

Scottish Child Abuse Inquiry

Witness Statement of

John TOLLAN

Support person present: No

1. My name is John Henshaw Tollan. My date of birth is [REDACTED] 1944. My contact details are known to the Inquiry.

Employment History

Teaching

Primary School

2. Belvidere Primary School, Bellshill. Class Teacher. P.6. 1966-67
Noble Primary School, Bellshill. Class Teacher. P.6. 1966-67

Secondary School

3. Graeme High School, Falkirk. P.E. Teacher. S1 - S6. 1967-68

Special School

4. Craighead Special School, Hamilton. Class Teacher. S4. 1972-73

Residential School

5. Ballikinrain School, Balfroun. Teacher/Housemaster. 1968-72

Kibble School, Paisley. Senior Assistant. 1972-75
Linnwood Hall School, Leven. Headteacher. 1988-94

Lecturing

6. Notre Dame College of Education, Glasgow. Lecturer. Psychology/Sociology. 1975-82
St Andrews College of Education, Glasgow. Lecturer. Psychology/Special Education. 1982-85
University of Glasgow. Visiting Lecturer. Stress Management/Special Education 1994-96
John Moore's University, Liverpool. Ph.D. External Examiner 2006-08

Psychology

7. Notre Dame College of Education. Lecturer. Psychology/Sociology. 1975-82
St Andrews College of Education. Lecturer. Psychology/Special Education. 1982-88
Linnwood Hall School. Residential Psychologist. 1988-94
North Lanarkshire Psychological Service. Psychologist. 1994-96
South Ayrshire Psychological Service. Psychologist. 1996-98
North Ayrshire Psychological Service. Senior Psychologist. 1998-06
Redcroft Psychological Consultancy. Principal Psychologist. 1994-Present

Social work

8. Ballikinrain School, Balfron. Housemaster. 1968-72
Kibble School. Paisley. Senior Assistant. 1972-1975
Linnwood Hall School. Head. 1988-94
Jefferson County Cabinet of Human Resources, Kentucky. Consultant. 1990-91
PILOT Care, Paisley. Consultant Psychologist. 2006-10
CATCH Scotland, Paisley. Consultant Psychologist. 2010-Present

Management Training

9. Catalytic Training. Hamilton. Director. 2010-14

Qualifications / Training

10. Ph.D., Psy.D., D.Litt. B.A., M.B.A., B.Ed., M.Ed., M.Sc., M.App.Sc. D.P.E., P.G.D.E.(Primary), Dip.Spec.Ed., D.H.P., Dip. Clin. Hypnotherapy. Certificate in Social Work Administration; Certificate in Social Casework C.Psychol., C.Sc., EuroPsych., A.F.B.Ps.S., U.K.C.P., Churchill Fellow.

Experiences at Linnwood Hall School, Leven, Fife

The Institution

11. Linnwood Hall School was located in Leven, Fife. Its purpose was to provide short-term residential education and support for vulnerable young people with Special Educational Needs associated with Social, Emotional and Behavioural Difficulties and to promote their reintegration to home, school and community.
12. With the agreement of the Education Department, before taking up post, I had the opportunity to run a one-day In-Service Training Day on 'Organisational Stress Management' for the full Linnwood Hall School staff complement, which informed my first impressions of the school and its culture.
13. On arrival at the school, I was greeted by a sense of gloom and apprehension, where the building appeared shabby and run down and the staff were wary of this person who would be becoming their new Headteacher. As a result, initially they were suspicious and reluctant to open up about their concerns. However, as the day progressed, the various exercises enabled them to feel that they could be more open about their thoughts and feelings and a more transparent connection was established.

14. The concerns outlined by the staff indicated the kind of stressors they were experiencing and what they were hoping for from the appointment of a new Headteacher. It also gave me an opportunity to explore the available resources and examine how the teaching, care and domestic staff interacted and what the main sources of stress were for each group.
15. The main stressors expressed by the full staff were: The authoritarian management style of the previous head, where staff had been unable to express their own views: Lack of consultation by the Education Department as to the future of the school: Lack of the requisite resources and staffing needed to fulfil their role: Differentiation in status between teaching and care staff: A domestic staff who saw the vital role they played in supporting the lives of the young people and the running of the school as under-valued and unappreciated: An overall sense of lack of staff direction and focus, attributable to having had to work for many years within an ethos where 'keeping your head down' was the safest option: Apprehension about the expectations of the new Headteacher.

School Culture

16. With regard to the culture of the school, my initial observations were that, despite the concerns expressed by the staff, overall there was a strong caring ethos present among all staff in relation to supporting the young people in the school at that time.
17. However, beneath that caring ethos, there also were specific issues that were affecting the school's effectiveness in meeting the needs of the young people placed there.
18. The Education Programme needed to be better coordinated and personalised, with Individual Educational Plans put in place for each young person. The teaching role also needed to be broadened to that of Mentoring, to enable IEP's to be specifically tailored to meet the needs of the young people and fit the developmental structure of a 'Personalised Developmental Curriculum'. Better resources and equipment also were needed to allow a more integrated curricular programme to be developed and implemented.

19. Care was largely provided by unqualified care staff, with only two qualified staff in promoted posts. A third member of care staff was undergoing professional social work training and would be returning to the school shortly on completion of her course. Clearly, significant ongoing in-house and 'on-the job' staff training and development would be required to promote the staff knowledge, skills and confidence required to establish a Keyworker role within the Care system in Linnwood Hall.
20. In addition, Care was provided in a large, somewhat soulless building where young people had little sense of privacy or dignity. Care staff also lacked a base from which to offer the level of professional interaction needed to provide the care and support individual young people needed. Quite radical change would be needed in this area to enable care practice to prove effective.
21. There was little interaction between teaching and care staff, with the teaching staff seeing themselves as superior, a tradition established under the previous regime: A perception that would have to be challenged if multidisciplinary collaboration was to be achieved.
22. The domestic staff felt unappreciated and undervalued by the other staff, given the vital role they played in meeting the needs of the young people and the running of the school. Again, a misperception that would need to be addressed to promote overall staff satisfaction.
23. Despite these concerns, all staff expressed a highly caring attitude towards the young people and obviously made a huge effort to meet their needs. They believed that the wellbeing and safety of the young people should always take precedence, resulting in a sense of mutual respect where the young people responded positively to the caring, supportive staff and school ethos.
24. I shared the outcomes of this day with my Line Manager, who indicated that the Education Department would do all that it could, within existing budgets, to resolve some of these issues.

My time at Linnwood Hall School, Leven, Fife

25. I spent six years at Linnwood Hall School as Headteacher (1988-94), using my psychological skills to support individual youngsters and staff as appropriate.
26. I formally applied for the position using the documentation provided by Fife Education Department. The job description specified the need for teaching and management experience. References were provided by college staff and a previous headteacher.
27. My Line Manager was Mr James W.G. McGregor, the Senior Assistant Director of Education, who was answerable to Mr Magnus More, the Director of Education. I met with the line manager each term, plus additional informal contacts as required. Ongoing informal monthly monitoring was provided by an Adviser in Special Education.
28. No Induction Programme or Formal Training was provided.
29. My performance as Head was supervised termly using the above procedure, plus an Annual Appraisal was undertaken by the Line Manager at the end of each year.
30. I was supervised and monitored to ensure that Education Department expectations and requirements were met but allowed the autonomy to introduce and develop a more personalised approach to education and care which enhanced the school's ability to meet the needs of its young people.
31. Following Education Department directions, I was actively involved in the day-to-day running of Linnwood Hall School, beginning with a morning assembly to set the scene and structure for the day and week ahead. I chaired all case conferences and attended all teacher and care staff meetings and coordinated all interaction with the local and wider community.
32. I interacted professionally with the young people individually through interviews, counselling when required and regular case reviews. I also participated in house group

meetings when requested by staff or youngsters and interacted with the whole community through daily assemblies and specific meetings. At a more personal basis, I also supervised intervals and ate with the young people to help build a better rapport.

