

APPENDICES

- Appendix A** Table of key features of 15 cases of child sexual abuse in organisational settings
- Appendix B** Examples of low-level concerns, and to illustrate the boundaries between low-level concerns and allegations
- Appendix C** Diagram 1: Spectrum of behaviour
Diagram 2: Sharing low-level concerns – action required by staff, safeguarding lead, values guardians/safeguarding champions
- Appendix D** Low-level concerns and data protection
- Appendix E** Example low-level concern form
- Appendix F** Example timeline where multiple low-level concerns are shared regarding the same individual
- Appendix G** Commentary on neutral notifications/low-level concerns
- Appendix H** Biographies



Appendix A

Table of key features of 15 cases of child sexual abuse in organisational settings

This table contains examples of fifteen cases of child sexual abuse by adults in organisational settings which were subsequently the subject of a public enquiry or published external review.

Its purpose is to illustrate that it is rare for cases of organisational child sexual abuse to occur without there having been preceding concerns observed by others. It also highlights other relevant issues about the circumstances of the abuse.

Education Sector³⁸

Case and source of information	1. Vanessa George Not for profit nursery (UK) for children aged 2+ and babies under 1 year. Plymouth Safeguarding Children Board (2010) <i>Serious Case Review re Nursery Z</i> . Plymouth, Plymouth Safeguarding Children Board.
The perpetrator	Female nursery worker. Aged 39 when sentenced in 2009. <i>Known</i> to have abused babies and children between late 2008 and June 2009. Concerns about Mrs. George's behaviour were raised from late 2008 (she joined the nursery in 2006). Took indecent images of, and sexually abused children at, the nursery where she worked. Sent images of herself abusing children at the nursery to a male who she met over the internet. She did not meet him in person until their trial. A popular member of staff who was described as having changed around the time of the commencement of the abuse. Initially described by the community as happy and bubbly. The SCR states "Although she was not senior in her position, other factors such as her age, personality and length of service could have created an illusion of position of power and encouraged a sense of trust." (Paragraph 5.2)
Known victim(s)	Babies and children under school age – exact ages unknown. Police were unable to identify victims. Victims were too young to report the abuse.
Colleagues	Staff noted changes from December 2008 when Mrs. George started to talk about chasing men and sexual encounters. Mrs. George was noted to not use general nappy changing areas but to use cubicle with full door. Mrs. George justified this on the basis that she could not bend to change nappies. Mrs. George's physical bulk blocked line of sight of her activities. Mrs. George's position of power within the staff group was such that although staff became increasingly concerned about her crude language, discussion of extra-marital relationships and showing indecent images of adults on her phone, they felt unable to challenge her. It is possible that staff believed they had "allowed" the abuse to happen as they had been drawn into her discussions about adult sexual behaviours but had not known how to raise this with others. A student on placement was described as being petrified of the nursery manager, which may have been indicative of the culture of the nursery.

Continued on next page

³⁸ Information on cases 1-5 originally appeared in Wonnacott, J., Foster, J. and Shaw, H. (2018) *After Savile: Implications for Education Settings* in M. Erooga, M. (ed) *Protecting Children and Adults from Abuse After Savile*, London, Jessica Kingsley Publishers

Education Sector³⁸

Organisational culture

Staff described the nursery as dirty, depressing and demoralising.

There were poor recruitment practices.

Roles and boundaries were not clear.

Roles of Trustees were not clear.

The nursery complaints procedure was not clear.

Cliques within staff made it difficult to report or act.

There was poor recording of incidents and follow up.

There were no whistleblowing procedures nor advice around e.g. nappy changing etc.

The ratio of staff to children was frequently breached, allowing Mrs. George more opportunities to be alone with a child.

A review of records and staff interviews made it clear that the nursery was not able consistently to provide a safe, positive environment for the children in its care.

Staff had little or no knowledge of sexual abuse or offending.

Family and community

Parents thought the manager was the owner of the nursery, which was not the case.

Governance arrangements were poor.

Parents did not know how to make a complaint.

Parents and nursery workers socialised together – blurring boundaries.

The nursery manager was also a Governor of the school that the nursery was associated with, and a foster carer, meaning the community expected that she would understand safeguarding, which in turn made it more difficult to challenge the ethos of the school.

