes back to the awareness of the staff and the importance of being curious about what's going on with the kids, their behaviour and what they were doing, or might be doing. There were certainly occasional instances of cannabis abuse. We would report incidents like that to the police and hand over the drugs, but it became a less serious issue to them over time.

122. It was occasional and incidental cannabis use and possession, but it certainly wasn't endemic at all. That was the biggest problem that we ever had. I'm not saying that we didn't have kids who had drug issues, but we didn't have a serious drug problem in St Philip's.
123. If a child was found to be using or in possession of cannabis, we'd attempt to find out what was going on, to look beyond the cannabis use and the reasons why they were using a substance. Often it was to do with emotional disturbance, either in school or very often at home. There would be a degree of counselling and referral onto health services, if appropriate, to provide additional support if it was a serious problem. The normal practice, as and when a boy was admitted to the school, was that they would be registered with the local health centre. That became the point of contact for any health issues.
124. I remember being concerned in general about the bullying of children by other children over the years. It was something that never really went away. It wasn't a huge problem but it did happen from time to time. When it did happen, we tried to deal with it as best we could. There was an anti-bullying policy that staff were expected to follow. We'd expect situations like that to be dealt with properly, working with the children who were involved, trying to resolve it as far as possible. Bullying was always there and it was reflective of the children who were there. A lot of them were from damaged homes where bullying was the norm so they were replicating that.
125. One of the changes that I made quite early on was to make sure that the residential units were age specific. When I arrived they were variable in terms of ages, size, behaviour, maturity and everyone was lumped together. I made a point of thinking through what was involved and changed the residential units. We had three units, one was for the youngest children from eleven to thirteen, one for the oldest children up to the age of fifteen or sixteen and then a middle unit for the ones that didn't fit into either of those brackets. There was an attempt to differentiate between the children in terms of need, treatment and behaviour. To some extent that lessened the instances of bullying and that was in place for years.

126. I can think of three instances of an abusive nature that stick out for me. The first one relates to an extract of an email from Alistair Marquis in 2003, 'Extract of SGV-000087073 (pages 43-44) [SGV-001031935], a copy of which has been provided to me by the Inquiry. I do remember the meeting with Alistair Marquis. I don't remember denying knowledge of an inquiry into historic abuse, but if I had known about any such investigation I would have shared that with him. I think I only found out about that investigation subsequent to the inspection. It says that at the time, I was the depute principal head of care and the designated child protection co-ordinator at the school and that during the interview it transpired that neither I nor the staff had formal training in child protection matters.
127. Child protection was just becoming a thing at that time and someone had to take responsibility for co-ordinating things in the school. I took on that role based on my knowledge, experience and practice over the years. I'd never been on a training course to qualify in child protection and that was what I was saying but when I saw that report, it looked terrible like I didn't know what I was doing. I was a qualified teacher and social worker so I had an awareness of child protection issues. As I remember, child protection formed a small part of my social work qualification and even when I did my education degree, child protection was seen as important and noteworthy. At that stage as well, we were only just starting to take on board the importance of training staff in child protection.
128. The extract suggests that I was asked about any current or recent investigations of a child protection nature and I assured him that there were none. Thereafter there's an implication that I kept some information from him after it transpired there was an ongoing child protection investigation. I remember Alistair Marquis and the interview but I can't remember an awful lot of what was said. At the time, and as I remember it looking back now, my memory is that I only found out about the investigation after the event and the inspection. There was an historic incident where a former pupil who was in custody, made an allegation of abuse about staff in the school. Paddy Hanrahan was dealing with it, as head, the board of managers would have had an awareness of it and the police were involved. I only found out about it in the course of the investigation. I didn't know about it at the time. It sounds as though the actual incident

took place before my time there but the investigation was taking place during my time at the school. I therefore didn't have any direct awareness or involvement with it when the conversation with Alistair Marquis took place.

129. My answer to Alistair Marquis was an honest answer at the time. I don't think that Paddy Hanrahan had shared that information with me until after the event or until it was nearing a conclusion. As far as I'm aware, the outcome of the investigation was that it was found to be a malicious allegation. I wasn't involved in the investigation at all. There is no way that I would have tried to deceive an HMIE inspector so I can't have been aware at the time.
130. One other instance involved a staff member, **KMP**. I think it was the early 2000s and he was on the care team, a deputy unit manager, when there was an allegation of physical assault made against him. I think the unit manager was **HWJ**. After the allegation there was some fact finding to establish what the situation was, and the police were involved as well. Because of the potential seriousness of the incident, I had to suspend **KMP**. I think he was the only person that I had to suspend for an abuse related incident.
131. What transpired then was that the person who made the allegation left the school or decided that he wasn't coming back. **KMP** was suspended **[REDACTED]**
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]. I think **KMP** returned to work but left eventually for another job.
132. I had no real concerns about **KMP** prior to that. He was a big outgoing guy who was quite gregarious and an extrovert with the boys. A lot of the kids loved him for that reason. In all honesty, I had no concerns about him. **[REDACTED]**
[REDACTED]
133. The third incident that I can think of happened within the secure unit, which was separate to my unit. **SNR** the secure unit, **KBE**, was dismissed.

