

Scottish Child Abuse Inquiry

Witness Statement of

Duncan WYLIE

1. My full name is Duncan Richard Wylie. My date of birth is [REDACTED] 1949. My contact details are known to the Inquiry.

Qualifications and work history

2. I have a BSc in Geography from the University of Edinburgh (1968-71) and a PGCE from Moray House College of Education (1971-72). I was registered with the General Teaching Council. I worked at Loretto School for thirty five years and I had various roles during this period. I worked as a teacher, Head of Department, Assistant Housemaster, Housemaster, Director of Personal Social and Health Education and Child Protection Coordinator. During my teaching career I completed numerous Child Protection seminars and training and I also completed a counselling course.
3. I worked as a geography supply teacher at The Edinburgh Academy from 2007 to 2008, covering a maternity leave.

Loretto School, Musselburgh, Edinburgh

Work role

4. I worked at Loretto for thirty five years so many of my answers pertain to a certain time or times and, as there were major changes in the school over that time, it is sometimes impossible to be accurate over a long timescale.

5. I started working for the school in 1972. I worked as a teacher from 1972 to 2007; an assistant Housemaster from 1972 to 1975; a Housemaster from 1983 to 1994 and a Head of Department from 1980 to 2007. I was a Child Protection Coordinator from 1995 to 2007 and PSHE Director from approximately 1994 to 2007. I also coached a number of sports throughout my entire period at the school.

Recruitment

6. A friend who was a member of staff at the school mentioned to me that there was a vacancy. I was looking for my first job so I applied for the role by writing an introductory letter and I was subsequently invited for an interview. I was interviewed by the Headmaster, Rab Bruce-Lockhart, and was offered the job.
7. I cannot remember whether I provided references. I was required to have a knowledge of my subjects and a willingness to coach sport. I have no knowledge of any checks being carried out to ascertain whether I was suitable to be working with children. I was not provided with a reference when I left the school as I was retiring.

Professional registration

8. I was a member of the General Teaching Council for Scotland but that was not compulsory at Loretto at the time.

Initial impressions

9. I found the school to be small, welcoming and it had good children. It had great accommodation, it was well organised and there was a very sporty atmosphere.

Structure

10. The school had four boarding houses which all accommodated only boys. There were sports fields, a gym, a library, squash courts, tennis courts and a sanatorium.
11. The school had twenty five members of teaching staff comprising of a Headmaster, a Deputy Headmaster, Heads of Department, four Housemasters and four Deputy Housemasters. There were ancillary staff including a Bursar, administrative staff, Matrons, the Sanatorium Sister, an accountant, cleaners, kitchen staff, maintenance staff and a Clerk of Works.
12. The Headmaster was in overall charge of the school. However, there was leadership at the different school levels and in the boarding house environment.
13. I was ultimately accountable to the Headmaster but I was accountable to others depending on the role I was fulfilling at the time.

Pupils

14. There were approximately 285 pupils at the school when I started working there and these were all boys. The age range of the boys was thirteen to eighteen and pupils tended to remain at the school for five years. There was a pupil to staff ratio of 11:1.
15. Over the years there was an increase in pupils' numbers to in excess of 300, including the intake of girls and the induction of day pupils. This resulted in a large increase in teaching staff, administrative staff, Learning Support and the introduction of a Design and Technology Department which has since gone.

My work

16. I started teaching junior science, chemistry and biology up to O- level in the science department and geography part time but I was Head of Geography for most of my career. Subsequently I was appointed Child Protection Coordinator and Personal Social and Health Education Director so I had an office within the main administration block.
17. I also was a Head of Department, organised School Hockey (all fixtures Umpires, coaches, staff and equipment) for two terms out of three. I coached the 1st XI of both boys and girls and I did the same for School Squash.
18. The frequency of contact that teachers had with the Headmaster usually depended on their seniority. As a junior member of staff I had little contact although the headmaster at that time. Rab Bruce-Lockhart, was passionate about squash and as I coached it I played against him and also went on a coaching course with him and so we had time for informal chat.

My responsibilities

19. I had the usual Head of Department responsibilities which were for exams, curriculum, satisfactory teaching outcomes, coordinating staff, reviews and organising fieldwork. I had responsibility for all the juniors who studied geography and about thirty sixth formers.
20. In 1986 I founded the Red School Diary which the headmaster, David McMurray, agreed to try and better organise the daily routine of pupils. This diary subsequently incorporated school policies like anti-bullying to better inform every pupil.
21. My responsibilities as PSHE Director included writing the programme, arranging staff, coordinating outside speakers and the occasional teaching of PSHE. I had responsibility for the whole school.

