

Scottish Child Abuse Inquiry

Witness Statement of

Dorothy BARBOUR

1. My name is Dorothy Mary Barbour. My date of birth is [REDACTED] 1946. My contact details are known to the Inquiry.

Background

2. After spending four years at Edinburgh University I obtained my MA in English Literature. I then attended Oxford University for my Diploma in Education. MY GTC (General Teaching Council) was accepted in 1973. Registration was not required at Loretto but I maintained mine.
3. My first teaching job was in 1969 when I worked at The Abbey School in Reading. I taught English to seniors to 'A' Level standard. My extracurricular activities involved putting on plays. I remained there until 1973 when I moved to St Columba's Girls School in Kilmacolm, where I stayed for two years. In 1976 until summer of 1980 I was headhunted for a position as Head of English at St Brides School in Helensburgh. This school later amalgamated with a local boys' preparatory school and was renamed as Lomond School. This school had a boarding element to it but when it amalgamated there was a big change in the character of the school. I left Lomond School and taught at Selkirk High School for a year until 1981.

4. From my time at St Columba's I also took on a role of an examiner for Ordinary Grade for Scottish exams and GCSE in English for schools in England. Thereafter I moved to Higher Grade and Advanced Level marking. This gave me an insight as to how other examiners marked papers, which helped me sharpen my teaching skills all round. I can't remember when I started with each of the exam boards. I stayed with them until around 1990 when I gave up the Scottish element. The English element was what was being taught in Loretto.
5. From my time at Selkirk I left education to bring up my family until the autumn of 1984 when I began at Loretto. At the time I began working at Loretto we were living in the Borders but working here allowed me to move to Edinburgh. The Headmaster I worked with at Lomond School, David Arthur, is a former pupil at Loretto and agreed to be a reference when I applied to join the staff there. A friend told me that Loretto were looking for a part time teacher.

Employment with Loretto School

6. I began working as a part time teacher in English in 1984. It was David McMurray who appointed me to teach at the school, but by the time of being accepted and arriving at the school, Reverend Norman Drummond had taken over as Headmaster. My first contact when I arrived at Loretto was meeting staff at Norman Drummond's house where he had organised a function. When I started at my previous schools I was given a timetable, a pile of books and just got on with it. Loretto was not any different. When I joined Loretto it was a boys' Public School, taking boys from 13 to 18 years. In 1981 it had begun admitting girls for the last two years, with 10-12 girls in each year group.
7. When Norman Drummond was appointed apparently this caused some concern because of his being so young and perceived lack of experience. I cannot recall where he was before Loretto. I do know he had been to Cambridge, served in the Black Watch and had taught at Fettes. I think he also did a spell working in Glasgow.

8. Norman Drummond left the school in 1994 and was replaced with Keith Budge. When Drummond left there was an uncomfortable feeling in the school. There was apprehension about the introduction of co-education. Norman left early in the school year, around March. Budge had not worked in Scotland prior to his appointment. Although I found him good to work for he did not seem to get on well with parents and the number of pupils in the school numbers did not improve. Keith stayed until around 2001 or 2002 when he was replaced by Michael Mavor. [REDACTED] a former Head at Gordonstoun and at Rugby School. When Michael was there, there was always the need to improve school numbers, build better relationships with parents and improving the facilities within the school. Michael retired from the school at the same time I left in 2008.
9. In Loretto the junior school was on the other side of the River Esk. The juniors had their own Headmaster and their own teaching staff catering for eight to thirteen year olds in a boarding set up.
10. The senior school had somewhere between thirty six to thirty eight staff looking after somewhere near three hundred pupils. The pupils who attended were secondary age. They were thirteen to sixteen year olds in third, fourth and fifth form working towards their GCSE's. The older pupils were in sixth form for two years working to 'A' level standard.
11. It was under Norman Drummond that I was first appointed as Head of English and Assistant Housemistress in the girls' boarding House, Trafalgar Lodge from the autumn of 1985.
12. When I arrived at the school I was not in need of any training relating to organising English lessons in the classrooms. One of the first lessons I did was have the students submit a written paper. The paper submitted by the students allowed me to see for myself the standard of the English, where each person was, a clue to their interests, and a sample of their writing. The paper may have been something like writing about what they did during the holidays.