He had previously worked at Kerelaw, where there had been a serious investigations into abuse. It transpired that he was on a register of some sort for potential involvement in allegations of abuse at Kerelaw, but it's vague in my head. It must've been after 2006 as that's when the secure unit opened and he was one of the first members of staff there. I think he was maybe in post for a couple of years so it was possibly 2008. I didn't really know him that well but whatever happened or whatever the allegations from Kerelaw were, he was dismissed by the board at St Philip's.

134. Those were the three cases that stuck out for me. Other than those cases, I wasn't ever aware of any external body or agency, or any other person having concerns about the way in which children and young people were being treated at St Philip's.

Reporting of complaints/concerns

135. If a child had worries or concerns there was always the option of talking to someone. Who Cares? Scotland became heavily involved in the school, as did the Children's Rights officers. I don't know that we had a named person for each boy in the school as such. To some extent we almost flattened out the hierarchy in the school so the key worker on the ground had the same authority as the head of the school to deal with a situation in the same expected way. Kids were encouraged and free to go to anyone they wanted, including domestic staff.
136. There was a process for raising a complaint or concern. A complaint was a bit more formal and there was a complaints procedure that was put in place eventually. It was a three tiered system of complaints, from something less serious to something very serious. Individual instances of discontent or unhappiness would just be raised with either a keyworker or another member of staff. The kids would be encouraged to voice their concerns about an issue. It could be something as simple as they didn't like what they had for their tea the night before. Once it got to the level of a 'complaint' we would move into formal mode and it would be recorded.
137. I was aware of children making complaints through external bodies, for example Who Cares? Scotland. By the very nature of that, we would hear about it after the event. Occasionally children would feel that they wanted to speak to someone outside of the

organisation, i.e. Children's Rights officers, social workers, staff in a children's home if they were based in a children's home or family members. If anyone external to our establishment got the complaint first of all then it would come back into us and our complaints procedure would be initiated.

138. It depended on the level of the complaint but as far as I remember, level one complaints were dealt with by the staff, level two by the unit managers and level three by the senior staff. There was a period of time when we were quite happy to do that and the kids seemed happy for us to do that as well as the social work department. There then came a point where it felt as if the more serious complaints shouldn't be dealt with in that way. I couldn't put a date on it, but that was the point at which serious complaints would go to the social work department, at least for a discussion about who was going to deal with it.
139. Depending on the case, the social work department might come back and say they were happy for us to investigate it and report back with an outcome. That was the process for a while, but then that stopped being acceptable. There was then an expectation on the social work departments themselves to pick up the tab and deal with the complaints rather than have us deal with them. We would then wait for social workers to conduct their own investigation, sometimes with police involvement, depending on the level of seriousness.
140. There was a period following that when we tried to get social workers involved more in the investigation of complaints but they didn't seem to have the time or resources to do it and it reverted back to the school doing the investigations again. I think there was then pressure on them again to do their own investigation so we went back to that. It was a bit of a fluid situation that evolved over time but I think I would have been satisfied enough that anything serious would have been dealt with and seen through to a conclusion.
141. Part of the conclusion would be to make sure that the child comes out of it at the other end and has a full and frank explanation of what had happened and what the outcome was. Sometimes they would be happy with that, but sometimes they wouldn't. The

keyworkers would often support the child through that, having built up a keyworker system, investing a lot in giving them the authority and autonomy to deal with things. Rather than having a whole team deal with all boys, each key worker had individual kids for whom they had responsibility alongside individual care plans.

142. The complaints were recorded and for a long time were held centrally in a complaints file. That was done partly to give us a central record of it but also to let inspectors see what had been happening in-between inspections, as they would often ask to see them. I think over time there was a practice where we started to either copy them or put the information in the child's individual file so it was there too.
143. In regard to a child ever making a complaint directly to me about someone or something, I don't recall that happening. The reports generally went to the people on the ground.

Allegations of Abuse

144. I wasn't ever the subject of any allegation of abuse when I worked at either the Good Shepherd or St Philip's. I never had a complaint made against me at any time.