Education Sector³⁸

Case and source of information	2. Robert Stringer State Primary (UK). Raynes, B (2011) <i>Executive Summary of Serious Case Review Written About Teacher Mr X</i> , Hillingdon Local Safeguarding Children Board.
The perpetrator	Male; joined the school as a newly qualified teacher. Committed suicide when due for trial in 2010, aged 56. Known to have abused girls between 2003 and 2009. Concerns about Mr. Stringer’s behaviour were raised in 1998 – the year he joined the school. Charged with 25 offences against four girls between 2000-2007. Set up and led a prestigious drama club with which Mr. Stringer used to test out the likely resistance of children he targeted for abuse. Difficult to manage, he flouted school rules and his lessons were known to lack structure.
Known victim(s)	Girls under 13 years old, the youngest aged 9. Known to have favourites. Pupils were aware that Mr. Stringer had access to a large knife used in drama productions. Pupils sought status through selection for roles in the drama club. Pupils were told Mr. Stringer would go to prison if they disclosed and no-one would then be able to look after his disabled wife.
Colleagues	Head and colleagues found Mr. Stringer “difficult.” Mr. Stringer instilled fear in staff through his behaviour e.g. shouting at them. Staff expressed concerns about Mr. Stringer’s relationship with pupils in the drama club. Anonymous referral was made to the headteacher. Reported concerns included suspicious photos on Mr. Stringer’s computer and him showing 15 rated DVD with explicit sex scenes to year 5 (9-year-old) pupils. This latter concern was reported by the parent of another child. Two teachers who attended safer recruitment training informed the headteacher that Mr. Stringer “ticks all the boxes of the [training] exercise <i>Profile of an abuser.</i> ”
Organisational culture	Mr Stringer’s offending spanned the tenure of two headteachers. Weak leadership of the first headteacher, and personal distractions of the second headteacher, fostered a culture where safeguarding was not taken seriously. Lack of record keeping meant patterns of behaviour were not identified.
Family and community	Parents were desperate for their children to get into the drama club which Mr. Stringer used to foster strong relationships with parents. Parents petitioned for Mr. Stringer to return to the school when suspended. Mr. Stringer had strong backing from the governing body making it difficult for second headteacher to challenge him.

Education Sector³⁸

Case and source of information	3. Nigel Leat State Primary (UK). North Somerset Safeguarding Children Board (2012) <i>Serious Case Review: The Sexual Abuse of Pupils in a First School Overview Report</i> , Weston-Super-Mare, NSSCB.
The perpetrator	Male; joined the school as a mature newly qualified teacher, who had previously worked as a musician and music teacher. Aged 51 when imprisoned in 2011. Known to have abused girls between 2006 and 2010. Concerns about Mr. Leat's behaviour were recognised from the time at which he joined the school in 1996. Mr. Leat pleaded guilty to 36 sexual offences, including 8 counts of penetration of a child under 13. He possessed 30,500 indecent photographs and 720 indecent films. Despite having been acting senior teacher at the school for 6 months and, at various times appointed as lead coordinator or in a support role to lead coordinator for a range of subjects, Mr. Leat was known to have a lax approach to teaching and classroom discipline.
Known victim(s)	Female primary school victims, the youngest aged 6 years. Mr. Leat had favourite pupils, all female, to whom he gave privileges and presents. Mr. Leat targeted as favourites those academically less able, vulnerable and "pretty." Two pupils reported to the school that Mr. Leat kissed them and touched their legs but the abuse only came to light after a pupil made a disclosure to her mother.
Colleagues	30 incidents of inappropriate behaviour were reported between 1999-2010, ranging from low-level issues around the content of lessons, to touching pupils inappropriately. It was "common knowledge" that Mr. Leat made inappropriate jokes. Staff were unaware of safeguarding procedures and internal training had not enabled them to identify Mr. Leat as an abuser. Non-professional staff made complaints, for example, Mr. Leat having a child on his knee, and having an erection whilst holding a child. The only action in relation to any of these concerns was a single verbal warning.
Organisational culture	There was evidence of poor relationships in the school. Not all staff felt they were treated equally. The school culture did not put children first and discouraged open communication. There was evidence of a hierarchical culture where junior staff did not feel they would be taken seriously, and the headteacher did not rigorously follow up concerns.
Family and community	The school community was not particularly local – parents may not have shared concerns with each other. The school was not seen by external agencies as needing support, leading to a false sense of security in the parent group.