13. There was a long standing member of staff, Clifford Sparks, who had been teaching at the school for a long number of years. When Norman Drummond arrived Cliff sent in his resignation, as he was upset that someone so young could be appointed as Head Teacher. He was persuaded to rescind the resignation and given a promotion with a new post. He was appointed as Director of Studies and it meant he could give direction on the education side of the school. He would also lead the staff meetings including when discussions of children were taking place. Prior to his appointment I suppose it would have been the Head teacher who led the meetings. I do not recall Norman Drummond being at those meetings. They were held often but I don't think it was every week, as there was not much free time.
14. After one year with Loretto I was made Head of English and it was a requirement that I moved to full time working.
15. Prior to me arriving at the school David Stock had applied for the position of Head of English. Unfortunately he had gone through a recent divorce and was having some issues dealing with that. I think this may have had an impact on his not being appointed.
16. Hugh Munro was the House Master of the girls' house and he was there for the first year I carried out that role. The next year and until I stopped it was Sarah Kwiatkowski.
17. Some Senior pupils carried significant responsibility. Head of School was a senior boy selected by the Headmaster. Girls were eventually appointed in this role. Each boarding house had a Head of House chosen by the Housemaster/Housemistress. There might be School Prefects chosen by the Headmaster and Housemaster/mistress and there would be House prefects, chosen by Housemaster/mistress. All prefects could issue punishments for perceived rule-infringements. Should a member of staff wish to query a punishment, there was a clear chain of pupil command.

18. The Housemaster or Housemistress would be the person who would have the final say as to who would be chosen as a Prefect. There were up to four or six Prefects in each house but it was up to the Housemaster how many Prefects he had.
19. I was aware of one house who elected a boy who was completely unsuitable to be a Prefect. I spoke with the Housemaster and he said he had to elect him as he had too much influence and he would cause too much trouble for him. He felt he had no choice. It is true to say that the pupils and the Prefects had a greater influence be it good or bad than the Housemaster.

Policy

20. I did not have any involvement on the school policy. There was no policy document issued when I arrived at the school. The only thing I was given when I arrived was a copy of the school calendar along with a listing of pupils in forms, rugby fixtures, plays and parent meetings. Policy was as it had ever been. All School Governors had to be former pupils, invited by the Governing Body to join. No outside influence brought change.
21. In the late 1980's I became aware of an issue that was not covered by anything in policy with the school and something we were not previously aware of as teachers there. There was a pupil in sixth form that I had not taught previously. When he was in class, he joined in with the topics and was excellent. When it came to his written work he was dreadful.
22. I asked him to speak privately with me. I questioned when he was completing his written work, thinking if it was around breakfast time he may not be fully awake. He said no, but that he had difficulty putting anything down on paper. We chatted and he said he had suffered this for a number of years and that anytime he brought it up with his prep school, their answer was to give him the belt.

23. If I had one pupil with this issue I knew there must be more in the same position. I wanted to see what I could do as there were no procedures in place. I knew of Catriona Collins and made an appointment for him with her. At that time Catriona was working at George Watson's. I also spoke with his parents as they would have to meet the cost. He was diagnosed with Dyslexia. We arranged for a teacher from the Dyslexia Association to come to the school but unfortunately she dealt with mainly young children with this issue and classed our pupil as an adult. We did manage to get extra time for him with his exams to ensure he had a fair attempt in passing. I did a course with Moray House and Heriot Watt to ensure I was qualified to be able to assist pupils with Dyslexia and other support issues.
24. In 1991 we had a teacher come in who assisted with pupils with this issue. By that time we were finding more pupils who needed learning support. This helped us in the school and we set up a Learning Support Unit. By the time I left it had grown steadily and was an independent unit distinct from the English Department. Learning support at Loretto was in its infancy and there was some resistance from established members of staff. If pupils failed their GCE exams they had been allowed to repeat and became part of the "Remove".
25. There was never any opposition to this work being set up, but for the first year the teacher was in place her lessons were paid for by the parents. This later changed as the school altered its stance and she was deemed to be a member of staff.
26. By 2008, when I left, we did have policies in place and they were all documented, which importantly included any issue of bullying. By that time they were already being updated on a regular basis to take into account changes being recommended. I think that the policies evolved after the visit of Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Schools 1992.