33. At all times the wellbeing and safety of the young people was paramount, with the school's reputation being based on its ability to meet the young peoples' Special Educational Needs, learning disabilities, emotional, social, behavioural and learning needs and prepare them to meet the school's stated aim of achieving 'Reintegration to Home, School and Community'.

Personal Influence

34. Initially, the approach I was advocating for the development of the school was presented to and accepted by the Line Manager, with the proviso that it: Complied with existing Departmental regulations regarding the purpose of the school: Conformed to specified Education Department guidelines regarding discipline and punishment: Specified how staff interacted and supported the young people admitted to Linnwood Hall: Ensured the protection of the young people being admitted to the school from abuse and ill-treatment.
35. With the agreement of the Education Department in place, I introduced the Linnwood Hall School staff and its young people to the concept of an 'Educative Community'. Within this ethos, the 'school community' enables a more therapeutic emphasis to be placed initially on the support provided for the emotionally, socially and behaviourally vulnerable young people with Special Educational Needs admitted to the school.
36. As the young person progresses, he/she becomes gradually more involved in the 'local community' to promote his/her personal and social skills, before reintegrating into his own 'wider community' and completing his/her placement.

37. Consequently, I had to provide personal influence for both staff and young people to ensure that they understood and felt confident and equipped to undertake this new approach.
38. As a result, I sought to develop with staff a more collegiate approach to Continuing Professional Development. This strategy ensured, through ongoing in-house and external training and support, that staff were aware of, understood and were fully committed to implementing the new policies and practices regarding discipline, support for young people and protection from abuse and ill-treatment associated with this approach.
39. Innovations designed to promote the ethos of an 'Educative Community' included: The introduction of a House System designed to provide the level of enhanced support for young people and interaction with staff that could not be provided in the existing block school.
40. The introduction of a Key Worker system within the house structure to ensure that Personal Care Plans could be developed and monitored via three-monthly Case Reviews, and support provided at the initial stages of a planned Reintegration.
41. The development of a Care Team, whose staff felt more valued and equipped to meet the needs of their young people.
42. The appointment of a returning qualified member of staff as a third SNR to enable the full implementation of a House Structure and allow the opportunity to personalise the support and guidance provided by the Care team for young people and staff.
43. The broadening of the teaching role to a Mentoring one, to enable the development of Individualised Educational Plans in a more personalised way in a more supportive classroom setting.

44. The implementation of a more Personalised Integrated Curriculum, which ensured that each young person was able to obtain the range of learning experiences necessary to prepare him / her for reintegration. This curriculum design subsequently was awarded a UK National Curriculum Award for its development of a unique learning programme that sought to attain the school's stated aim of effective reintegration to home, school and community through interaction with the local and wider community.
45. The development of a weekly Multidisciplinary Senior Staff Meeting Structure to involve both care and teaching managers in promoting more effective whole-organisational planning and implementation of further requisite developments.
46. The expansion of an Inter-Agency Review System onto a three-monthly basis, to better consider progress made, issues experienced and future action required towards attaining the school's aim of attaining reintegration for those young people who had reached that stage of development.
47. The introduction of a Pupil Support Centre was established in an old building on the school grounds to support local secondary schools. The 'Linnwood Support Centre' offered part-time support to ten pupils experiencing difficulties in mainstream education, at the same time as promoting the reintegration of young people from Linnwood Hall School back to their local High Schools.
48. Opening the growing range of school resources to the Local Community as a means of helping change negative impressions of the setting as 'a school for bad boys and girls'.
49. Ensuring that such developments were recognised through a variety of means: Presentations (Regional, National and International Conferences): Publications (Journal of Special Education, 1992): Talks with local groups (e.g. The Broom Community Forum, Children's Panel Members and Mainstream High School Rectors): to promote awareness of the developments being made in Linnwood Hall School towards attaining 'Educative Community' and 'Centre of Excellence' status.

Policy

50. Using the guidelines provided by Fife Education Department, I was given responsibility for developing the full range of Policies and Practices required to manage such a therapeutic, supportive community. These included developing the requisite policies on Education and Care necessary to ensure that every young person's range of Special Educational Needs, learning disabilities and associated social, emotional and behavioural needs were met.
51. This process was undertaken through consultation with staff, education advisers and other agencies to address shortfalls in existing policies and practice. Over time, the resulting guidelines enabled staff to accept the positive changes to existing policies as well as the development of a range of new policies relating to the changes taking place in the school's practices to address such issues as abuse and child protection.
52. In consequence, a full range of policies was produced and implemented by staff to promote the development of more effective supportive strategies on admission, training, recruitment, staff appraisal, complaints, restraint, discipline and punishment, whistleblowing and recording. The related practices also were implemented to ensure that these policies took full effect.
53. Unfortunately, over time, changes had to be made to several policies and practices, as in the latter stages of my involvement as Head, the nature of the population admitted to the school changed. The focus moved from supporting vulnerable young people with Special Educational Needs, learning disabilities and emotional, social and behavioural difficulties who were responding very well to the new school ethos, to managing a more challenging population.
54. Instead, older youngsters who had presented more extreme challenging and delinquent behaviour, were involved with the police and Children's Panel system and had been placed in external settings outside the Region were brought back and relocated in Linnwood Hall owing to financial reasons. This decision, which was made without consultation with the Headteacher or preparation of staff, resulted in a

significant increase in numbers of such young people and challenges for staff and existing pupils.

55. As a result, school policies on behavioural management and restraint had to be adapted to enable staff to cope with the kinds of behaviour now being faced daily, which affected the wellbeing of both the young people originally in the school and the personal safety of staff.

Strategic Planning

56. Strategic planning was the preserve of Fife Council. However, at the initial stages of the school's development, when the focus was placed on developing a more therapeutic approach, I was given the opportunity to introduce, develop and evaluate the effectiveness of an 'Educative Community' approach to enhancing young people's learning and promote their social, emotional and behavioural development. At the same time, it also was stated that the continuation of such a development would be determined by its effectiveness in enhancing each young person's learning and sense of personal and social wellbeing.
57. Linnwood Hall's own strategic approach was to develop an 'Educative Community' ethos, which reduced the potential for abuse by providing at a 'school community' level, a more therapeutic, supportive, caring environment within which vulnerable young people could thrive by feeling safe in their interaction with staff and school community.
58. As they progressed, each young person could then become involved in the 'local community' and eventually their own 'wider community' as they moved towards reintegration. This arrangement further enabled the young people to be gradually involved in local community activities to increase their self-control, emotional stability and social confidence, before becoming involved in activities in their own community as they moved towards reintegration.