Education Sector³⁸

Case and source of information	4. Jeremy Forrest State Secondary (UK). East Sussex Safeguarding Children Board (2013) <i>Serious Case Review: Child G</i> , Brighton, East Sussex Safeguarding Children Board.
The perpetrator	Male teacher. Aged 30 when convicted in 2013. Known to have abused one teenage female pupil during 2012. Concerns about Mr. Forrest's behaviour were raised over a period of 9 months before the abduction of the pupil in September 2012. Developed an older "boyfriend" relationship with the pupil. Set up additional lessons and contacted the pupil via social media.
Known victim(s)	The pupil was aged 14-15, and was already known to have been vulnerable from contact with a previous abuser when she was aged 12.
Colleagues	Accumulating concerns developed amongst staff who were aware of Mr. Forrest's "inappropriate relationship" with the pupil and him using Twitter to communicate with her. Staff were supportive and reluctant to believe Mr. Forrest might be an abuser. Mr. Forrest was seen as the victim of the pupil's infatuation. A teacher noted in their diary "Discussed with Child G to stop hounding Mr. K [i.e. Mr. Forrest] in corridors...Find own-age boyfriend."
Organisational culture	Safeguarding was not high on the agenda in spite of a recent case of abuse in the school which resulted in a member of staff being imprisoned. A "head in the sand" approach was taken to safeguarding and there was an assumption that allegations were false. There was an adult focused culture where pupils' voices were not heard. The pupil (who Mr. Forrest subsequently abducted) was regarded as the problem.
Family and community	Mr. Forrest spoke directly to the parents of the pupil to reassure them that there was no relationship. The parents accepted that their daughter had a "crush."

Education Sector³⁸

Case and source of information	5. William Vahey Secondary private / International (UK). Davies. H. (2014) <i>Southbank International School Independent Review arising from the criminal conduct of William Vahey: Final Report</i> , London, Farrer and Co, LLP. Wonnacott, J. and Carmi. E. (2016) <i>Serious Case Review: Southbank International School</i> , Hammersmith and Fulham, Kensington & Chelsea and Westminster LSCB.
The perpetrator	Male teacher. Identified as an abuser in 2014. Committed suicide aged 64 in 2014 prior to being apprehended by the FBI. <i>Known</i> to have abused 54 secondary aged boys between 2009 and 2013 (possibly having offended for decades in a career that involved teaching in a number of international schools). Concerns about Mr. Vahey's behaviour were raised during his first week at the school in 2009. Mr. Vahey's previous history in the USA (1969) of abusing children was not picked up in pre-employment checks. Mr. Vahey ran a prestigious 'travel club' involving residential trips abroad. On trips Mr. Vahey drugged victims, many of whom were not then, and are still not, aware that they were abused. Mr. Vahey aligned himself with those in power, making it difficult to challenge behaviour that may have caused concern. Mr. Vahey's abuse came to light after he had left the school and was working abroad, when a domestic maid stole a data stick containing images of his abuse.
Known victim(s)	Abused boys aged between 12-14 years. Chose either very popular pupils or those with some vulnerability. Pupils were 'chosen' or selected to go on trips, and trips were used as a way for Mr. Vahey to be alone with pupils. Pupils joked that Mr. Vahey was a "paedo" but his popularity and mechanism for abusing boys when they were drugged meant that no formal allegations were made.
Colleagues	Some staff were uneasy about Mr. Vahey's behaviour but put it down to his "informal style." Mr. Vahey was not universally popular with staff but was difficult to challenge as he aligned himself with those in power. Staff were overtly threatened that Mr. Vahey could use his wife's influence (she held a high-profile position in the professional community) to damage their careers. Training on safeguarding had focused mainly on abuse within the family, and did not equip staff to understand indicators of abuse in their own organisation or how to report them.

Continued on next page

Education Sector³⁸

Organisational culture

Laissez-faire and relaxed under first headship.

Changes in leadership, management and proprietors caused uncertainty and rifts in the staff group. This diverted attention from any concerns about Mr. Vahey.