Child protection arrangements

145. Child protection guidance and instruction started almost right at the job interview. It would be raised with potential staff at interview, in terms of the importance of child protection, dealing with children properly and the importance of holding safely. From there, if and when people were appointed, they would go through an induction programme where they would learn about those expectations in more detail, shadowing more experienced staff. It was almost like an apprenticeship in some respects.
146. They were given guidance on how to handle and process reports of abuse. It was part of the whole learning process; clarifying what the expectations were from the

organisation in terms of what they should do if they were concerned about situations. People seemed to pick it up very quickly. There was an expectation that they would buy into it and generally everybody did.

147. The system was very prescriptive in how to respond to complaints of abuse. The managers had an intention of how they wanted the place to work and they were very clear about how it should happen. The behaviour of the staff, the way they treated the kids, the way they dealt with concerns, the way they managed misbehaviour, it was all part of the same package. As people grew into the establishment and the systems, they became more comfortable with it.
148. There was also a mutual appraisal process going on. If a member of staff was unhappy with a colleague and the way they were dealing with a situation or not, then there was an expectation that they would be challenged on it. That often happened in front of the children too. It was all very upfront and open and there was no hiding place.
149. There was a basic definition of abuse within a lever arch file. It grew over the years and contained all policies, procedures and guidance and staff were expected to become familiar with it. There was a definition of abuse and a distinction between sexual abuse, emotional abuse, physical abuse and physical neglect. I can't recall the exact definitions, but they were broad and I remember the word deliberate being there and exploitation of children.
150. That was introduced during my time there. It was quite an onerous task but there was an expectation through induction, staff training and development that staff would familiarise themselves with the policies and procedures of the school. I'm sure each unit had their own copy of the file and they would be quizzed on that from time to time to check that they knew what they were doing and what they were talking about. Those who had more experience would naturally know more, but it was a constant part of their training and the culture.
151. I honestly didn't ever see any staff behaviour taking place at St Philip's that I considered to be abuse of a child or young person.

Investigations into abuse – personal involvement

Care Inspectorate eForms Document, Allegation of Misconduct by Provider or Persons Employed

152. Latterly, after the Care Inspectorate came into being, an electronic notification process about significant incidents was introduced.
153. When this system came in there was debate across the sector about what we actually notify to the Care Inspectorate. People were unsure within the sector about how much to notify and how much autonomy we had. It did eventually settle down by 2013. I think it was the Care Inspectorate that introduced the eForms. My memory over the many years is that most complaints came in regard to safe-holdings that went wrong or didn't go to plan or children being hurt, which they were occasionally. I remember a period when you would often hear about children getting a carpet burn on their face as they were placed in a safe hold on a carpet. It was horrible really because sometimes, believe it or not, they were actually rubbing their face on the carpet almost to aggravate a burn. They were sometimes hurting themselves and that was hard to see.
154. Generally, I wasn't involved in the complaints at all, other than to do the notification as it fell to me as head of the school. Once the system bedded in and people became more familiar with it, I started to hand that responsibility over to staff. The unit managers would have often been directly involved and they would make the notification on behalf of the school.
155. I have been shown a number of Care Inspectorate eForm reports by the Inquiry. I wasn't directly involved with any of them, other than reporting the circumstances.
156. There's a report dated 22nd January 2013 that I don't remember even writing [CIS-000005033]. One of the few times I was off sick was due to losing my son in a road accident in 2012. He died on [REDACTED] 2012 and I was off work until 1st February 2013. When I saw the date, it triggered in my head and I don't think I was there to write that. I think somebody else wrote that but my name was on the electronic form.

157. I do have a vague memory of the others. With notifications like this, there's only the notification. There's no record of the outcome so you wouldn't know what resulted from these reports. That was the system that was in place. The outcome would've been noted elsewhere.
158. There was a report involving a young person [REDACTED] born [REDACTED] 1996, who alleged that he was assaulted by a staff member [REDACTED] [CIS-000005117]. The incident took place on 30th January 2011 and it seems to have been an incident where he was in a safe hold and sustained some injuries to his neck and arm. I have a vague memory of that case as I remember those involved, including Ian McCauley, who was the social work manager in North Lanarkshire. I remember conversations about it. I can't remember how we decided that [REDACTED] should take some time off. He had been moved to another unit on the night in question so immediate action was taken.
159. Normally what would happen then is that we'd have a conversation with the social work department about what had happened and what the risks were, the member of staff involved and what we thought we should be doing. It would be an agreed decision. It was obviously decided that [REDACTED] should have some time off. It looks as though he came back into an admin role, having no contact with children until the matter was resolved. These were decisions that would have been discussed with the social work department and we would've agreed on a way forward. Pretty much in all cases we would consult with the social work department but that was the normal practice.
160. The report from 23rd March 2011 involved the young person [REDACTED] [CIS-000005193]. That one was interesting because he was a day pupil and I didn't have an awful lot to do with day pupils. I do remember having discussions with Sean McGuigan, who was the social work manager, about the case and about what should happen. Even from a distance and having limited knowledge of some of these cases, I'm fairly certain none of them resulted in disciplinary action for staff or criminal proceedings.