59. In addition, the development of an off-campus Pupil Support Centre enabled local young people to be supported during their reintegration to local High Schools.
60. Enabling the local community to access the school's developing range of resources in turn promoted a more positive interaction with those young people and the support staff involved in community groups. With young people being involved with staff in supporting local activities such as a 'Pre-School Group' and a 'Twins Group' hosted by the school, this level of interaction also led to a positive change in the perception of the nature of the young people and the role of the school by the members of these groups and the wider community.
61. The funding for these developments was raised by Linnwood Hall taking several young people on a short-term basis from outside the Region, which enabled a multi-gym, art studio, dark room, video-editing suite and off-air Radio Station (Radio Linnwood) to be developed in an unused stable block. It also allowed minor adaptations to the main building to be made to make it more secure, by relocating the main office to the entrance hallway to stop people walking unobserved into the building. All developments that otherwise would not have taken place given existing Regional financial restrictions.

Structure and Recruitment of Staff

62. On appointment as Headteacher, the school Management Structure comprised a SNR (Mr KZZ), SNR (KNG) and two SNR (KZP and KNH). SNR SNR and SNR were responsible for supervising and supporting the educational programme and teaching staff, while the two SNR had responsibility for the supervision and development of care practice in Linnwood Hall.
63. Initially, I took responsibility for working directly with the Care Team, with the teaching staff being supported in adapting to the new ethos by SNR and SNR SNR. Both groups of Senior Managers reported to me each Friday afternoon: The

SNR reporting on teaching staff progress regarding the Mentoring Role, new curricular developments, IEP progress and any other emerging issues, concerns, recommendations and staff suggestions as to improvements in practice, enabling the requisite action to be taken. SNR provided an update on House matters, Keyworking, Personal Support Plan development and ongoing staff training initiatives.

64. With the agreement of the Education Department, the return of a third qualified SNR to the Care Team (Pearl McBride), enabled a House Structure to be put in place. This development replaced the original more impersonal block school structure where the young people had restricted privacy and a more limited sense of dignity in their living accommodation. The introduction of a Keyworker Role also enabled care staff to work more effectively with individual youngsters on Personal Support Plans, record their progress and represent their interests at Case Reviews.
65. With support from Education Department Officials, I was able to undertake the planning of a five-year 'whole-school' developmental programme designed to promote the implementation of an 'Educative Community' initiative and attain 'Centre for Excellence' status. A development that was monitored informally by a Special Education Adviser.
66. With my reading for an MBA in Human Resource Management, I already had developed a good understanding of recruitment policy and practice.
67. Consequently, for the appointment of new Care Staff, the Management Team was now able to check that applicants had appropriate qualifications or previous relevant experience.
68. With regard to Teaching posts, the Management Team already knew that applicants had been registered by the General Teaching Council as qualified, while their references illustrated their relevant experience.

69. However, decisions regarding the subsequent appointment of Senior Managers to Linnwood Hall School were made directly by Fife Education Department and Council politicians. I had no say in who was appointed as SNR [REDACTED] (GLT [REDACTED]) and SNR [REDACTED] (David Morrison) when the first one retired and the other moved on to a promoted post in another setting. Not a good situation, when a headteacher needs to work 'hand in glove' with his management team.
70. No volunteers were involved in Linnwood Hall School, but students from teaching and social work courses were encouraged to undertake their practice placement in the setting, with vetting provided by the placement organisation.
71. References were always picked up by the Depute Head Teacher who had responsibility for ensuring this was done.
72. The Depute Head Teacher also made sure that all referees were spoken to prior to selection for interview and provided feedback to all applicants on interview performance.

Training

73. Initially, I was heavily involved in staff training and subsequently in promoting the personal and professional development of staff.
74. With the agreement of the Line Manager, I became involved in staff training from before taking up post, running a full day programme on 'Organisational Stress Management' to obtain a staff perspective on issues facing young people and staff that needed to be addressed. These topics formed the basis for the subsequent initial staff training activities undertaken on taking up post.
75. For teaching staff, with my contacts in Special Education, I was able to arrange for well-known speakers to deliver presentations on identified concerns until a Staff Training Committee, comprising the Principal Teacher, Care Staff Development Coordinator and Head, was appointed to take on this function.

76. I also was able to ensure that Local Authority staff development courses were accessible to Teaching Staff, while specific sessions were provided by staff tutors as requested to ensure individual teachers remained familiar with current educational developments. Subsequently, the Principal Teacher was given responsibility for developing the training programme for the teaching group.
77. With regard to Care Staff, there was a significant lack of qualified staff. This issue meant that initial planned changes could not be implemented until a qualified member of staff had returned from her Social Work Qualification course, as no replacement had been put in place to cover her secondment. This difficulty unfortunately slowed the planned pace of change required to ensure that care staff were adequately trained, supervised and supported.
78. An initial in-house Care Staff Training Programme in booklet form was provided by myself for existing care staff on 'The Role of Houseparents' and 'Key Working'. Subsequently, with a full Care Management team in post, it also became possible to give each Senior Houseparent an area of Professional Responsibility, namely: 'Care Staff Development Coordinator'; 'Designated Child Protection Manager'; 'Social Work Liaison Officer'.
79. The Care Staff Development Coordinator took responsibility for training the Care Team, with support from myself and other promoted colleagues, as required. The Education Department funded a sampling range of non-care related activities for individual care staff members from the school's education budget.
80. Throughout my time as Head of Linnwood Hall School, there was a continuing shortage of care staff, with little recognition by the Education Department of the need to upgrade their number, training and status to meet the needs of the changing nature of the young people being admitted to the setting.

Supervision / Appraisal / Evaluation

81. To ensure that staff felt supported during the change-over of approaches, I was heavily involved in both Supervision and Training.
82. With Education Department agreement, I was involved in setting up each of the following components in Linnwood Hall School: Monthly Supervision was offered by myself to Senior Managers who, in turn, offered supervision to care and teaching staff. Monthly Supervision also was provided for myself by the visiting Consultant Adolescent Psychiatrist regarding psychological support provided for specific youngsters.
83. A formal Annual Appraisal System was set up, with myself offering all staff an opportunity to discuss 'mutual accountability', while receiving in turn Supervision and Annual Appraisal by my Line Manager each term.
84. In addition, after discussion with the Line Manager and Principal Psychologist, it was agreed that an external Evaluation of Linnwood Hall School's effectiveness in meeting its stated aim and goals would be conducted by the Psychology Service.
85. A Senior Psychologist would undertake a Baseline and Summative Evaluation to provide an independent account of education and care outcomes. This overall evaluation would provide: an assessment of the effectiveness of the changes made by Linnwood Hall School, as perceived by young people, staff, external professionals and parental ratings of positive changes made; an ongoing school-based evaluation conducted by the Headteacher throughout his term of employment.
86. No volunteers were involved in the school.

Young People

87. Initially, the young people placed in Linnwood Hall School were referred there by the Regional Psychological Service, a process that operated very effectively during the first three years of the school's five-year developmental plan when the young people came on a voluntary basis. Subsequently, its role became more that of a 'gatekeeper' regarding access to the school.
88. However, as the Psychological Service had publicly stated that they did not see the need for residential education, this became a source of continuing concern as increasingly the young people referred to the school were not the group for whom Linnwood Hall had originally been designed.
89. Instead, the population changed from vulnerable, abused young people with a range of Special Education Needs, associated learning disabilities and social, emotional and behavioural issues who could benefit from involvement in such a therapeutic community, to an increasingly challenging and delinquent group.
90. As a result, staff were regularly faced by older youngsters with no identification with the school, who resented the compulsory placement order on which they had been placed in the setting and for whom staff felt inadequately trained to meet their needs. A situation which generated increasing staff stress, absence and related mental health issues regarding the future of the school and their own security, as well as the increased anxiety in the original group of young people in the school.
91. Initial Assessment was carried out by the Case Psychologist, who referred the young person to the school together with the requisite background paperwork and recommendations. An Initial Case Conference was then held in Linnwood Hall, involving the psychologist, young person, parents and other agencies, chaired by myself, at which it was determined whether the placement was appropriate.
92. The outcomes of the Case Conference and information provided by the psychologist, social worker, school, young people and parents were then used by Mentors to

develop Individual Educational Programmes for use in the classroom. The Keyworkers similarly developed appropriate Personal Support Plans with which to provide each young person with the personal and social activities required to prepare him/her for eventual reintegration to home, school and community. Further advice on the design and development of each programme was available for both groups from myself in my psychological capacity.