22. I was appointed Child Protection Coordinator in around 1995 as The Children Act had made it necessary for schools to create this post. I was already in charge of PSHE and so was well placed to add this job to my work. My responsibilities as Child Protection Coordinator were training staff, arranging for the outside training of staff, interviewing pupils in relation to bullying, liaising with the Headmaster, Housemasters and, in some cases, parents and all matters related to Child Protection.
23. I had responsibility for the whole school. I provided the policy documents and contributed to the school handbook as required for my pastoral roles. In addition I organised and ran parent seminars during one evening per term featuring one aspect of PSHE teaching and the programme their children were following. Outside speakers were invited on occasion. I also ran a Sex Education Consultation Committee including parents, Governors and staff prior to drawing up a sex education programme to be delivered to pupils during their PSHE classes.
24. I was the first Child Protection Coordinator at Loretto but in addition was Head of Department and coached sports three or four times per week throughout the year as well as designing the PSHE course from scratch and running the programme both school based and a series of outside speakers. I also organised the School Counsellor and liaised with him or her on a regular basis.
25. I ensured relevant policies were made known to the pupils. I also introduced a risk assessment policy and associated forms for all formal travel to and from the school for theatre trips, field courses, history trips and suchlike. They were written into a policy document and available in the Common Room. Every time a school trip was taken outside the school, a form had to be filled in with regard to the risk assessment. It was then handed to me to sign off on the trip. The forms were then filed. A trip abroad or lasting overnight and involving residential stays was particularly lengthy. A Geography field trip to Iceland required me to visit prior to the school trip to assess risk.

26. I appointed a Counsellor and liaised with him and his successors.
27. I cannot be sure of individual measures and when they were introduced but a bullying policy was an important part of my job as was training the staff in school as to appropriate and inappropriate behaviour towards pupils. I invited Dr Sue Hamilton from Lothian Region to give us an annual daylong seminar to staff to train them in Child Protection policy and behaviour.
28. I was supervised by the Director of Studies, staff review system, exam review, HMI inspections and ultimately the headmaster plus Care Commission Inspectors.

My responsibilities as Housemaster

29. I looked after over seventy boys with some help from an Assistant and a Matron. In addition a visiting House Tutor would come in on a weekly basis to do duty. The role meant working hours of 7am to 11pm often for fourteen days running, Chapel being compulsory on a Sunday. It was an arduous job looking after seventy pupils but I was ably supported by my wife. The Deputy Headmaster could be informally approached for support or, more formally, the Headmaster. The Housemasters tended to form their own support group on an informal basis and formally during a weekly meeting.
30. In my time as Housemaster, the four Housemasters, Deputy Head and Headmaster were consulted on a regular basis and formed a Management team.

Induction and training

31. When I started my role at the school, I was given talks and tours by the Headmaster and the Heads of Department who covered safety in labs and other related matters. I was not given any specific training. I started off as an assistant geography teacher in a two person department so no role explanation was needed.

32. I was not required by the school to attend any training. It was left to me to organise and attend meetings which I deemed necessary for my ongoing employment at the school. Ongoing Geography training was usually at least annual attendance at an exam meeting in London. These were a major help in organising paperwork, arranging protocols, interviewing pupils, writing policy documents and purchasing the best textbooks. I also travelled to Iceland prior to a field course to enable risk assessment. I always attended geography field courses run by an outside agency to ensure the right standards were met and to make sure that the pupils were well looked after.
33. With regard to my roles as Child Protection Coordinator and PSHE Director, I attended training courses and consulted staff with similar responsibility in similar schools, especially in the Edinburgh area. No one at Loretto had any experience when I started this role. I was not given any training in child protection or safeguarding until I occupied the roles myself.
34. I attended seminars arranged by Dr Sue Hamilton in the Lothian Region and Edinburgh City Council and SCIS, who provided regular training courses. I invited her because she was an excellent presenter and very knowledgeable on Child Protection. I assume she worked for Edinburgh Council or Lothian Region Child Protection but could be wrong. She also presented on behalf of SCIS. I did not receive any formal qualifications from these, but would have received attendance certificates.
35. We set up a cooperative with three other fee paying schools in Edinburgh to help with resources and information and we met once a term. These schools were St George's, Merchiston Castle and Edinburgh Academy.
36. My Housemaster, in my role as Assistant Housemaster, did his best to brief on House routines and general ethos.

Contact with children

37. I was an Assistant Housemaster (House Tutor) so I lived at one end of a boarding house in a modern flat. The children were all around.
38. During my tenure as Assistant Housemaster and Housemaster, I had extensive contact with children. Out with this I had contact with children while I was coaching sport. This contact would have taken place in the squash courts, on the outside pitches and on buses while travelling to and from matches. This contact would have taken place about three times a week and this did not change throughout my period at the school. When I was Housemaster I had access to the boarding houses at all times and after that I would generally tell the Housemaster when I was visiting but I was never refused access.

School routine for children

39. As Housemaster from 1983 to 1994, I was responsible for the new pupils. The Headmaster allocated the pupils to their boarding Houses. The pupils, who were almost all boarding, were dropped off at the start of term at their designated House and taken to their dormitory by their parents who then had a cup of tea with my wife and me and chatted informally for however long they needed. The new pupils later came to our house for refreshments and a talk. Usually there were twelve or thirteen new boys and they were put in the same dormitory and monitored as much as possible over the next few days and weeks, both by my wife and me and by the prefects.

Mornings and Bedtimes

40. The children got up in the morning at 7.15am. They washed, dressed, attended assembly, had breakfast and then went to lessons.

41. Prior to bedtime the pupils had assembly where the Housemaster, the Assistant Housemaster or the Tutor checked the names and whereabouts of every pupil, gave a small talk, read out notices and said a prayer followed by the dispensing of pocket money. After that they had to wash and go to bed. Any pupil out late for a valid reason was required to report to a member of staff on their return. The pupils were free to get up during the night to use the bathroom.
42. The Housemaster, Assistant Housemaster and Matron all stayed in the boarding house and could be woken during the night if there was a problem with a pupil.