Strategic planning

27. I was not involved in any strategy meetings held by Loretto until after 1996.

Training of staff

28. I was not sent by the school on any training or development courses, until the late 1990s when I was sent on a Management Course. Any courses I wished to attend I organised myself and someone within the school would cover my duties while I was away. I felt I did have to go to GCSE training meetings and would try to have staff from the English Department attend with me as this would give us an insight into the changes being implemented. Loretto was supportive of this throughout my time as Head of English. If I needed leave of absence for myself or the staff, Loretto paid for it.

Supervision/staff appraisal / staff evaluation

29. Supervision in the school structure was under the Headmaster and the Vicegerent, then Housemasters or Housemistresses and below them their assistants. The heads of departments dealt with the academic side of the school. A resident Chaplain was viewed as having a central role in ensuring pupil wellbeing. There was a board of governors, all old boys, who oversaw what was happening in the school. Although they had oversight I think the Headmaster did have the freedom to run the school as he saw fit. I served under three Headmasters and one temporary Headmaster who all brought differing styles and methods to the school.
30. For the first year I was at the school I reported to the [REDACTED], CFE [REDACTED]. He would allocate what I was to teach as part of the curriculum. CFE [REDACTED] was also at the time [REDACTED] I was appointed as Head of English in the autumn of 1985 and would report to the Headmaster, at that time Norman Drummond.
31. As for checking on a day to day basis, we never sat in on each other classes. The only time I did sit on a class was when we may have had a student teacher. Although it was

not standard practice Norman Drummond and perhaps Keith Budge may have been in my classes once or twice. After 1996 or so, classroom observation became much more common.

32. During my time there Loretto started to bring in a process of assessments of individual staff. During this process staff could talk freely about anything. I know some of the staff found it difficult typing up the interviews and in such a small staff group as you could be appraisee one day and the appraiser the next. The process could be difficult. I don't recall much about this process, such as when it came in, and when it died off but real changes began with the introduction of co-education.

Living arrangements

33. The role of Assistant Housemistress from 1985 required me to be living on campus. I moved into a building called Holm House, which was attached to the complex of Trafalgar Lodge, with my family. The seven of the senior girls also moved into rooms in this building as it provided quieter and more private rooms for their study. As a family we remained there until 1994, prior to my leaving in 2008.
34. From 2003 maybe 2004 staff were being appointed who were permitted to live off campus. This was an alteration which helped with the school finances. In the 1980's Mr Barclay Smith, who was nearing the end of his career and David Stock preferred to live off campus and had permission to do so.

Access to dormitories

35. In 1985 when I first moved into the boarding house I felt that access to the girls' rooms was inappropriate. But I imagined the rules for the boys' houses had merely been applied also to the girls' house. In 1994 this changed and restrictions were put in place to stop the pupils being freely available to visit individual rooms, replacing this with common room visits.
36. With regard to access to the Boarding Houses key pads were being introduced at the school but when I left not all the buildings had them fitted. I think they are all fitted now.

Culture within Loretto School

37. When I started teaching at Loretto there was a measure of directness and openness within the classroom, which was different from what I had previously experienced. I enjoyed this and really thrived on this. One thing I discovered was that the older boys had a lot of power. They told me if they did not like a teacher, they could cause enough trouble to prove things difficult. If that happened the school would have no choice but to get rid of that teacher. They told me that this happened to a new Geography teacher whose name I can't recall, they took a dislike to him.
38. Prefects within the school had a great deal of authority in the school. They were older boys who were left in charge of the younger pupils in the dormitory. This was a cultural thing from well before my time. As far as any uniform, the boys did not have to wear their ties and their shirt collars were worn open. Red jackets and grey trousers were standard uniform.
39. From my time in Loretto the culture was always looking to attract more pupils as Scotland's pupil demographic was falling. There was one prep school that closed due to lack of numbers and insufficient funds to sustain it. For similar reasons during the same time Rannoch senior school closed.
40. At the weekends the girls were expected to support the first fifteen rugby team. They were either asked to watch the match or were tasked with making tea and sandwiches for the teams. This led to the Rugby XV having a dominant role in school culture. This practice finished around 1994 when co-education was introduced.