93. Initially, the Length of Placement was reasonably short (15 months), with much of that time spent on daily attendance once the young person had proved himself / herself ready to return home. However, as the population changed, a lengthier residential placement was increasingly required (20 months), since many of this new group did not want to reintegrate to school, nor did the schools want them returned.
94. With regard to number of placements, initially Linnwood Hall School worked with up to 24 young people who had agreed to attend the school voluntarily. On my arrival, this comprised 11 males and 5 females, which made providing each young person with appropriate learning, care and therapeutic support easier to manage.
95. However, gradually the school population increased to over forty, as the Council found the cost of external placements in other settings too expensive and pulled the young people back to use existing Fife resources. This number also included young people who had moved onto a daily basis, those on a phased reintegration, plus young people being educated in the Linnwood Support Centre.
96. Mentors worked with a maximum of six pupils, which enabled an IEP structure to be implemented in each class. In contrast, Care Staff worked in a house team of one senior houseparent and three members of care staff supporting each house group of a maximum of eight young people. The introduction of a Keyworker Role within the Care Team enabled a Personal Support Plan for each young person to be developed, monitored and assessed by team seniors, before presentation at Case Reviews.
97. Linnwood Hall School had its own Cook and Kitchen Staff, who provided excellent meals for the young people and were very accommodating in providing specific meals

for young people with a range of allergies and specific needs. As part of their Vocational Programme, some older youngsters chose to work in the school's walled garden and greenhouses with a qualified Gardener, growing a range of fresh fruit and vegetables for use in the preparation of meals.

98. Initially, sleeping accommodation in the school was provided within three units in the main school building. These offered little provision for privacy and dignity for each young person, as the groups shared large rooms in groups of four. After discussion with the Line Manager regarding changes in Sleeping Arrangements, the main building was adapted to provide two House Units: One for the younger boys and the other for the more mature group.
99. Both groups of young males slept in their own structured personal areas created by installing specifically designed furniture placement within larger rooms in the main building to provide as much privacy as possible, paid for through external placement funding.
100. The females lived in the former schoolhouse where it was possible to have their own room and greater privacy.
101. As required by Education Department guidelines, wherever possible additional Showers and Toilets were provided in each house unit, which enabled youngsters to use these in greater privacy.
102. Residential Placement in Linnwood Hall School was for the first three years initially on a five-day per week basis. This arrangement was kept as short as possible to allow young people to move onto a planned reintegration to home, school and community as soon as they had demonstrated the relevant personal and social development and behavioural self-management. While in the school, each young person was encouraged to use his/her leisure time as profitably as possible, taking part in the range of activities on offer.

103. However, as the population changed, the level of residential involvement increased, with the time spent residentially in Linnwood Hall by an older group lasting longer before they began a planned reintegration process to home, college and the world of work. So, a more structured use of leisure time was required to encourage their participation in the range of leisure activities on offer.
104. A wide range of risk-assessed Leisure Activities was offered during evenings and weekends. These enabled the young people to participate in both formal activities like the Duke of Edinburgh Award, or more informal ones such as canoeing, hillwalking and gym activities. They also were given the opportunity to develop areas of personal interest such as photography, art, chess and reading.
105. Additionally, opportunities were provided for youngsters to use local swimming and gym facilities with staff support, while others were encouraged, when ready, to take part in local groups (Scouts, Sea Cadets) in preparation for reintegration to home and community. Celebration of achievement was a significant part of the affirmation process for all young people with, for example, the UK Olympic athlete Kris Akabusi presenting the Duke of Edinburgh Certificates to each young person who had completed the Award requirements.
106. With the agreement of the Education Department, a range of organised trips also was provided, varying from educational visits to outdoor activities and annual camps. In addition, one group of ten Linnwood Hall youngsters had the opportunity to participate in a 'student exchange', visiting and living in the Chekhov School in Moscow for ten days.
107. Full details of the school and planned visit itinerary had been obtained from the school and educational officials prior to the trip. The following year, ten girls from the Chekhov School spent ten days living in Linnwood Hall, with funding raised by the school from sponsorships by local businesses and community groups as the Education Department could not fund it from existing budgets.

108. This experience proved mutually beneficial for both groups. The Linnwood group gained some insight into the restrictions on freedom experienced by the girls in the Russian setting, while the Chekhov students indicated that they would undertake such an exchange on a permanent basis if it were possible. In addition to support staff, accompanying the Chekhov girls were the Headteacher, the Director of Education for Moscow and the Depute Director of Education for St Petersburg. Both of these officials indicated to Education Department Managers how much they had appreciated being given the chance to see a school operating at 'the cutting edge of residential education provision'.
109. No informal trips were allowed. Each had to be planned in terms of risk assessments and implications for medication, meals and toileting issues, to ensure it met Education Department requirements. No staff member was allowed to take individual young people out on their own to participate in organised activities whether outdoors or in their own homes.
110. No volunteers were involved, although students from a variety of University and College Courses participated fully in the work, supervised by staff from the relevant university and college.
111. As specified by the Education Department, Linnwood Hall youngsters participated fully in a five-day Educational Programme. This programme covered the main components of the secondary school curriculum to promote reintegration, with a learning support specialist on the staff available to help meet the range of learning difficulties and disabilities experienced by many of the young people in the school. In addition, several teachers had completed an additional Diploma in Special Education qualification to enable them to work more effectively with children and young people with a range of Additional Support Needs.
112. A School Doctor paid regular visits to the school to advise on appropriate medication and treatment. The three Senior Care Staff were trained and accredited to manage and administer any required medication for the young people in their houses, while the school had a named 'first aider' to deal with minor medical issues during the day.

Linnwood Hall School also had a visiting Consultant Adolescent Psychiatrist, who advised on issues such as abuse and specific emotional issues and also provided formal monthly supervision for the Head.

113. The young people were involved in maintaining their own personal living area while resident, but all cleaning was undertaken by the school's team of School Cleaners. However, as part of their vocational training programme, older youngsters were expected to participate in horticulture, landscaping, joinery, catering and sport and leisure activities in preparation for transition to college or relevant work experiences.
114. On the advice of the case psychologist and social worker, Family and Parental Visits were encouraged at the appropriate stage of a young person's placement. Although placement in Linnwood Hall was on a voluntary basis, initially parents were unable to take the young person out of the school until such an action had been cleared at the Initial Case Review.
115. Case psychologists, social workers and school psychiatrist did see young people individually on a planned basis, with feedback given to appropriate staff afterwards and general reports provided when relevant, which were held in the case file. The professional's own notes were held by themselves with discussion of more private outcomes held with myself as appropriate.
116. The three-monthly Case Reviews were the forum where decisions on Reintegration were taken and the timing of Reintegration determined.
117. A Summative Case Review was held prior to placement completion to plan the best form of supported Reintegration for each young person.
118. Continuing support for the young person during the Reintegration process was provided by his/her Keyworker, whether in the home, community or school, as appropriate, and by staff in the Linnwood Support Centre

Living Arrangements

- 119. I was initially required by the Education Department to live in the School House provided on the school grounds. However, to allow for a third house unit to be made available for girls, it was agreed that I could move off-campus to an easily drivable distance from the school, with on-call duties shared.
- 120. No other staff member lived on the school grounds, with the on-duty manager being the only one in contact with both staff and young people overnight.
- 121. Access to the young people's residential areas was restricted to only on-duty house staff, and if required, the on-duty manager. A member of the house team covered each house overnight, with a duty manager on call to support staff with any concerns.