Clothes and shoes

43. The pupils wore an informal uniform. They wore a sweater, grey trousers and black shoes and they did not wear a tie. This was worn at all times during formal school time unless playing sport or at Sunday Chapel when kilts, jackets and ties were worn. The clothes were sent to a laundry by Matron and the pupils were responsible for cleaning their own shoes.

Mealtimes

44. When I first taught at Loretto, meals were eaten in allocated 'family groups' at long tables which were in the format of a sit down meal. During approximately the last twelve years of my time there, the meals were taken self-service using a cafeteria system. The pupils ate in the dining room and I ate my lunch with the pupils but I had my other meals at home. Latterly a member of staff would be present in the dining room for evening meals.
45. I have no knowledge about any action taken regarding pupils if they did not like or finish their food. They supplemented their diets by buying food in town so may not have eaten much during mealtimes.

Washing and bathing

46. The pupils washed when they got up in the morning. They used shower rooms on a daily basis and bathrooms, known as tubrooms, on a weekly basis. There were no restrictions regarding how often they washed and they were not supervised while they did so.

Sleeping arrangements

47. The pupils slept in dormitories which accommodated four to sixteen boys. The dormitories had single beds, wardrobes and bedside cabinets. The sixth form boys had single study bedrooms.

Bedwetting

48. The House Matron dealt with any bedwetting issues and would liaise with me if there was an ongoing problem and possibly counselling was required.

Leisure time

49. The pupils could play many sports in the school grounds and they could also play table tennis or watch television in their boarding house. The pupils generally played without adult supervision but occasionally I or one of the other teachers would referee a football match or participate in a game of table tennis.
50. The pupils were allowed to leave the school grounds but this was restricted to certain times during the day and week.

Personal Possessions

51. The pupils were allowed to have personal possessions at school with them and the older the boy, the more they had. Some had bicycles, for example. I gave out pocket money to those who requested it when they were chatting prior to lights out.

Trips/holidays

52. Trips depended on which subjects the pupils studied and on which year group they were in. To bond with the third formers, my wife and I took them to a hotel near Eyemouth for the night where we played games on the beach.
53. There were many trips to museums, cinemas, theatres, a ten pin bowling alley, Murrayfield and other places. The pupils were accompanied by as many members of staff as were necessary and sometimes Matron would also attend. I attended most of these trips where I would be in overall charge.

Religious instruction

54. When I first arrived at the school there were two chapel services every Sunday but this subsequently reduced to one. These were conducted by the resident chaplain and the services were generally Episcopal. My wife took a small group of Catholic boys to the local Catholic church on Sundays. An occasional pupil was Muslim or Jewish so attendance at chapel was not mandatory for them but the services were considered to be multi-denominational and okay for all. If a pupil did not want to participate, on occasion alternative worship was arranged but the pupil would stay in the boarding house for that hour on a Sunday. A prayer was said every evening in the boarding house.

Health

55. Any minor health issues were handled by Matron and there was a daily doctor's surgery for more serious cases. The school also had a resident nurse. Latterly the

pupils attended the local doctor's surgery rather than the doctor attending the school. All health records were kept in the Medical Centre in the school.

56. I have no knowledge of any health checks but immunisations were kept up to date and, as the doctor attended every day, the health of the school was very good. There was a sick bay within the school where pupils who were ill could spend time if required including overnight stays. If a pupil needed to go to hospital, they would be referred by the doctor and taken by Matron or the school nurse.
57. I have no knowledge of pupils attending the dentist but this would have been arranged by Matron in liaison with the pupil's parent or guardian.

Sport

58. The pupils had organised sports activities on three or four afternoons a week.

Chores

59. The pupils did not do any manual work except on occasion the odd pupil might help Matron sort out a laundry return as all laundry was sent away.

Birthdays and family contact

60. Apart from wishing the pupil well, nothing was organised on a House basis.
61. The pupils had visits from parents, siblings, the friends of parents, Godparents and others. These visits usually took place on weekends or during free time. There were few restrictions during non-organised activity. Many parents would support their children playing sport. The pupils went out at weekends to visit parents or other family and parents and friends were encouraged to visit the school. Other people could visit but only with the pupil's consent and knowledge. I am not aware of a visitor's book being kept and, as a Housemaster, I did not keep one.

Internal monitoring

62. The Headmaster had overall charge of monitoring as well as Care and Welfare Inspections. The Housemasters had a weekly meeting with the Headmaster and the Deputy Headmaster. These were business meetings discussing the week ahead, any possible policy changes or a problem that had arisen and required a discussion. Pupils or staff were never or hardly ever discussed on an individual basis. The Bursar was not involved in these. A full record or minutes were taken by the Deputy Head and full minutes should be available in the Central Office. There was an AOB section where anybody could raise an issue. As far as I know the meetings continued. The Bursar was approachable on an informal basis for any particular reason and often was consulted, mostly about School fabric.
63. Checks varied and were mostly informal for example the Headmaster lived at one end of my boarding house and on his way to and from work would often walk through the house.
64. The health of the house was the concern of the Housemaster. The pupils were spoken to in groups and individually. If there was any feedback pertinent to a member of staff then they were informed but usually with the permission or knowledge of the pupil. The staff would be consulted to ensure that the 'problem' or reason had been resolved. This referred to problems with a pupil for example a pupil being bullied that was noted by staff. I would follow up to check the matter had been resolved.
65. In addition, each boarding house had a Head of House who was a senior pupil most suitable for the task of doing that role. The Head of House was selected by me as the prefect most likely to fulfil the role required.
66. I was responsible for ongoing checks on Matron and my Assistant Housemaster (but not pre-employment checks). I had overall responsibility to see that the pupils in house were getting the best possible care and part of this was to check that the

persons mentioned were doing their job. I had weekly meetings with the Matron and saw the Assistant Housemaster more frequently. The Matrons I worked with during my time at Loretto were Helen Philip, Mrs Mitchell, Mary Stevens, Diane Pringle-Taylor and a lady called Nina whose surname I can't recall.