There was over-reliance on external inspection regimes rather than reflective practice with clear lines of accountability concerning governance to scrutinise effectiveness of safeguarding practice.

Family and community

Mr. Vahey quickly normalised behaviours such as being alone with children and manipulating staff ratios for trips.

Popular with parents and pupils – Mr. Vahey came second in teacher popularity ratings.

Families from abroad may not have been familiar with child protection expectations and procedures in UK and were provided with very limited information.

The school was a strong social hub for families from abroad where the school was perceived as “part of the family.”

Education Sector³⁸

Case and source of information	6. Jonathon Thomson-Glover Independent boys' day and boarding school (UK). <i>Jones, P. (2016) Investigation into Safeguarding Issues at Clifton College Arising from The Prosecution Of X, Bristol: Clifton College.</i>
The perpetrator	Male Housemaster, teacher and former pupil of the school. Aged 53 when convicted in 2016. Known to have abused secondary aged boys over a period of 16 years. Also took covert indecent photographs and video of male and female pupils. Concerns about Mr. Thomson-Glover's behaviour were raised from 1999 onwards. Convicted of taking indecent images of pupils between 1998-2004. 330 tapes were recovered by Police. Secretly installed cameras. Groomed pupils through providing friendship, beer, pizza, socialising and encouraging them to break school rules. Sexualised relationships through "banter" and discussing his own sexual relationships. Befriended adult carers and headteachers. Described by boys as behaving like a friend rather than a teacher.
Known victim(s)	Boys – described as "good looking, naughty, sporty" were favourites. "Chosen" to go and stay at a holiday cottage owned by Mr. Thomson-Glover, where he also abused two boys. Victims were also chosen to socialise with Mr. Thomson-Glover in his (school) study, where alcohol was consumed. In 2003 pupils complained about Mr. Thomson-Glover sleeping in the school boarding house, locking the kitchen and drinking alcohol.
Colleagues	Colleagues noticed blurred boundaries between pupils and Mr. Thomson-Glover. An Education Psychologist was concerned about favourites and Mr. Thomson-Glover fitting the profile of an abuser. Several allegations were made about Mr. Thomson-Glover being tied up in his study by pupils in a state of undress. A cleaner reported Mr. Thomson-Glover wrapping a boy in cellophane as a prank. Concerns were expressed by non-teaching staff who could see Mr. Thomson-Glover's behaviour was different from other staff. Complaints were diluted, lost or disbelieved as they went up the management chain.
Organisational culture	A liberal ethos in the school had developed from its early days and this deterred people from reporting concerns when rules were broken. Favouritism was part of the school culture. There was a culture of "informally socialising." There was a culture of "pranks" in the school. There was a lack of curiosity or consideration that "it could happen here."

Continued on next page

Education Sector³⁸

Family and community

There were permeable boundaries with families, some of whom would make private visits to Mr. Thomson-Glover's holiday cottage.

Some parents complained that trips were only for favourites.

There was a lack of confidence in the complaints system by families in the late 2000's – they did not want to "rock the boat" in case it was taken out on a pupil. The headteacher and Mr. Thomson-Glover seemed to be friends.