Discipline and punishment

41. You could report pupils to the Headmaster. I preferred to deal with it myself. There were times if I thought it necessary I would administer detention, but this was not a common occurrence.
42. Punishments given out by prefects could be "sides" or bookings. A side was an A4 sheet of writing and these were never given as single sheets but were given in

multiples. For a pupil who struggled to write, this was time-consuming when you could collect 6 sides by 10:00 am. It could and did interfere with prep completion. A booking was simply noted against the pupil's name and after a number of them, an appearance "on parade" was automatic. I did hear of an incident involving the Head of House. Someone had said something to him that he was upset about. He then instructed all the boys to lay their chocolate bars into a box and then he trampled on all the bars. This was just him showing that he could punish the boys for minor issues and there was not anything they could do. I suspect that the staff didn't agree with this behaviour and I can't recall what year it happened.

Day to day running of the school

43. When I was on supervising duty one of the roles was to cover the day prep where senior pupils attended if they had a gap in their timetable. I did not have a list of names of those who should have been in attendance, again this was not unusual with Loretto. I handed round paper for them to sign and their response was not what I was accustomed to. The sheets were returned with an assortment of names, including Elvis and Mickey Mouse. I took this as part of the sense of humour we had at the school, but did not repeat that exercise again.
44. The first occasion I covered an evening duty involved supervising boys in the boarding house. I found there was no heating at night and the boys slept with the windows open. This reinforced my thoughts about the Spartan lifestyle they led and was part of the rugby mentality of the boys.
45. My normal teaching routine was we taught all day Monday and Friday, as well as Tuesday and Thursday mornings, while on Tuesday and Thursday afternoons the whole school was on games until 4:00 pm when we were back in class and did two lessons until 6:00 pm. Wednesday was slightly longer morning with CCF in the afternoon. Saturday morning there were classes with games in the afternoon.

46. Wednesday afternoons were given over to CCF (Combined Cadet Force). The youngest year group did not participate but had creative arts activities instead, while both years in the Sixth Form had a choice of Community Service or CCF. Those who chose Community Service could volunteer for charity shops, hospices, hostels or visit the elderly in their homes locally.
47. Chapel was on Sundays. I was comfortable with this. We always had a good financial package at the school which compensated for the extra work we carried out.
48. There were a few foreign boys at the school. If any of them were from a different religious background then they were excused chapel. There were also a number of day pupils at the school. They were mainly sixth form pupils... The only real difference was the sleeping arrangements as they were usually in the school from 8:00 am and could be there until 9:00 pm. They still attended the Saturday lessons and games on Saturday afternoons. Prep usually took place within the boarding houses and the boarders would be joined by day pupils. The younger boys would be supervised by some of the older boys. Sixth form pupils were slightly different in that they had their own study rooms to work in.
49. There was a significant emphasis in school on pupils playing a role in entertaining visitors and parents in school. Norman Drummond and his family offered hospitality to visitors and pupils regularly. Norman Drummond had a great memory for the names of all the pupils and their parents. Often visitors were eminent in their field and pupils were expected to participate fully. This was one of the features of his Headmastership. Pupils had to be dressed in their best school uniform, and the parents and the visitors really liked it. I felt that this was good practise and there was an emphasis on good manners. Budge and Mavor also entertained but not to the same degree.
50. Loretto had an old swimming pool and a school theatre. It was an adaptable theatre and the design allowed for it be used for different layouts for plays and when necessary for parents' nights. At one point I was tasked with completing a History of Loretto. Part of this research showed that the Sports Hall was an idea while David McMurray was the Headmaster and it opened just before I joined the staff. Until this time Loretto only

did games but this hall provided the opportunity for gymnastics, work on the horse, ropes or other activities.