Discipline

67. The Headmaster generally handled the disciplining of staff. Staff would raise a grievance through the Headmaster or the Deputy Headmaster. I was not aware of individual grievances.

External monitoring

68. This was carried out initially by HMI and from 1997 by the Care Inspectorate. Care and Welfare Inspections were undertaken in 1999, being followed up in 2001. Also in 2006 The Inspection was carried out by David Martin, HM Inspector, and Trudi Reid, Care Commission Inspector, all of which can be found on the internet. In 2005 an HMI Inspection covered some aspects of pastoral care. Care inspections generally involved the whole school and Her Majesty's Inspectors looked at specific subjects. They spoke to children both in groups and individually and staff would have been present on occasion. All necessary steps were taken to rectify any points of concern raised in the Care Commission Reports. The pupils were interviewed often during the Care Commission inspection and often during the rest of term to iron out problems and to ensure the smooth running of their lives and the routine in the boarding house.
69. The Care Commission spoke to me at length in my role as Child Protection Coordinator and they gave feedback. (See Appendix 1) This was a useful 'benchmark' for my work as Director of PSHE and also in Child Protection.

Siblings

70. Some siblings lived together and some lived separately, depending on the wishes of the parents but they could see each other at all times when not required for formal school events.

Access to children

71. All staff members had access to children and visitors had access, with the knowledge of a member of staff. Members of the community would liaise with pupils regarding various matters, for example Musselburgh Sailing Club and Community Service. This could happen on a one to one basis but almost always with Sixth Form only.
72. Prior to Disclosure Scotland there may have been informal checks by the Master in charge of the activity, for example the Chaplain organised community service, to make sure members of the community were suitable to be with children. Prior to Disclosure Scotland I have no knowledge any checks were made although there was almost always a member of staff in charge of any activity who would monitor the situation, for example the Master in charge of sailing. The safety of children was protected as carefully as the staff could, depending on practicality and time constraints.

Records

73. There was no written or unwritten policy, guidance or instructions given by the school regarding the keeping of records. Academic records were kept by Heads of Departments and Director of Studies in the school office. Pastoral records were kept by Housemasters in their houses and by the Headmaster in the school office. In my boarding house I kept all records locked in my study and once I had taken on the

role of Child Protection Officer all records were kept locked in my office within the school administration block.

74. As a Housemaster I kept numerous records from punishment books to pocket money books to interviews. Every pupil had a file kept in the boarding house which was amended and added to as was necessary. Each Housemaster kept a punishment book and the books would be kept until they were finished. Providing the child remained in the school they were preserved and locked in my office in House.
75. As Child Protection Coordinator all interviews, incidents and the bullying book were kept by me within the Child Protection Coordinator office. The book was loose leaf and was kept locked in the office I used for PSHE and Child Protection. It was a continuing record and I left it in place when I left.
76. I introduced the bullying book and invited staff to report all incidents, however trivial, to me so as to detect patterns of behaviour. Careful notes were taken covering all reported incidents and follow up procedures were also noted. I made sure protection measures were printed for staff and pupil consumption in the school diary so that guidelines would be clear to all. The bullying book would contain details of the child being bullied, the perpetrator, the nature of the bullying, the date, the time and the person reporting it. The follow up was also recorded.
77. Such records were written as soon as possible after the event and often transcribed from notes taken or, as was often the case, the notes taken at the time of interview were used. The purpose of keeping these notes was to note patterns of behaviour and hopefully to make life for certain pupils easier and more pleasant. This book was submitted to and read by the Care Commission in their Reports dated 1997 and onwards.
78. As a Housemaster my Assistant would be given access to the records as would the Headmaster, if requested. They were read when the occasion demanded as certain pupils may have been discussed during my weekly meeting with the House Matron.

79. As Child Protection Coordinator the records would be accessed by persons I deemed necessary to the ongoing health and welfare of a particular pupil. Sometimes these were of a highly confidential nature and very few, if any, other staff would have had access. When I left the school I left all records to my successor. I am unsure but I think Elaine Middlemass took over these duties in her role as Deputy Head.
80. Generally records were kept within the school office although their nature probably varied depending on who was compiling them at the time. All records relating to punishments, visitors and inspections were kept by the Housemaster or the Headmaster. The Admissions department would keep records specific to admissions and health records would be kept in the Sanatorium. In pre-computer days these records were all handwritten but gradually they became more computerised. As Child Protection Coordinator I kept mostly written records. These were stored either in a locked cabinet in my study in the boarding house or in a locked file within the Child Protection Coordinator's office.
81. All records were destroyed when a pupil left the school unless I deemed them important enough to be kept by the school in the central office. I handed my child protection records to my successor so I have no knowledge of where they are now. The same book was used by me from its inception to my leaving. As it was loose leaf individual pupils could have their records removed when they left school.