Discipline and Punishment

- 122. Using the guidelines provided by the Education Department, initially my preferred approach to discipline and punishment was to review a situation once the crisis had been reduced, rather than provide a crisis escalation.
- 123. Conflict Resolution and Conflict Mediation was my preferred strategy, within which issues could be resolved more easily following the initial use of a Time-Out for the young person concerned. During the Time-Out, the young person was supported by a keyworker or manager to help reduce the recovery period and enable the young person to be ready for the subsequent conflict mediation session.
- 124. I have never been in favour of corporal punishment, nor used it with young people to establish discipline.
- 125. Following Education Department policy, no corporal punishment was ever administered in Linnwood Hall in my time, which myself, young people and staff agreed was the most effective strategy. Deprivation of privilege was usually found to

be the most effective form of punishment, together with rewards for appropriate performance.

126. The established policy ensured that no staff member could use corporal punishment at any time.
127. Using the guidelines provided by the Education Department, an agreed Set of Rules as to appropriate, acceptable behaviour was discussed with all staff and young people, which was then applied in the event of an incident taking place that broke these rules. For most situations of defiance, challenging behaviour and refusal to participate in lessons and activities, a range of sanctions and rewards was sufficient to promote appropriate behaviour.
128. No senior youngster was involved in the disciplinary process, although group disapproval proved an effective strategy.
129. The types of behaviour likely to lead to deprivation of privilege included Challenging Behaviour, Verbal Abuse of Staff, Refusal to Undertake or Complete Appropriate Work and Leaving the Class or House Unit without Permission.
130. Discipline was administered for the exhibition of such behaviour within the appropriate setting as far as possible. Where the behaviour was extreme, either removal from the classroom or group setting, or removal of the group from the setting was the strategy adopted.
131. On the Education side of the school, the Principal Teacher was responsible for discipline, with the Depute Head available for backup if required on any required action. On the Care side, the Senior Houseparent had responsibility for advising on and implementing any required discipline in the house unit, with the Duty Manager available for support for staff and young person, as required.

132. Action usually took the form of the young person accounting for his/her behaviour, followed by a decision on an appropriate sanction by the appropriate manager, with an apology given, if merited, to the staff member involved.
133. No staff physical punishment or discipline was acceptable, with the staff member disciplined subsequently if the action was substantiated.
134. Time-Outs were utilised when appropriate, but only for long enough to allow a manager / keyworker to help the young person stabilise sufficiently for a subsequent conflict resolution / conflict mediation session to be implemented.
135. A Record of Discipline was maintained by the Depute Head Teacher for significant decisions requiring further action, such as suspension. This specified the date, behaviour exhibited and action taken. However, incidents requiring such extreme action were very rare and were seen as a failure by the school rather than by the young person.

Restraint

136. Unfortunately, as required by the Education Department because of growing Council financial pressures, over time the population referred by the Psychology Department to the school became increasingly more challenging, aggressive and threatening. As a result, different behavioural management policies and strategies became necessary to restrain young people who were exhibiting highly aggressive and physically challenging behaviour.
137. With the agreement of the Education Department, specific staff members, including myself, were fully trained in the use of Therapeutic Crisis Intervention for utilising in the event of a young person requiring to be restrained to prevent injury to him/herself, other young people and staff.

138. The initial training was delivered by Registered TCI Trainers, with regular follow-up sessions each term to ensure maintenance of technique standards, plus an annual re-assessment of staff competence to retain the requisite qualifying certificate. Payment for this training was paid for out of income generated from external placements.
139. Restraint was carried out as safely and for as short a time as possible, preferably using a standing restraint, before the young person involved was allowed a cooling-off period supported by a member of staff, prior to a conflict resolution / conflict mediation strategy with myself.
140. No medication was ever administered as a means of restraining or sedating a young person.
141. Although qualified to use TCI, I was not directly involved in restraint. My function and that of the Depute Head was to operate the subsequent Conflict Resolution / Conflict Mediation process and record any details in the school's Record of Discipline.
142. The school policies and practices regarding Restraint followed exact TCI specifications, with the trained staff becoming more skilled and confident about preventing physical aggression, resulting in fewer restraints being required. In addition, the young people quickly accepted that violence against other youngsters or staff would invariably result in intervention by staff trained to manage such behaviour, which both youngsters and staff agreed was necessary.
143. As a result, at no time did I ever witness any excessive use of force. Rather, what I saw was a well-trained, competent staff carrying out only the level of restraint required to bring a challenging situation under control.
144. As required by the Education Department, all incidents of restraint were recorded by the Depute Head Teacher as part of Linnwood Hall School's 'Record of Discipline'.

Concerns About Linnwood Hall School

145. In my time as Headteacher, initially I was unaware that Linnwood Hall School was the subject of concern regarding the treatment of its young people, as I was immersed in trying to ensure that the young person-centred treatment provided was as effective and supportive as could be achieved.
146. However, although no concern was expressed directly to me about the way children were treated in Linnwood Hall, I was aware that the school was the focus of negative discussion by other agencies regarding what they perceived as the limited value of residential education and the increased benefits of community care.
147. To help counter such negativity and illustrate the flexible support that could be provided by a residential school, with the agreement of the Line Manager I approached the local High Schools with a view to setting up an Off-Campus Day Support Centre, an initiative they were very happy to support.
148. This facility provided support for ten pupils from the local high schools who were finding it difficult to cope with mainstream education. It also provided two young people from Linnwood Hall School with the opportunity to use this resource as part of their phased reintegration to the local high schools.
149. The parents of the two young people reaching this stage of planned reintegration were informed of this new facility at their Summative Case Conferences and offered the opportunity to visit the Linnwood Support Centre before the planned reintegration process was implemented. The resulting visits gained parental support for this proposal, together with attaining the high school rectors' recognition of the effectiveness of Linnwood Hall School's curriculum and practice in preparing its young people for reintegration.
150. The reintegration process for each young person did prove difficult, but with parental support and known staff in the Support Centre to share their concerns with, each of

them returned to their high schools with continuing support from Support Centre staff for reassurance.