161. One of the eForm cases involved a teacher who had been seconded from St Mary's [CIS-000006602]. I think he was a technical teacher or teacher of a practical subject. The secondment was temporarily suspended and I'm not sure how that case resolved itself. He went back to St Mary's but I assume there was no further action as we didn't hear any more about it.
162. In relation to the notification about ██████████ made on 24th November 2014, I remember the incident but I don't recall writing the notification [CIS-000006466]. My limited memory of that incident was that there was a safe-holding incident and in terms of the eventual investigation, it transpired that ██████████'s trousers came down in the course of being held, rather than being pulled down as alleged
163. I would normally write these reports based on the information I was given by staff. The quality of the information that I was getting from the staff varied. Sometimes it would be sufficient, sometimes I would go and check things that were said with them. I wouldn't say that I never went and spoke to the young person, but it wasn't a regular occurrence.
164. I recognised some of the names in the reports but I don't have any real memory of the outcome of the cases and it's not recorded on these forms. If there had been any further action as a result of these notifications, such as disciplinary action or criminal charges, I would have known about that and it would be recorded elsewhere.
165. As I delegated this task to other people I was conscious that there was always the opportunity of misinterpretation. I was always very precise about the use of words and language and vocabulary, especially in the formation of formal reports. The fact that you were giving people the opportunity to report directly to the Care Inspectorate, meant there was always an anxiety about how that was going to look but it was part of the process of delegation. Just as I was leaving, there was a growing list of demands in terms of requirements to notify the Care Inspectorate. I'm not saying it wasn't necessary, but it started to feel a bit onerous and that it could get in the way of doing the job.

166. In the later reports, those after 2013, there is mention of 'triggering a duty of candour responsibility'. It must've been an amendment when they extended the information that was required. I can't remember that phrase being part of the notification but it must have been, as it's on these reports. I don't remember having to think about answering that question and I haven't answered that question on any of the reports I've completed. I'm really confused about where it came from so I don't know what would have triggered a duty of candour responsibility.
167. In some cases there was a referral to the police and that decision would normally be made in consultation with the social work department. Sometimes, depending on the circumstances, social work would involve the police automatically, sometimes they would talk to us before doing it. Sometimes we would talk to them beforehand so there was a consultative process. It would usually involve the young person wanting to elevate it to that level and that was taken into account.
168. In dealing with staff members who were the subject of a complaint, it really depended on the circumstances. We always tried to make the right decision and not jump the gun and take precipitous action, especially when we didn't know the facts. The case that I mentioned about KMP, who was suspended for a whole year, was so unusual and that's why I mentioned it. I can't remember any other case involving a formal suspension.
169. Whilst I have been shown eight forms that cover two years or so, I'd be surprised if there aren't more. I think someone has selected them for a reason. It should be on file how often we were receiving complaints of this nature from children but from memory, it's hard to put a number on it. My sense of it was that as the problems became more complex, and the children became more damaged or had mental health issues, there was a move away from some of the more obvious reasons for residential placement. When it got to that level there were more complaints, but that's just an impression that I got. The work we were doing was becoming more complex.

Reports of abuse and civil claims

170. I wasn't ever involved in any civil claims made concerning historical abuse.

Police investigations/criminal proceedings

171. I mentioned a police investigation that took place into historical matters that I became aware of after the fact and which was highlighted in the email from Alistair Marquis. There were no other police investigations that I was aware of, other than the investigation into **KMP**. There may have been another investigation that didn't result in any criminal proceedings and it was involving night care officers. It would've been in Paddy Hanrahan's time and he would've dealt with it, but I have a vague memory of it being spoken about. It didn't lead anywhere.
172. I haven't ever given a statement to police about the alleged abuse of children cared for at St Philip's. I may have occasionally spoken to the police about individual complaints of assault, but I think it would have been a conversation rather than a formal statement.
173. I wasn't aware of any member of staff who worked at St Philip's being convicted of abuse of children.