Discipline

82. Methods of punishment changed hugely over my 35 years at the school. For example, corporal punishment stopped around 1990, I believe. When I first joined in 1972 caning was permitted by prefects on younger boys but this stopped soon afterwards, perhaps in 1976. The punishments were in line with other schools and ranged from various forms of lines to gating to suspension to expulsion. Any member of staff could issue lines, a Housemaster could issue a gating but suspension and expulsion were the Headmaster's remit.

83. There was also a form of punishment called 'wake ups' where a pupil had to wake up a prefect of another house which involved getting up a little earlier than usual. An early punishment was the sending up on a run of a pupil to Fa'side Castle and back. On non-rugby days whole school runs were sent to Fa'side for fitness purposes. Also in those days 'lines' the form of 'maps' where maps of countries had to be traced and forty or so place names written out in place. Detention was also used, usually for academic reasons and pupils could be sent to the Headmaster for various offences.
84. No one person was responsible for discipline but the ultimate responsibility lay with the Headmaster.
85. Written rules of conduct were all written out in the Red School Diary which was issued to every pupil at the beginning of term and all sanctions were included in the diary. I cannot recall where the rules were prior to the introduction of the Red School Diary.
86. Punishments depended on the type of behaviour. For example shoplifting, bringing drugs into school or having sex on the campus might result in expulsion while getting drunk in Edinburgh might mean a gating for a few days. A form of lines might be issued for rowdy behaviour, disrupting prep or disruptive behaviour in dormitory. Rudeness, poor behaviour or fighting were seldom seen but would result in a similar sanction.
87. Before corporal punishment was banned pupils could be caned by prefects and any member of staff. Pupils were caned on their fully clothed bottoms, a maximum of six strokes and a minimum of one stroke, with a cane which didn't have knots. It caused varying degrees of pain but no lasting physical damage to my knowledge.
88. When I became a Housemaster in 1983 the system in place was that if an accumulation of 'maps' totalled twelve then the pupil would receive the cane and then the maps would be reduced to zero and the whole system started again. However, I determined that no child in my House should be given a physical

punishment so my options ranged from the writing of lines to gating. In my House twelve maps resulted in a gating for two or three days. The map accumulation was recorded in the House punishment book. Other staff members used the sanctions available to them depending on the offense. This varied depending on the staff and the offence.

89. All canings were recorded in a book held by the Headmaster and other punishments were recorded on a House by House basis. I can only speak for my House where I recorded all sanctions.
90. I would describe the culture of the school as being a well behaved environment where all pupils knew where they stood in relation to sanctions.

Prefects, Peer Discipline and Fagging

91. There was a prefect system in place when I arrived at the school although inevitably some prefects had to be corrected on their over robust use of power. Some prefects were admired but some were feared. Some prefects gave out punishments either unfairly or too often to junior pupils. Prefects were allowed to punish other pupils by caning, giving them lines and sending them on runs or wake ups. The issuing of lines was recorded by the Housemaster and the caning of any pupil was recorded in the Headmaster's punishment book. Any sanctions would be recorded immediately and certainly on the same day.
92. The Headmaster was ultimately responsible for all sanctions but Housemasters were responsible for the prefects within their Houses. As best the Housemaster could, he would counsel and organise the prefects and organise their discipline routine. Most punishments handed out by prefects were recorded by the house staff although I cannot recall wake ups as being recorded by House staff. Inevitably, especially before 1976, pupils were given too severe a punishment for too minor an offence for example junior pupils walking on a piece of grass which was deemed to be hallowed

turf, allowed only to be walked on by sixth form. I am unsure what the punishment was.

93. The prefect system gave prefects power over all those pupils junior to themselves although in practice this was third, fourth and fifth form. School prefects could sanction school wide and House prefects could sanction House wide. Prefects were selected by the Headmaster or Housemaster as being the most responsible, mature, trustworthy and generally fitted to the tasks they had to perform. They were generally looked up to by the pupils as they were often very competent at sport or in academia. School prefects were selected by the Headmaster.
94. Each boarding house had a Head of House and there were a small number of pupils in their final year who were House Prefects. This was a less senior position than School Prefects who were appointed by the Headmaster but still remained in House unlike the Head of School who resided in School House in a special bedsit.
95. I understand fagging to mean where an older pupil would ask or coerce a younger pupil to do tasks for him. This didn't happen on a formal basis in Loretto and it was never an official part of Loretto's ethos but it did go on in an informal way pre Child Protection although it was not tolerated by staff. Child Protection Policies, post 1995 and to the present day, would not tolerate it and so any fagging or similar incident was dealt with if and when it came to my attention. I would strongly counsel the pupil against it. It may have merited an entry in the Bullying Book to note repeat behaviour.
96. Inevitably an older pupil might ask a younger pupil to buy him a pie or a lemonade in Musselburgh and the older pupil would pay. This was not permitted by the staff and where they saw it they would or should have taken the older pupil to task. I have no knowledge whether fagging still occurs at the school or when it may have stopped.
97. After 1976 the school became gradually more civilised as the years progressed. This was as a result of pressure from society, staff and parents but the Headmaster ultimately determined the ethos of the school. Loretto was a small school which was

very Headmaster centric. The Children Act of 1995 ensured everything was much more formalised and accountable.