Problems at Linnwood Hall School, Leven, Fife

151. Initially, as Head of Linnwood Hall School, I was concerned with the educational programme, with its lack of focus on the needs of the children, which remained on following the mainstream school curriculum in order to attain the aim of promoting reintegration. This was an understandable stance, but was unsuitable initially for the young people placed there, given the extent of their Special Educational Needs, learning disabilities and associated emotional, social, behavioural and learning issues.
152. Instead, the structure of a new more 'Personalised Integrated Curriculum' in Linnwood Hall was adopted through discussion with the teaching staff on the value of following a more person-centred, supportive approach, focusing on the themes of 'Myself', 'Group Membership', 'Home and Family' 'Independent Travel, 'Leisure and Recreation', 'Returning to School / Going to College' 'Work' and 'Independent Living'.
153. These themes enabled the curriculum to reflect the developmental stage and level of progress reached by each young person better, while still working towards attaining the reintegration to school aim specified for the school by organising the traditional curricular areas into four cognate areas that better reflected the needs of the young person.
154. Similarly, I was concerned about the lack of care support provided in the school, which was under-resourced, understaffed and under-valued, and so constantly sought support from my Line Manager to gain additional support for this area of the school's work with little effect. As a result, a range of Linnwood Hall initiatives were introduced to make the Care provision more person-centred and supportive of the emotional and social needs of the young people.

155. These developments included the setting up of a coherent Care Staff Management Structure, a House Unit Structure and a Key Working System which facilitated the development of Personal Support Plans for each young person.
156. In consequence, I was confident by the end of the fourth year of the school's Organisational Development Plan, that the school was making steady progress in meeting the needs of its young people. It also was gaining increasing recognition as an 'Educative Community', 'Centre of Excellence' and an effective Education Department resource, developments which I foresaw progressing steadily over the next two years.
157. However, I became increasingly aware during the fifth and sixth years of Linnwood Hall School's development of growing concerns expressed by staff regarding the changing nature of the young people admitted to the setting. Also, of their feelings that they were not being sufficiently protected by the Head from such placements. Something that I no longer had any influence over, as admission increasingly was now decided for many young people by the Education Department and Children's Panel system.
158. I also recognised that, despite the introduction of Therapeutic Crisis Intervention support, the teaching staff in particular were experiencing significant challenges regarding classroom management and also continued to resent the change in their status toward equivalence with care staff. This was exacerbated by my decision to move the location of the teaching staffroom into the main education building to provide additional support for teaching staff.
159. This arrangement was undertaken to enable a Care Team Office to be established in the main building from which the growing numbers of care staff could operate during the day. As a result, the teaching staff sought Union support to regain this office space and to seek additional support for their classroom management issues.
160. The Union representative met with the Depute Head and myself to discuss this grievance and was unhappy that the school would not change the use of the office

space back to a teachers' staffroom and took this complaint to the Director of Education. An Education Adviser subsequently visited the school on several occasions to observe the situation and to advise on this decision.

161. Her suggestion to the Line Manager was that the main office, where all personal papers were kept, review meetings and interviews held, counselling and conflict mediation sessions carried out, visitors welcomed and visiting groups hosted, should be made available to the teaching staff, with the headteacher being relocated to a smaller administrative upstairs office.
162. My line manager dealt with the Education Advisor's report and made no recommendations for change as the suggestions advocated had been considered inappropriate in the circumstances.
163. All staff rightly expressed further significant concerns about Linnwood Hall School's future role, given how it was being seen by other agencies and officials and the changing nature of its population. They also were well aware that the school was not being allocated the level of resources and staffing necessary to enable it to become a permanent, evolving part of the Council's Developmental Plan.
164. As a result, it became increasingly apparent to all staff that Linnwood Hall's existence was time-limited, no matter how effective everyone had been in trying to support the new population they had been required to take responsibility for managing. They also were aware that a more 'community-based' support model was being advocated outside the school, which negatively affected staff morale, absence and ill-health on an increasing basis.
165. In consequence, the incidence of staff absence and ill-health increased during this time, with both factors also affecting the wellbeing of other staff members. A sad reflection on all of the effort and commitment made by the Linwood Hall staff to introduce and develop a highly effective and unique approach to providing residential support.

166. Unfortunately, this ongoing issue was not resolved before the Head too became ill and was forced to retire on the grounds of ill-health in 1994.

Reporting of Complaints / Concerns

167. Using the guidelines provided by the Education Department, a 'Complaints Procedure' and 'Record of Complaints' was put in place within Linnwood Hall, in which a young person or someone acting on his / her behalf could make a formal complaint.
168. This procedure was rarely used following the introduction of 'Childline', with the young people preferring the novelty of this new medium to sharing any concerns with staff.
169. As a result, no formal complaints were made directly to staff.
170. To my knowledge, no formal complaint of abuse was received during my time as Head.
171. Therefore, no formal complaints of abuse were recorded in the school's 'Record of Complaints' maintained by the Depute Head Teacher.

Trusted Adult /Confidante

172. Linnwood Hall School had access on a one-day-per week basis to a Consultant Adolescent Psychiatrist, who was a recognised expert on 'Abuse' and 'Child Protection'. She was available for young people to speak to regarding any personal concerns and had access to the Head to report any significant issues that she felt the young people needed to have addressed.
173. This level of professional support continued throughout my time in Linnwood Hall.
174. As far as I am aware, young people did raise concerns with her regarding their feelings and anxieties, but she did not refer them on to me, as she was able to resolve these herself.

175. No young person raised such concerns with me directly.
176. However, the Consultant Psychiatrist did recommend that an ongoing staff development programme on 'Abuse' should be provided to ensure that all staff had a much better understanding of the issue and how abused young people could best be supported. Together with myself, she also provided advice and materials for the Designated Child Protection Manager as he developed the setting's 'Abuse' and 'Child Protection Policies'.
177. In addition, she felt that the ethos and setting of Linnwood Hall was highly suitable for the relocation of the Playfield House Adolescent Psychiatric Unit where she was based, and together with myself presented a proposed four-year developmental plan to the Education Department to enable this development to occur.

External Monitoring

178. Since prior appointments were made for all visits to the school as part of its monitoring process, I was aware when inspectors, officials and other professionals were due to visit the school.
179. Later, when social workers were more involved in cases where young people were involved with the Children's Panel, 'Drop-In' Visits took place when I was unaware of such a visit to ensure that no prior preparation had been undertaken for such visits.
180. After an initial welcome meeting with myself, visitors were always offered the opportunity to meet with children in the form requested, whether individually or in a group. Staff were usually present at these meetings, but visitors could request a meeting with an individual young person or a group of young people from myself.
181. They also had the opportunity to speak with me on both their observations and the results of their discussion with the young people.

182. Predominantly, the focus of such feedback was on observations of the safety and wellbeing of the young people, as well as on observed school policies and practices.
183. Concerns were raised initially regarding Recruitment of Care Staff and Training of these staff, as visitors quickly recognised that few of the existing care staff had been trained and that few qualified applicants were applying for such positions.
184. No concerns initially were expressed about discipline and restraint until after the school population had changed, following which these became the main source of concern. As a result, concerns regarding School Governance increased as staff became increasingly concerned about their personal safety and the future of the school.

Inspectors

185. The school had one informal visit by two HMI's during the second year of the school's development. They saw around the school, met with care and teaching staff as well as a group of young people and subsequently held an informal discussion with myself on proposed developments. They noted that, in their opinion what was being attempted at Linwood Hall was a 'tour de force' in residential school practice. They expressed no concern about the safety and welfare of the young people but commented on the need for the recruitment of more care staff in particular.

Officials

186. Visits by Education Officers and Advisers took place on a regular basis to monitor organisational change and young people's progress. They were able to speak with children, relevant staff and school managers, listen to school concerns, discuss any observations and make any relevant recommendations thought appropriate to myself.