Reporting of complaints/concerns

51. The common room for teachers were all men, with three women. A part-time Biology teacher, a full-time languages teacher and myself. This dynamic did not change until the introduction of co-education at the school. If I had a grievance I never felt there was anyone I could approach. I am a strong enough character that if I had an issue I would deal with it and would not take it someone else. If it was an English Department issue I would discuss it with the others in the Department to see if they were having a similar issue, whatever it may be. In general conversation with colleagues one gained support/advice most readily.
52. Our classrooms were largely quite separate and quite isolated when pupils were on games etc. At least one male member of staff enjoyed taking advantage of this for flirtations, sexual invitations, whether for humorous purposes or not. He was a popular staff member and there was a reluctance for the "victim" to take any reporting action. The anticipation was the "victim" was likely to be found to have invited/provoked the actions.
53. If I was unhappy with the way a prefect may have been treating a younger pupil I might have spoken to the Housemaster. One boy came to me and said he had been given six sides of paper as a punishment by a Prefect. He was asked to copy passages from the bible. This was a boy who was not very fluent and had difficulty with his writing. It would have taken so long to complete that task. It was a wrong use of his time. I did not think this was fair or helpful and I queried the practice. I did not have to do this often and I don't think that the Prefects complained about me.

Abuse

54. Before breakfast pupils under punishment would get dressed in their school uniforms and the prefects would have them parade. The prefects would tell pupils under punishments to do any task he wished. One of things might involve making a pupil run around the playing fields. Even girls could be treated like this. Any pupil who was not fit would have difficulty with this type of punishment. I found this was completely inappropriate and unfair on the less athletic boys. One heard from time to time of prefects vying to set the most difficult tasks. Traditionally this was the punishment in place and meant that the staff did not have to be involved.
55. When it came to food and meal times the tables were a mix of older and younger pupils. The older boys had access to the food before the younger ones and as such they would take such helpings that there was sometimes little left for others. After taking their own food sometimes the older boys would pour so much pepper or similar that the food was spoiled.
56. The system of allocating places from mixed year groups at refectory tables with a senior pupil as Head of Table was part of the tradition and was believed to create a "family" atmosphere. In reality it did for many but the system could also facilitate poor treatment of younger and individual pupils. The understanding was that it promoted the family feeling in the school and should be allowed to continue.
57. Fagging existed when I joined and was there for the first few years I was there. Upper sixth could send a young pupil to run and get breakfast for him. After getting the breakfast the young boy had to run back to try and get some breakfast for himself and still be on time for school. He was not always successful and had to go hungry. The young pupil could also be sent into Musselburgh to the shops on behalf of the senior boy. This type of behaviour just bred future seniors who would continue to use the fagging system. As time went on it was done away with but I can't remember when.

58. One of worst examples of abuse I was aware of at the school was called 'Shunning'. The persons subjected to this type of abuse were left on their own throughout the day in school and it could last all term. Often the boys caught up in this would not even tell their parents.
59. You had to be careful on how you intervened as it could be seen that the pupil had broken the silence code about the punishment and things could be made worse for him. One recourse was to bring the behaviours to the attention of the House staff and hope they could overview and stop the practice.
60. There was one pupil I knew that this happened to and I spoke with his mother in later years and she had been completely unaware it was happening to him. This boy went on to have a successful career. Later in life I was told he had gone to a pub where he discovered some pupils from Loretto also drinking. This brought back the bad memories and he tried to take his own life. It showed how badly this treatment could affect some people longer than just at the school.
61. Shunning just seemed to be regarded as the way boys behaved in those days. It was the boys themselves that made the decision to shun someone and it could be done for a whole variety of reasons. It was difficult to identify a boy that had been shunned because with all the movement on the campus it was hard to work out who was on their own. I think that if the boys realised that I knew about them being shunned it would have added to their humiliation. The staff did not approve of shunning but there was no system in place that dealt effectively with it.

External monitoring

62. There was an inspection carried by Her Majesty's Inspector of Schools 1992 or 1993. I was told that Norman Drummond had invited the Inspectors in. That was the first full inspection that I experienced during my career to that date. Sheila McKillop from HMI brought in a team of inspectors. One of them was checking on the English Department so I spoke with that person. The inspectors interviewed pupils, staff and the Headmaster. Some of them sat in during lunch, with the pupils. The Inspectors provided some feedback which I understand went really well. They did recommend

Loretto introduce a development plan, but no mention was made of the issues I expected them to address and on which I had looked forward to their judgement.

63. One Head of Department gave his personal opinion during the inspection. Afterwards he was taken aside by the Headmaster and given a proper dressing down. We all knew what was expected of us and that we were also to say positive things about Loretto. All the staff understood the culture and it was accepted. I do not recall any other outside inspections.