Abuse

98. When I first started at the school bullying was in a much more institutionalised form with older boys keeping younger boys in their place. Bullying was more prevalent and the school was a difficult environment for the more sensitive pupil. As a young, inexperienced member of staff it seemed to me that a pupil who was a reluctant sportsman or was more interested in art or music than rugby and generally more introvert by nature was less able to fit into Loretto's ethos. This was just part of life in that era.
99. Almost all abuse of pupils took the form of bullying by one or several pupils on another. This was often done to establish a pecking order within the school or House. This abuse could happen at all times of the day when pupils were not supervised by staff and generally one pupil would be insulted, teased, ignored or excluded from a friendship group. On a few occasions a pupil could be physically abused. This was mostly done out of staff hearing or knowledge. If brought to staff attention then they would deal with it as best they could. The bullying was dealt with whenever staff witnessed it or it was referred to the Housemaster or Headmaster to deal with.
100. After the Child Protection Coordinator post was created the handling of bullying became much more formalised but still needed to come to staff attention for action to be taken. I am sure bullying of a very minor sort went on somewhere in the school on a daily basis. Any abuse I became aware of was reported to me by a prefect, a member of staff or Matron. Some pupils reported abuse to me but sadly not enough.
101. There was a general ethos of NOT telling 'tales' in line with most groups of individuals and, in the main the pupils would sort out their problems themselves. Telling tales on one's classmates was not liked then as it would not be liked now.

Loretto certainly did not encourage such behaviour and it gradually became more open and inclusive as time went on, girls and day pupils helping to encourage the openness. Any bullying or abuse that I heard about would be followed up to a conclusion either by counselling the perpetrator or by sending them to the Headmaster as the ultimate sanction.

102. Every case was different and other staff may have known what was going on in some circumstances. I am sure some pupils needed medical attention after they had been abused on occasion but I cannot recall a specific incident except the stabbing incident referred to below. All medical records were kept in the Sanatorium. Sadly, in my opinion, the caning of boys on boys in the early days pre 1976 was abusive and sending pupils on a run to Fa'side was an arduous task for a less fit pupil. Nowadays the caning of pupils by staff is rightly considered abusive and is prohibited.
103. I don't now remember any specific incidents of abuse although I do recall one incident where a pupil was stabbed. This happened in around 1992 when a boy in Seton House was provoked or teased by another boy and then used his penknife to stab the boy who was provoking him. The boy who was stabbed was called [REDACTED] [REDACTED] I don't recall the name of the boy who did the stabbing but he was expelled.
104. I am asked about whether I recall an incident which involved third formers in the gallery in Pinkie House in the late 1990's but I was not in Pinkie House in the late 1990's so I don't recall this.
105. I am asked about whether I am aware of any allegations of abuse of pupils being made by members of staff and in relation to other members of staff but I am not aware of any, nor of any being made by pupils. I never saw or heard of any pupil being abused in any way by staff.
106. I am asked about whether a review was carried out in 1985 of the Nippers but I do not recall any review at that time.

107. I am asked whether I remember a staff member called David Stock and I do. He was an assistant English teacher who helped in play production and occasionally coaching hockey to juniors. Mr Stock made reports to the school about bullying that he had become aware of because he set his pupils an essay whose title suggested they talk about bullying or such incidents they were unhappy with during their time at school. I have no opinion on this and I don't know the title of the essay set.
108. In a dramatic fashion Mr Stock (DCLS) held an informal meeting in the staff room in 1992, just as morning break was finishing, relating bullying incidents that had taken place but not giving any detail. He was in a bit of a state and seemed very upset by his findings from the essay returns. He rambled somewhat incoherently for seven or eight minutes. I was left with little understanding of his salient points and formed the impression that he was having some kind of nervous breakdown. He was a highly strung person. At no time did he mention essay writing or pupils' names or house names. This information was not apparent at the time of the 'meeting' which was incoherent and difficult to determine what David Stock found so upsetting. After the meeting we had to immediately go to teach and I don't recall talking to David Stock for a long time afterwards.
109. Just prior to this SNR PGR come to me subsequent to a meeting with Mr Stock, which had taken place the day before the above staff meeting, to ask me to investigate a bullying incident that had happened some time earlier, perhaps in 1989. As David Stock's meeting was so rambling and incoherent I did not connect it with the meeting I had with Mr PGR previously. I was not provided with the title of the essay and I investigated one particular incident that I thought was pertinent.
110. That evening I immediately mounted an investigation as to what had happened and as far as I could gather, after interviewing several pupils ranging from fifth formers, who had been third formers at the time, to prefects, I learnt that a fifth former called [REDACTED], who held some responsibility in the Gallery, being [REDACTED] of Gallery, had got some of the third form boys in their dormitory, the Gallery, to lie on

their beds face down while he placed the handle end of a hockey stick against their anus. No penetration was involved nor any pain.