Psychologists

187. Initially the school had access to a Consultant Psychologist who spent one day a month in the school to observe practice, assess the effectiveness of the programmes provided by teaching and care staff and advise on how the school's Organisational Development Plan could be developed more effectively. A valuable support service subsequently withdrawn by the Principal Psychologist as the Service's philosophy now favoured Community Care rather than Residential Support for Young People with Additional Support Needs associated with Social, Emotional and Behavioural Difficulties.
188. As a result, the service provided was then restricted to Case Psychologists referring young people to the school and attending case reviews to monitor progress. However, the Depute Principal Psychologist did carry out a Baseline and Summative Evaluation of the Effectiveness of the School's Five-Year Organisational Developmental Plan as a means of providing an independent evaluation to add to the school's ongoing assessment of developments made.
189. The outcome of these studies illustrated that, predominantly, Linnwood Hall School had proved effective in meeting the needs of the majority of young people referred to it and had promoted a better understanding of its function within the local community.

Social Workers

190. As the school began to develop the Care side of its service, access to Social Work support was sought initially through access to In-Service Training, with staff undertaking individual programmes such as Child Protection. Additionally, full-time training was provided for a member of staff who was undertaking a professional social work qualification.
191. Increasingly, however, as the population changed at the latter stages of the school's development towards the increased placement of a more challenging population, case Social Workers attended more Case Reviews and got a better understanding of what

Linnwood Hall was attempting to achieve. Unfortunately, they had little influence over changing the developing Social Work commitment to Community Care, which was subsequently to affect the future of the school.

Record-keeping

192. Using the Education Department's recommended guidelines, Record Keeping became a major source of data collation regarding the developments made by individual young people during their placement in Linnwood Hall School.
193. This information was gathered from initial referral documents, case reviews, staff and parental ratings of progress made by young people, together with performance on internal assessments and external examinations as a further indicator of personal achievement.
194. The collated information was used to shape Linnwood Hall School's Organisational Development Plan for the following year and support its request to the Line Manager for enhanced staffing and resources to take the setting to the next stage of evolution.
195. This development was a substantial improvement on Previous Record Keeping in the school, which had focused predominantly on recording basic educational performance and the behaviour of the young people. I saw no record of incidents of abuse, ill treatment or staff inappropriate conduct in the previous documentation.

Abuse

196. In 1988, on my appointment to Linnwood Hall School, 'abuse' was only just becoming recognised as a major issue, leading subsequently to the publication of the 1989 Children's Act one year later.
197. As a result, the definition of 'abuse' used in relation to the treatment of young people in Linnwood Hall School was initially that advocated by the school's Consultant

Adolescent Psychiatrist: She was a recognised expert on abuse and child protection and quickly became the staff adviser on 'abuse', helping them to understand that this behaviour involved more than just physical and sexual abuse, but also included emotional and social abuse as well as neglect.

198. Her definition, which stated that - 'Abuse involves the physical, emotional, sexual and exploitation of young people by adults in a position of trust,' really resonated with the staff, who fully took that concept on board.
199. I did not witness any abuse of any kind taking place in Linnwood Hall during this period.
200. No child ever reported abuse to me during my time in the school.
201. I feel confident that no young person was abused or ill-treated at Linnwood Hall during this time, given the level of input and guidance provided for and by staff.
202. I believe that the focus on abuse and child protection delivered through the initial staff development programme and documentation produced by the Designated Child Protection Manager proved effective in reducing the occurrence of abuse.
203. However, it is possible that abuse could have taken place in Linnwood Hall during my time there and gone undetected, despite all the precautions and continuing training put in place for established and new staff members.

Child Protection Arrangements

204. This definition of 'abuse' was used to help Linnwood Hall develop a coherent Child Protection Policy and to implement an appropriate ongoing Staff Development Programme designed to heighten staff awareness of the issues relating to Abuse and Child Protection. It also ensured that all staff were given consistent sound advice and guidance by Managers, Consultant and myself as to how the young people should be protected from abuse and how to help them handle it.

205. Under my direction, a Senior Houseparent was named 'Designated Child Protection Manager' and given responsibility for the implementation of this strategy. Together with the 'Care Staff Development Coordinator', he also was responsible for setting up both an ongoing Staff Development Programme for existing staff and a Staff Induction Programme for all staff newly appointed to Linnwood Hall School.
206. Following participation in a course on 'Child Protection' run by the Council Social Work Department, the new manager was given direction by myself to develop a specific Child Protection Training Programme based on the guidelines provided during his own training and the advice provided by the Consultant Psychiatrist and myself. This programme was updated regularly for all staff, to ensure that their skills and expertise remained current and that they felt able to deal with such situations autonomously following the specified procedures.
207. Some of the materials provided by the Consultant Psychiatrist and myself were incorporated into the Child Protection Training Programme developed by the Child Protection Manager. These included guidelines on: 'Symptoms of Child Abuse'; 'Supporting Abused Young People'; 'Recording and Reporting Abuse'; 'Action to be Taken if Abuse Observed'; and 'Who to Contact in the Event of Such an Incident'. Awareness of such arrangements helped staff feel more confident about preventing as much as possible the occurrence of abuse, ill-treatment and inappropriate conduct by staff.
208. With the use of Social Work Guidelines and the further help from the Consultant and myself, the Designated Child Protection Manager further outlined Linnwood Hall School's structure for dealing with 'Internal Allegations'. He also evolved with the Social Work Liaison Coordinator a 'Reporting Procedure' to link with other External Agencies involved in Recording and Investigating the impact of such an incident, together with clarifying the 'Communication System' with other agencies activated by such a report.
209. As a result, the effectiveness of these Social Work Guidelines on the process of training and provision of clear policies and practices ensured the development of a

staff whose awareness of the needs of these youngsters had been heightened. Consequently, during this time, I feel that the arrangements put in place proved effective, in that I cannot recall any young person or staff member ever reporting to me directly an experience of abuse.

210. Looking back, given that staff had been aware of previous abuse by a former staff member, of which I knew nothing on appointment not having been informed of this situation by the Education Department, their new heightened awareness of 'abuse' meant that it was unlikely that young people would be exploited during that time. However, I believe that the Designated Child Protection Manager, Consultant Psychiatrist, staff and myself had done their best to set up a robust Child Protection system which could ensure that such an incident would not recur.

Allegations of Abuse

211. I have never been the subject of an allegation of abuse or ill-treatment of children and young people.

Investigations into Abuse - Personal Involvement

212. I was never involved in any investigation into abuse allegations during my time as Head of Linnwood Hall.
213. I was never made aware of a complaint of abuse or ill-treatment of young people by a member of staff, so there was no reason to make a report to police.
214. There were no occurrences of alleged abuse while I was Head of Linnwood Hall School. As such, no references were ever given to a person subject to a child protection concern.
215. No member of staff resigned because they were the subject of a complaint or an investigation into alleged abuse while I was Head of Linnwood Hall School.

216. I was not involved in any other investigation.
217. To my recall, no reference was given for any staff member who was the subject of a child protection concern.

Reports of Historical Abuse and Civil Claims

218. I have never been involved in the handling of reports to Linnwood Hall School by former residents.
219. I was never involved in the handling of civil claims made against Linnwood Hall School.

Police Investigations / Criminal Proceedings

220. During my time at Linnwood Hall School, I was unaware of any police investigation into alleged abuse.

Convicted Abusers

221. I subsequently became aware once the case was in the public domain that David Murphy had been convicted of child abuse in 2001.
222. I met with David Murphy as part of a group of Houseparents during an induction programme I ran following my appointment to Linnwood Hall School. Subsequent interaction with David Murphy took the form of monitoring the evening groups he ran prior to his resignation. During these activities he gave no evidence of inappropriate behaviour.
223. Throughout the three-month period, he did nothing to stand out or give cause for concern.