Record-keeping

64. During long break was when all the staff would meet and that was where discussions took place. The pupils and items of importance were discussed.
65. I never used the belt or anything like that throughout my career. Use of belting continued at Loretto in my early years which I found dismaying. There was a book kept for a period which may show some punishments that were administered. This was done away with because it was stored in rooms that were not properly secure and so they were removed. I understood that this recorded the beatings administered.
66. House records were kept for each pupil and past records were stored in the stable block at Pinkie. Single sheet reports were prepared each term for every pupil. We completed all of them in a locked room.

Investigations into abuse – personal involvement

67. I have never given a statement to the police into any alleged abuse at the school. There may have been an investigation after an allegation of a boy having 'moonied' at a girl outside the school fence. I am not sure what happened but was aware this made it to the Press.
68. I am also aware that Dan Boyd published an article in the Telegraph newspaper. Within that article he named a member of staff who abused him within Loretto Junior School. It happened before my time and I was unaware of it before it was published.

69. During the first October that I was at the school there was an issue with a teacher in the Chemistry department. I am not sure what the allegation was but it cannot have been anything major as I understand the teacher was sent for training by the Headmaster. I feel it is unfair to name him as I can't recall his full name. I think a [REDACTED] left under a cloud, but I don't know the details. It was dealt with under wraps and there was no announcement. I would rather not give his name.
70. In the early 1990's I did hear about a stabbing at the school involving boys, but I am not sure of the severity of the injury. It is my understanding the pupil who wielded the knife was expelled from the school. The boy carrying out the stabbing had been the subject of bullying and had lost his temper when he could not take anymore was what I heard. I think he was accepted into another school. I do not think the police were ever involved.
71. I have heard of an incident but do not know the full information about it. A boy had been climbing into one of the electricity sub stations and was bitten by a dog. He sustained a deep cut. The rumour was that the Headmaster had the boy taken to his house and the school doctor was asked to come to the house to stitch the boy's wounds on the kitchen table. There was nothing of this reported to the police.
72. I have been asked about a comment made by Michael Mavor commenting on staff meetings being fragile. I assume this stemmed from Keith Budge's time at the school where spending was outgrowing the income and people were really concerned not just for their employment but for the school in general.

David Stock

73. I am aware of the issue relating to my colleague David Stock. David had been in the school for many years. He taught English and was an outstanding teacher in both senior and junior levels. He inspired a lot of his pupils to do well in this subject I really liked working with David.

Were any reports made by Mr Stock investigated?

74. I was spoken to by a Housemaster whom I do not wish to name. He did not agree with David Stock and how an incident in the House was dealt with. The Housemaster said that the boy involved would have been offensive in the manner he broke wind. Rather than the other boys spraying him with deodorant, they took it too far and someone pushed a can into his anus. The Housemaster's attitude was the other boys would treat it as just a schoolboy prank, where David Stock wanted it dealt with in a more serious manner.
75. I am aware that David made reports to the school about bullying. I made some notes at the time, which I still have, of the times of some of the things that took place. What David was trying to do needs to be put into context.
76. On 29th/30th October 1991 there had been newspaper reports about the establishment of Esther Rantzen's Childline and how they were dealing with children reporting abuse and the success they were having helping those children. During our long break it was discussed by the all the staff. The answers from a few were that the school was already effective when it had reports of bullying. I don't recall a lead from Norman Drummond on bullying.
77. At a staff meeting on 30th October one of the items raised was that the school was looking to introduce a Tutor system within the school. On the Thursday there was a casual discussion among the teachers about how effectively this system would deal with bullying. Some staff gave their opinions on how effective it was in other schools. I raised the question to ask whether this system could deal with the problem of 'Shunning' within our school.
78. On the Friday David tasked his fifth form class with completing a paper on bullying. I do think he was justified in asking their opinion, after all, the class he was asking had been in the school for three years and would have some views and experience. Before David gave any opinion on the tutoring system he used this exercise to obtain some insight on the thoughts of the people it was affecting.