Education Sector³⁸

Case and source of information	<p>7. Laurie Elizabeth Softley</p> <p>State Secondary (Academy).</p> <p>Teacher Regulation Agency (TRA) Professional conduct panel outcome November 2018.</p> <p>https://www.derbytelegraph.co.uk/news/derby-news/lifetime-classroom-ban-ecclesbourne-sex-2409856.</p>
The perpetrator	<p>Female music teacher.</p> <p>Aged 34 when prohibited from teaching.</p> <p>The CPS took the decision not to prosecute.</p> <p>Known to have sexually abused a 17-year-old male pupil in 2008 (on more than one occasion), and a second 17-year-old male pupil in 2013 (on more than one occasion).</p> <p>Both cases of abuse were arranged via social media, and involved alcohol and visits to Ms. Softley's home.</p> <p>An investigation was conducted and Ms. Softley was given a final written warning in September 2008.</p> <p>Rumours then existed in school about Ms. Softley's behaviour from 2013. A report in the Derby Telegraph newspaper suggests the behaviours involved swearing and being drunk in charge of an international trip.</p> <p>Comment was made in the TRA conduct panel's recommendations to the Secretary of State regarding Ms. Softley's disciplinary record at the school "Whilst the factual background to these incidents is separate and different to the proven allegation, the panel considers that this history is indicative of previous failures to act in accordance with required standard of conduct."(P.12).</p> <p>The panel found little or no evidence that Ms. Softley had any insight into her actions.</p>
Known victim(s)	<p>Two male pupils.</p> <p>Pupil A, aged 17 in 2008.</p> <p>Pupil B, aged 17 in 2013.</p> <p>Pupil B disclosed in 2017 that Ms. Softley had engaged in sexual activity with him, leading to a police investigation.</p>
Colleagues	<p>In 2013 a teacher overheard pupils discussing rumours of an inappropriate relationship between Ms. Softley and pupil B.</p>
Organisational culture	<p>A final written warning for gross misconduct was given in September 2008 regarding pupil A – following Ms. Softley's admission in a police interview that sexual activity had occurred between her and pupil A.</p> <p>In 2013, an investigation took place regarding pupil B but both he and Ms. Softley denied it. Accounts were sought from other pupils at the school but no direct evidence was found and the matter was closed.</p>
Family and community	<p>Pupils allegedly joked that "She'll buy you a drink – and apparently she'll do more than that."</p> <p>Pupil B said that when she picked him up in her car she was uncoordinated and missed the gears.</p> <p>Pupil B had heard rumours that she had "slept with the lads in the years above me."</p> <p>Whilst at the school Ms. Softley had 'transformed' the music department and was described as a perfectionist.</p>

Sports and Leisure

Case and source of information	<p>8. Jerry (Gerald) Sandusky</p> <p>Penn State University (USA).</p> <p>Freeh, L. Sporkin, S. and Sullivan, W. (2012) <i>Report of the Special Investigative Council Regarding the Actions of The Pennsylvania State University Related to Child Sexual Abuse Committed by Gerald A. Sandusky</i>, Washington DC; Freeh, Sporkin and Sullivan, LLP.</p>
The perpetrator	<p>A male football coach at Penn State University (PSU), and founder of the Second Mile Foundation, a non-profit organisation which served underprivileged and at-risk youth.</p> <p>In those roles Mr. Sandusky was a nationally known celebrity in the sports community.</p> <p>The Second Mile Foundation was praised as a “shining example” of charity work by U.S. President George H. W. Bush in 1990.</p> <p>Aged 68 in 2012 when convicted of abusing 10 boys and young men between 1994-2008.</p> <p><i>Known</i> to have abused boys and young men between 1994 – 2008.</p> <p>An allegation about Mr. Sandusky’s abuse was first made in 1998.</p>
Known victim(s)	<p>Since Mr. Sandusky’s conviction further allegations of his abuse of boys and young men have been made.</p> <p>He targeted potential victims through the football programs in which he was a leading figure, and through his Second Mile Foundation.</p>
Colleagues	<p>Several staff members regularly observed him showering with young boys, none of whom reported this behaviour to their managers. Some of the offences for which Mr. Sandusky was subsequently convicted occurred during this time.</p> <p>Concerns about Mr. Sandusky’s behaviour were reported to PSU managers after this time but were not appropriately responded to or acted upon.</p>
Organisational culture	<p>The independent review noted a “total and consistent disregard by the most senior leaders at Penn State for the safety of Sandusky’s child victims.” (P.14).</p> <p>Further, 4 senior figures at PSU actively “concealed Sandusky’s activities from the Board of Trustees, the University community and authorities.” (P.14).</p>
Family and community	<p>Mr. Sandusky was well known in the community and highly regarded for his work with youths.</p> <p>The independent review describes a culture of reverence for the football program (of which Sandusky was a key element) “...that is ingrained at all levels of the campus community” (P.17).</p>

Sports and Leisure

Case and source of information

9. Grant Davies

RG Dance Studio, Sydney (Australia).

Royal Commission Investigation into Institutional Responses to Child Sexual Abuse (2017) *Report of Case Study No. 37: The response of the Australian Institute of Music and RG Dance to allegations of child sexual abuse*, Commonwealth of Australia, Sydney.

The perpetrator

Male co-owner (with his sister), and principal instructor of, a nationally known dance studio in Sydney, Australia.