224. I don't know how this person was recruited to Linnwood Hall School. I cannot recall which care qualifications he had gained. I believe that he had had training in a previous setting. He was subject to regular monitoring by the Depute Head. I was unaware of any previous allegations of abuse.

Other staff working at Linnwood Hall School at the same time

David Murphy

225. I do recall David Murphy. He was a housemaster and member of care staff at the school when I started in 1988, but he left after three months. I would say he was around sixty-five at that time. I actually remember very little about him. I didn't know him well but would say he was quiet and non-intrusive.
226. I did see David with children in the school and would say he was a competent worker. I didn't see him discipline children. I didn't see nor hear of him abusing children.
227. I only heard that David Murphy had abused children after he was sentenced in 2001. I am aware he was found guilty of sexually abusing a number of children in a previous setting and at Linnwood Hall before I took up post.

KNF

228. I recall KNF at the school. He was there when I started in 1988 and was there for the following six months before he left. I would say he was around forty years old at that time. He was a houseparent and member of the care staff.
229. I did see KNF with children and would say he was competent, but showed little commitment. I did not see him discipline children. I did not see nor hear of him abusing children.

KNG

230. I recall KNG. Our time at the school coincided between 1988 and 1991. KNG would have been in his forties and was SNR and member of the SNR. I remember him as being a very competent science teacher and a talented musician. He was conscientious and hard working. I only knew him professionally and would say he interacted with the young people with great rapport.

231. I didn't see KNG discipline children. I did not see nor hear of him abusing children.

KZZ

232. I recall KZZ. Our time at the school overlapped between 1988 and 1991. KZZ was in his late fifties and was SNR of the school and a member of SNR. KZZ was very competent but he wasn't committed to the job.

233. I saw KZZ with children and would say he was jocular and amusing, but able to control a situation when required. I saw him discipline children with strict verbal direction when required. I did not see nor hear of him abusing children.

HTZ

234. I recall HTZ. Our times coincided at the school between 1988 and 1994. HTZ would have been in his forties and was a technical teacher and member of the teaching team. I would say he was well liked by the children and staff and was always willing to go the extra mile for the young people.

235. I didn't know HTZ well, only at a professionally level. I did see him with children and would describe him as very competent and encouraging. I did not see nor hear of him disciplining or abusing children.

LUT

236. I only met LUT once. Our time did not overlap as he was SNR I would say he was in his sixties when I met with him. I remember very little about him although I would say he was very forceful and pushy.

237. I didn't see him with children. I didn't see nor hear of him abusing children.

Thomas George

238. I recall Thomas George. Our time at the school overlapped between 1988 and 1994. Thomas would have been in his sixties back then and was a gardener and member of the ancillary staff.

239. I remember having to formally warn Thomas for selling garden produce locally and keeping the income rather than sourcing the school kitchen. I didn't know him well but would say he only did what he needed to do and no more.

240. I did see him with children and would describe him as directive and strict. I didn't see him discipline children and did not see nor hear of him abusing children.

GLQ

241. I recall GLQ. Our time at the school overlapped between 1990 and 1994. GLQ was in his forties and was a physical education teacher and a member of the teaching team. I remember he was very good with the young people and with greater commitment, in my opinion, he could have been really special with the right effort.

242. I didn't know GLQ well but would say he was very amusing and used his sense of humour to build relationships with both colleagues and young people.

243. I saw GLT with the children and would say he was well organised and a good motivator. I did not see him discipline children nor did I see or hear of him abusing children.

GLT

244. I recall GLT. Our time at the school overlapped between 1991 and 1994. GLT was in his forties when he became SNR and member of the SNR. I remember him as being very experienced, highly motivated and hard working. I knew GLT well and would describe him as reliable and dependable.

245. I saw GLT with children. He had a real rapport with young people, so experienced little difficulties in motivating them. I did see him discipline children and he did so directly and openly with every incident recorded fully. I did not see nor hear of him abusing children.

KNH

246. I recall KNH. Our time at the school overlapped between 1988 and 1991. At that time he was in his forties and was SNR and the care team. I didn't know KNH well but would say he was an excellent member of staff, quiet and steady and a committed team member.

247. I did see him with children and would describe him as quietly motivational, getting the most out of the young people. I saw him discipline children and would say that he firmly issued clear guidance and outlined consequences. I did not see nor hear of him abusing children.

KZP

248. I recall KZP. Our time at the school coincided between 1988 and 1994. KZP would have been in his forties and was SNR and

the care team. I didn't know KZP well but would say he was very conscientious and hard working and committed to fulfilling his job.

249. I saw KZP with children and would say he was very competent and well organised so that the young people knew exactly where they were with him. I also saw him disciplining children. He provided clear guidelines regarding expectations and consequences, so that the young people knew exactly what was expected of them. I did not see nor hear of him abusing children.

GLU

250. I do not recall a GLU

HPH

251. I do not recall a HPH

GLS

252. I do not recall a GLS

Leaving Linnwood Hall School

253. I resigned from my position as Headteacher on the grounds of ill health and, with much sadness and considerable regret, left Linnwood Hall School in 1994.
254. I did not need references from my time at Linnwood Hall School, as subsequently I set up my own part-time professional psychological practice - 'Redcroft Psychological Consultancy'. In due course I also sought part-time employment as an educational psychologist, using references by local professionals familiar with my psychological practice.

Helping the Inquiry


255. With regard to the situation at Linnwood Hall School, all incidents of abuse took place prior to my appointment. I now know that such abuse did take place by David Murphy in a previous Children's Home, as well as during the previous regime within Linnwood Hall. However, I was never informed of this situation by the Education Department prior to appointment, nor during my time in Linnwood Hall.
256. Having worked with many traumatised adults as a psychologist, I can well understand how such abusive experiences in early adolescence can result in victims continuing to have a lasting impact throughout their lives until they can obtain closure by seeing their abuser punished, which was achieved in the case of David Murphy.
257. In my opinion, the lessons to be learned from the Linnwood Hall experience are that, at a personal level, people put into such a position of trust as a Headteacher need to be fully screened before appointment. They also need to be fully monitored in terms of their accountability for the management and support of the vulnerable young people placed in their care throughout their time in office.
258. At an organisational level, the Linnwood Hall experience also illustrates that for the experience to prove fully effective in preventing the issue of 'abuse' with young people, it is essential for such a setting to have:
259. Clear policies on everything likely to affect interaction with the young people and which can protect their person and interests; fully trained staff experienced in supporting young people who have been abused; managers trained in supporting both young people and staff regarding their ongoing residential experience; professional support available for both young people and staff from professionals with expertise in working with young people who have been abused; opportunities for professional support being available for young people when required; ongoing staff guidance to ensure their awareness of the causes of abuse and how young people can best be supported; effective record keeping to ensure that any instance of abuse is fully reported, recorded and actioned; an established support network of all appropriate agencies

and officials is an imperative so that staff immediately know who and how to access the appropriate resource.

260. However, based on my personal experience at Linnwood Hall School, I would say that the most important factor is that the individual appointed to a senior management position should be fully informed prior to taking up post of any person on the staff complement who has been suspected, or found guilty of abuse, so that any requisite action can be taken.

Other information

261. 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.....17 June 2025.....