79. On the Saturday he was preparing a paper on motivation that he was going to deliver to a staff meeting on 14th November. He discussed with me whether I thought bullying could affect motivation. By that time he had looked at some of the papers submitted and was dismayed with what he read.
80. About 5:00 pm on the Monday 5th November after being in school all day, I saw him. By that time he was very dismayed with the papers submitted. What also distressed him was that the boys thought staff knew of bullying and were doing nothing about it. I said to him that he was dealing with material that had to be attended to but that nothing in the papers had been verified. I knew that as an English teacher when I was marking any papers that contained any sexual abuse or bullying that I would pass my concerns to the relevant people.
81. Line management would mean reporting to the Housemaster or Chaplain in the first instance. What David was shocked by was that the boys were insisting that the Headmaster had been told of the behaviours (and in their view this also meant that the staff knew about it) and nothing had been done. They insisted one boy had reported it to the Headmaster directly and named the individual involved.
82. David Stock was aware that the staff knew nothing about it, although he could not know whether the Housemaster knew. I had a talk with David that the appropriate person to talk with was the relevant Housemaster where the boy or boys were staying, and then take things from there. If it involved more than one House then talk with the person he thought would deal with the issue. Apart from gossip staff did not know the details of any bullying.
83. On Tuesday 6th November David broke down in class. I was trying to help him and I decided he needed to talk about it and took him to the Chaplain, John Anderson. I explained to John what was happening and left David with him.

84. Richard Selley, one of the Housemasters was approached and his opinion was that most of the boys mentioned as carrying out the abuse were no longer at the school, therefore the school did not have to do anything about the allegations despite the boys who had witnessed incidents being still in the fifth form. He was of the opinion we did nothing about it but I believed strongly we did have to do something as the boys affected were still with us and needed to see the staff doing something. The issue then escalated out of hand. Richard was well respected within the school and did eventually take over on a temporary basis as Headmaster of the senior school and became the Headmaster of the 'Nippers'.
85. I agreed with David that this should be dealt with properly. The complication was the boys insisting the Headmaster knew all about it through a boy whose name they gave. I maybe should have gone to the Headmaster but as I said earlier there was no obvious chain of command in such a situation because the man at the top the boys claimed that Headmaster already knew about it. There had been difficulties between David and the Headmaster already. He had summoned David and me for an interview over a comment David had made to a parent during a parents' meeting. David ran a creative writing magazine in school which the parent was inquiring about and he had reported to her that the magazine was defunct because it had been so heavily censored that pupils were discouraged.
86. The Headmaster was angry about this and made his views known to David in my presence. News of David's remark had been reported to the Headmaster by a Governor who had heard it from the parents in question at a dinner in Perth. The Headmaster's meeting made it clear that David was under warning. I was summoned by the Headmaster the next day and told that were David to make another negative remark I would not be enough to save him. In fact, David was correct and around that time the pupils produced an undercover paper which ran with the headline "SHOCK, HORROR, boy tells truth in chapel." This related to the fact that if they were to speak in chapel they were groomed with what to say. One boy had agreed what he would say but then spoke his mind instead.
87. Finding an effective route to attending to the boys' bullying or abuse claims was made difficult.

88. I never saw the papers, for it was clearly not an academic matter but needed to be dealt with in a pastoral and supportive context. David told me the content of some of the papers including the deodorant being pushed up one of the boy's rear end. Another incident of a hockey stick being used in the same manner, someone being beaten with a belt and a cricket bat, and other sexual abuse. All that could not be ignored. The boys told David that the Headmaster had already been told and he had done nothing about it. While this made for concern, the claims still had to be addressed and through meetings involving the Chaplain, the [REDACTED] PGR and some of the boys, David endeavoured to do this.
89. I am not sure what was happening after that with the reports but I did know that John Anderson and David were going to speak to one of the boys who was the victim of some of the complaints. John being there as Chaplain would provide support for the boy. David asked the relevant questions so he fully understood what had happened to the boy. The [REDACTED] was also present at one of the interviews.
90. While that was all being done I got a phone call at home from Alan Johnston, Chair of Board of Governors and Dean of the Faculty of Advocates. He was coming to see David and I was required to be present. This was going to be the first I saw David since he broke down. I thought surely with his background in the legal world that Alan Johnston would see the need to have some sort of hearing for the boys to deal with their concerns. When I got to David's he had the papers ready to give to Alan. He had also tape recorded some of the interviews with the boys, again ready to hand over. I never heard the interviews.
91. Alan Johnston brought [REDACTED] PYK to the meeting who was the Clerk to the Governors. He would be expected to take notes of the meeting and not to be speaking. The meeting was one of the most appalling experiences of my life. I have difficulty in describing how unpleasant Alan Johnston's manner and bearing were during the meeting. He was utterly contemptuous. There was no polite introduction to the meeting and nothing sympathetic to David with what he had uncovered.
92. When David offered the papers, Alan Johnston merely swept them up and placed them into his briefcase. He never asked David anything about what he had done; he