111. After interviewing every pupil involved there seemed to have been little long lasting trauma to the then third form pupils. I followed up all these interviews, all of which were documented, with more informal ones to assess any medium term or indeed long term harm which was not apparent. I never spoke to Mr Stock during my investigation and he may not have been on campus any more. The findings were sent to the Headmaster. If the report still exists it would be in the Central Office.
112. I also contacted the father of one of the boys, who I happened to know to relate to on a confidential basis, about what had happened. He seemed satisfied that the matter was closed regarding his son and in fact had no knowledge of the incident.
113. [REDACTED] had left the school by this time and in fact had reached the position of [REDACTED] before leaving. I was surprised that I knew nothing about this incident and surprised by the perpetrator whose school career had been exemplary as far as I was concerned. I discussed this with the Headmaster at the time, Norman Drummond. This was post my investigation findings and well after David Stock's outburst. Mr Drummond seemed to take the incident less seriously than I had.
114. I was later asked to provide a reference for [REDACTED] to teach in his gap year in a school in the Antipodes. This was in my capacity as his Housemaster and his impending job as a gap year student. I declined to do so and referred the reference to the Headmaster who gave the reference as far as I knew and made the remark verbally to me that 'every boy deserves a second chance'.
115. I am asked whether I attended any meetings with Alan Johnston, Governor, relating to Mr Stock and I did not. As far as I am aware no report was made to me by Mr Stock at any time and it was only Mr PGR [REDACTED] who related to me that what had gone on two years previously should be fully investigated. I fully agreed with this and did so. Mr Stock later left the school. After the incident in the staff room he was not seen much on campus, if at all. I am unsure of the circumstances but he left against his

will and at the wishes of the Headmaster. This was all gleaned from hearsay subsequent to Mr Stock leaving the school so I cannot comment further. I am not aware of any other investigation being carried out into bullying in the period after Mr Stock's informal meeting.

116. I am asked whether I remember ^{BND} [REDACTED] and I do recall him as he was a [REDACTED] at the school. He also taught [REDACTED]. I was not directly involved in any allegations against him. As far as I recall the incidents involved making inappropriate comments to female pupils and as such interviews were conducted by a senior female member of management. She completed the necessary interviews and forwarded them to the then Headmaster, Michael Mavor. I cannot recall if the matter was reported to any external body. Mr ^{BND} [REDACTED] was given a Final Written Warning but I cannot recall how long this remained in place. I am not aware of him being promoted and I was never asked to provide reference input for him or any other teachers.

Supports and reporting of abuse

117. I employed a school counsellor in 1995 and the pupils could speak to him about any concerns or worries they had. Bullying was not a problem in the school and its level was low but I cannot compare with other schools. Loretto was generally a happy and safe environment and on the whole pupils thrived. The school counsellor role was there until I retired and the pupil could speak to the counsellor about any concerns or worries on a totally confidential basis and, unless they were a danger to themselves or others, their problems would not be discussed by staff or with staff. The school counsellor was well advertised and their confidentiality was assured so this was a major step forwards to pupils' welfare.
118. In addition, any member of staff the pupils were confident would listen, and had sufficient empathy, were encouraged to speak to the pupils if concerns were raised. Their confidentiality had to be assessed by the pupils before disclosure. The House staff were the most immediate for concerns as were visiting tutors, who visited pupils

once per week in house or elsewhere if a day pupil. The vast majority of staff would be happy to speak to pupils on a confidential basis. Whether a pupil felt confident enough to speak to a member of staff about abuse very much depended on the individual pupil and their perception of the member of staff or counsellor.

119. Every child latterly had a tutor who visited pupils in House on a weekly basis. This was mainly to check on academic progress and assist if necessary but also formed a conduit by which pupils could air concerns ranging hugely from trivial to serious. All concerns were confidential and only related to me as Child Protection Coordinator or if the counsellor felt a pupil would come to harm and the pupil's permission was always sought.
120. If I had any concerns about a pupil I could speak to any member of appropriate staff ranging from House staff to nurses to doctor to Deputy Headmaster to Headmaster. There was no formal direction about this, it was just what I felt at the time was the best judgment I could for the child at the time. As a Housemaster I could also phone parents or guardians to discuss their child's welfare.
121. I made many reports of minor incidents too numerous to itemise when I was at the school but none once I had left. Whilst at school it depended on my role as to how I dealt with bullying but I never ignored a case and always tried to resolve it. In the days after the Child Protection Coordinator role was created then a more formal reporting process was in place and incidents were reported to me. Once I left school I had no knowledge of what was happening because as Child Protection Coordinator there was an issue of confidentiality to be observed.
122. In my role as Child Protection Coordinator various staff members would discuss with me problems they thought pupils were having or being mixed up in. Staff were encouraged to record all bullying incidents in the bullying book which I kept. Any pattern developing could then be seen and I would follow up every entry. Anything I heard I did my best to rectify or pass on to the most suitable person to deal with it.

123. We had an anti-bullying policy and a Child Protection policy which gave guidance on the reporting of abuse by children, staff or others. As part of the Child Protection Policy, post the Children Act of 1995, a formal Anti-Bullying Policy was introduced and this formalised any policies prior to that.
124. I am asked about comments made by Michael Mavor, the new Headmaster, in 2001 whereby he described the common room as 'basically good, optimistic attitude but fragile'. I have no knowledge of this but the previous Headmaster had left the school short of numbers and staff may have been worried about the staff numbers being reduced, certainly morale was low.

Prior statements

125. I have not given any other statements about my time at the school. No other document relates to my time at Loretto unless it was paperwork requested by the Care Commission or similar body and nothing in this paperwork related to the historical abuse of children or similar.

Police investigations

126. Over the years the police visited the school when pupils got into trouble for example shoplifting, fighting with locals or being assaulted. On occasion there was an outbreak of stealing where the police might be brought in as they were when equipment was stolen by the locals from pupils for example stereos and bicycles but there were no visits pertaining to child abuse within the school as I remember and I am not aware of any abuse of children being reported to the police.