Other Staff

HWJ

174. I recall **HWJ**. He was at St Philip's when I arrived and he left before me. I think he left in about 2012 after taking early retirement. I think he had a few health issues.
175. **HWJ** was a good family man and he had good intentions. He was a decent guy with a good heart. He became a unit manager and prior to that he would have been a childcare officer. He was old-school, he'd been at St Philip's way back and I think he

found the move to the secure unit quite difficult. I have a feeling he had a childcare qualification, which was a CSS.

176. I knew **HWJ** fairly well and we had a good working relationship. I frequently saw him working with the children. He was very good with the boys as I remember and a good model for his team. He managed a staff team. I never had any concerns about him.
177. I did see him disciplining the children in line with the safe-holds. I saw him interact with the kids and he was very good at getting down to their level. He was a good solid dependable worker. I didn't ever see or hear anything about him that concerned me.

GXQ

178. I feel as though I should remember him but I'm struggling to put a face to him. The name rings a bell somewhere but I'm fairly sure he wasn't someone I appointed. He may have been a sessional worker but I can't really recall him.

GXS

179. I have a vague memory of **GXS**. I didn't know him as well as **HWJ**. He may have been a sessional worker, that post may even have become a substantive post. I remember him working in the school for a short period of time and then I seem to remember he went off to work somewhere abroad.
180. I think it was around 2005 when our time at St Philip's coincided, for a period of maybe two or three years and then he left.
181. **GXS** was either a sessional worker or a social care worker and both of those roles overlapped to some extent. I wouldn't have had a great amount of dealings with him, other than seeing him about the place. I didn't know him as well as some of the others.

182. I probably did see **GXS** interacting with the children but I can't remember much about that. From what little I know and remember of him, he wouldn't have the experience, knowledge and expertise of some other staff. If he came to the job late and I didn't know much of him, he was probably still learning about the job I suspect. I've got no memory at all of him dealing inappropriately with an incident or anything of that nature. No concerns come to mind and I didn't hear of anything to cause me concern.

Leaving St Philip's

183. I left St Philip's in 2016 after retiring.

Helping the Inquiry

184. If and when adults abused children at St. Philip's without other adults being around, then there is an element of deception and secrecy about it. In that situation you wouldn't necessarily know about it, even if it was happening. The counter to that, if there is abuse, oppression, bullying or forceful treatment then the child in question would potentially be fearful of sharing that information.
185. I'm conscious that it is a changing world that has moved on even since I left. In terms of abuse within a residential placement, one of the things that I would look to have in place would be to have stability. We need to build in the safety nets that are required. We need to have a stable and a safe placement for kids as far as possible and that is something we should always be moving towards. Unfortunately, a lot of placements break down, some very quickly or others over a period of time. You end up with children being moved around different placements and that doesn't help. I would include stability of staffing in that too, building relationships between the children and staff.
186. The very first in-service course that I did was at Langside college and I was 26 or 28 and learning the ropes, listening to the nuns and following good advice. I was given an exercise to do where I had to write an essay on something like: 'In a residential

establishment, the needs of the children are more important than the needs of the staff. Discuss'. I thought that was pretty self-evident. My point is, the whole environment and the way that the place is set up and the way that it operates should be geared towards the children and not the staff. Some staff found that difficult, as we started to introduce new systems and procedures. It was about making sure that we were child-centred and not staff-centred. Staff have a role to play clearly but it has to be based on the needs of the kids.

187. We were very lucky that from 1990 to 2010, the turnover of staff that we had was certainly very small compared to other establishments and local authority homes. We were able to bring in people, develop them, hold onto them. If you've got that, you have a chance.
188. There needs to be good professional support overall for everyone. Over time at St Philip's, we started to bring in consultants for the senior management team. We had a Canadian man who worked for Barnardo's and I think had worked at Craigerne in the Borders. He was a very wise, learned, skilled practitioner and he came in almost as a consultant to the senior management team. Occasionally he would also do bits of work with the children. He had to move on and we replaced him with a female psychotherapist. She was a very good support to the senior management team and supported kids in certain difficult situations. We also had the services of a psychologist through the CORA network who spent at least one, sometimes two, days a week in the school supporting senior managers or working with some of the staff teams around issues with particular children. That kind of support coming in to help boost what is already there makes a difference and is important.
189. Having good training and recording systems is important. Keeping records as best you can but always in the knowledge that there is no failsafe system. You do your best by recruiting good people, training them well and making sure that your intentions are clear. If you have the right people in charge who then bring in the right staff and get them to behave in the right way, it works well. That's what we did, by and large, at St Philip's.

190. I'm not saying St. Philip's was perfect but I think we did have a good reputation with government, education and social work departments. I loved working there. It was a privilege.

191. 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.....

7th August 2024

.....