just terminated David's employment. He took the copy of the tape. David could not get any more than three sentences out and Alan told him that he was not to return to campus. He said nothing to me, and PYK just sat noting things down. From my point of view this was no way to treat a member of staff, who was trying to deal with a difficult situation. The way he was treated was dreadful. David was completely broken by it. A colleague's view was succinctly that there was a case to answer and that Johnston had not addressed it.

93. Such action by the Chair of the Governors meant that no recourse was available. No word was expressed of concern for the boys' wellbeing, no reassurance given to David that the matter would be dealt with or the boys heard and given support. The central issues were not even mentioned.
94. I was summoned to the Headmaster's office the next morning. He told me that I had the good fortune to be able to deal with the situation like a good Christian. I assumed that he meant that I was caring and looking after the situation in a Christian spirit. Given that he himself was ordained, I was not in a position to argue with him as the only result would have been my termination from Loretto. The Headmaster left the school some two years later. His successor dismissed me from the promoted position of Assistant Housemistress. I assumed the outgoing Head had given me a less than good reference and that was the general view.
95. Loretto's failure to deal with the incidents in an appropriate and caring way both with regard to David and to the boys who had written about bullying had a profound personal impact on me. I felt that my opinion and judgement had been shown to be worthless in the eyes of the Governors and that any assessment I made of issues regarding pupils would be cast aside if it did not suit their and the Headmaster's opinions. Johnston wrote a letter to David, in which he described the meeting as having been attended by John Anderson, who had somehow replaced me. That was how much he paid attention to the whole incident.
96. Nothing of the reports made from the boys was ever reported to the rest of the school staff. There was also never anything passed to the police for them to investigate and

possibly take action or anyone else for them to take action. No clear explanation was ever offered, and the emphasis was that really David Stock was overwrought.

Reports of abuse and civil claims

97. I was never involved in any reports to or civil claims made against the school by former pupils regarding any historical abuse.

Police investigations/ criminal proceedings

98. I was not aware of any police investigations into any alleged abuse at the school.

Convicted abusers


99. I am not aware of any person who worked at the school who was convicted of the abuse of a child or children at the school.

Helping the Inquiry

100. One clear lesson is that governors for any school should sign an undertaking about what their responsibilities are and it must include duty to the pupils. Our governors saw only their duty to the "School" in the abstract and to the Headmaster who was their "chosen" man and so no shortcomings could be attributable to him and he must have his way regardless.
101. Trying to bring an old fashioned system close to modern practice was impossible with so many past pupils involved who followed the dictum "it did me no harm". I found any attempt to talk of best modern practice was swept aside arrogantly in the light of how successful they all were and how could there therefore be faults in the system.
102. Norman Drummond has been a great success nationally- and he is involved again with Loretto running the Former Pupil network. So it is hard to argue any case that does not acknowledge his outstanding abilities. But it was acknowledged by all staff that he ran a Team A and a Team B of where staff, the A's liked him and agreed while

the B's were more detached and he believed them "cynical". I must have started on Team A but ended up on Team B. I don't know how, for I am not cynical or wasn't. I was always committed to children, their welfare and their academic success.

103. Drummond followed a different path and told parents and pupils that exam results did not matter for university entrance that it would be his words in his character reference on the UCAS form that would secure their future. Quite a lot believed him though not all.
104. In the late 90's at a function, I was approached by Norman Drummond and he suggested only that we "let bygones be bygones". That was unexpected but I took it to mean he had harboured a negative attitude after the issue with David. He had after all carried the day in that David was still barred from the campus despite having taught so may Lorettonians for so long.
105. I do know that some eminent Old Lorettonians refused to visit school as a Speaker during Drummond's time as Headmaster because of his treatment of David Stock. But in the scheme of things they were "small" voices. UK organises things differently.
106. 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..........

21 October 2020

Dated.....