Convicted abusers

127. I am not aware of any person who was at the school at the same time as me being convicted of the abuse of a child.

Helping the Inquiry

128. As you can see from earlier in my statement, Loretto changed hugely from 1972 to my leaving date of 2007. I entered a school in 1972 which, by today's standards, was 'Dickensian' in terms of punishment both by staff to boys and prefects to boys. Few policies seemed to exist and training was minimal at best. As Headmasters came and went, girls arrived, eventually Child Protection and PSHE were instituted and a Learning Support Department was introduced. The school became much more civilised and up to date as a result.
129. The arrival and increase of day children numbers, a new and hugely improved music department, an increasingly good art department and a fully functional theatre and new library plus librarian all helped to civilise the experience. In the early days not every child was suited to the Loretto life however, an outgoing, sporty child or one who was academically gifted would thrive. The shy, introvert, possibly arty or musical and generally more sensitive by nature sometimes struggled to thrive.
130. The School I left in 2007 was well into the 21st century with an excellent music school, theatre, library, Learning Support Department and all round sporting facilities. The Child Protection Policies and the work of staff ensured a robust welfare ethos. It was altogether a more sympathetic place for all types of pupils and in fact many from overseas. I refer to an extract from the 2006 Care Commission Report on Loretto School:

What are the views of parents and carers, pupils and staff?

Parents and carers who responded to the questionnaire were very pleased with the provision for boarding and would recommend the school to other parents. Almost all thought that pupils felt safe and well cared for, and they believed they got regular, accurate and helpful reports about their child's welfare and development. Overall, pupils were happy with their boarding experiences. Almost all thought that their boarding house was a good place to live in and they got on well with each other. Around a third of pupils felt toilet and showering facilities were poor and that their personal belongings were not safe in the house. Around a fifth of them felt there was too little to do in the evenings and at the weekends. Staff expressed very positive views about almost all aspects of the houses and the care provided for pupils.

Pastoral care

The quality of pastoral care was very good. Staff were deployed appropriately to ensure a rota of staff on duty each evening. House staff were approachable and very responsive to the welfare needs of the pupils. New pupils were made to feel welcome by other boarders. New boarders in the junior house were monitored closely by staff to ensure that they settled well. The spiritual and religious needs of pupils were very well met. The school accommodated pupils from a wide range of countries and had appropriate arrangements to meet the needs of those from other faith groups. Throughout the year, houses celebrated different cultural festivals. The matrons and school nurses ensured that the medical needs of the pupils were being met effectively at all times. All pupils were registered with the local medical practice and the practice doctor held a regular surgery at the school. The matrons were well supported by the school nurses and had ensured that good systems of communication were in place between the boarding houses, nurses and parents on pupils' medical needs and treatments. The school provided pupils with a varied and balanced diet, with

a good range of choices at all mealtimes. Specific dietary requirements were well met.

The school had an appropriate child protection policy and generally implemented it well. However a few members of staff were not fully confident with its procedures. Pupils had received relevant information relating to child protection and ChildLine posters were displayed prominently throughout the boarding houses. The school had an appropriate anti-bullying policy and staff had dealt effectively with the few instances of bullying. Staff were clear about procedures they would follow should a pupil go missing. However, there was no written guidance regarding this.

Pupils agreed that the rules were clear and sensible. They and their parents were provided with informative house handbooks. The school had a clear complaints policy which was available to all parents and pupils. Complaints were recorded and responded to appropriately. The complaints procedure did not include contact details for the Care Commission.

Under the requirements of the Education (Disability Strategies and Pupils' Records) (Scotland) Act, the school had submitted its policy on disability and discrimination to the Scottish Executive. The policy included the school's detailed review of its approaches to improving accessibility.


Personal and social development

The school's provision for personal and social development was very good. Its programme for personal, social and health education (PSHE) covered appropriate aspects, including healthy living, moral issues and careers.

Visitors gave informative talks on a range of interesting topics. Aspects of the PSHE programme, such as promoting healthy eating, and developing personal responsibility were reinforced appropriately in the boarding houses. Some house staff had organised imaginative house activities which had helped pupils to learn more about issues such as relationships and diversity. Pupils took part in a wide range of activities in school and within the community to help them take responsibility and develop their citizenship skills, including older pupils being prefects. However, pupils did not always

have sufficient opportunities to prepare for independent life after school, through, for example, taking responsibility for washing up, cooking or budgeting.

131. The ethos of the school was determined by the Headmaster and all decisions of any import were made by him. Good Care Inspection reports of approximately 1997 and after back up the progress made. The warmth of the vast majority of Old Loretto pupils toward the School is testament to their respect and liking of their time at Loretto.
132. The lessons learned are that more staff training and consultation would be beneficial and perhaps the Child Protection Coordinator role being part of the Senior Management Team. The majority of staff are extremely caring in their role as Schoolmasters and Mistresses and school policy ensures that pupils are well cared for and safe. The Getting It Right For Every Child policy is followed and thrives.
133. Today, Houses are smaller and staff are more efficiently assisted. The sports coaching has been largely superseded by 'professional' coaches. Above all, staff are well trained and school policies, procedure and structure give a much better guidance, which, together with Care Inspection Reports and Education Scotland Inspections, mean that the workings of the School are regulated on an ongoing basis.
134. 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..... 22 November 2020

.