Aged 41 when convicted in 2015.

Known to have abused girl and boy students from 2002.

Allegations of abuse were first made against Mr. Davies in 2007.

As well as sexually assaulting students, Mr. Davies took indecent photographs of them and exchanged thousands of explicit text messages with two young female adolescent victims and their mother.

In 2015, Mr. Davies pleaded guilty to 28 charges relating to child sex offences over a period of 13 years against adolescent female and dance students.

Sentenced to 24 years imprisonment, and to serve 18 years before being considered for parole.

Mr. Davies had both hierarchical power as co-owner and principal dance instructor, and was an organisational and national dance community celebrity.

Mr. Davies used his positional and ascribed authority to enable him to make rules that enabled his abusive behaviour. This included giving private tutoring in a secluded location, and to be generally regarded as 'above suspicion,' despite concerns arising about aspects of his behaviour e.g. choreographing sexualised dance routines.

Known victim(s)

Male and female students aged between 10-14 years.

Mr. Davies encouraged obedience to him in order to achieve success in the world of competitive dance and was idolised by many of his victims and their families.

One parent described the dance students as being "on a constant emotional roller-coaster," with Mr. Davies encouraging the children to push themselves to extremes in their performance to please, rather than anger, him.

Students felt emotionally blackmailed by Mr. Davies or were otherwise afraid of him.

Colleagues

Mr. Davies' only significant colleague was his sister and co-owner.

Other dance instructors were also employed at the studio, but overall it appears that by conflating the success of the dance studio and individual students' achievements with sexualised practices (e.g. not allowing underwear or a G-string while performing) Mr. Davies was able to divert concern about his behaviour.

Organisational culture

A key element of the studio culture was its reputation for having a 'winning' culture, with students often claiming top prizes at competitions.

This engendered a highly competitive atmosphere which required long hours of attendance, conformity to rules about behaviour at the studio and outside of it (e.g. diet). This led to a high level of compliance with Mr. Davies' expectations and gratitude to him for what was achieved.

Continued on next page

Sports and Leisure

Family and community

Two mothers of Mr. Davies' victims were separately complicit in the abuse. One was subsequently convicted and imprisoned for taking and sending naked, indecent photographs of her two daughters to Mr. Davies.

The other mother was described as "obviously acquiescing" to Mr. Davies' grooming of her daughter and was given a suspended prison sentence.

Students and teachers who expressed concern were accused of telling lies or labelled as "troublemakers."

The inquiry also found that:

- (i) parents were groomed to comply with Mr. Davies' wishes;
 - (ii) reports of child sexual abuse were not made in a timely manner, or were otherwise hindered because Mr. Davies' standing and position within RG Dance intimidated students and families; and
 - (iii) students and parents felt a strong desire to succeed in dance and feared that non-compliance with Mr. Davies' behaviour would have a negative impact on the students' dance careers.
-

Sports and Leisure

Case and source of information

10. Professor Victor Makarov

The Australian Institute of Music (AIM), Sydney (Australia).

Royal Commission Investigation into Institutional Responses to Child Sexual Abuse (2017), *Report of Case Study No. 37: The response of the Australian Institute of Music and RG Dance to allegations of child sexual abuse*, Commonwealth of Australia, Sydney.

The perpetrator

Male Professor of Music.

Aged 51, when arrested in February 2004.

Known to have abused boys between 2002 – 2004.

Allegations of abuse were first made in 2004.

Arrested in February 2004 and charged with sexual offences against two male students. In May 2004, Professor Makarov was charged with a further 19 charges of child sexual assault in relation to an additional three male students. The offences took place at the Institute and Professor Makarov's home.

In a total of four trials, Professor Makarov was convicted of 26 charges, ranging from gross indecency to aggravated indecent assaults and aggravated sexual intercourse with a minor.

He was sentenced to a total of 12 years' imprisonment.

Known victim(s)

Male students aged from 13-17 years.

One student victim gave evidence that over time his family became very close to Professor Makarov's family and bought him presents for his birthday, Christmas and when he went on overseas trips.

Colleagues

[Intentionally blank]

Organisational culture

At the time of the allegations against Professor Makarov, AIM did not have any policies, procedures or systems in place concerning the prevention, handling and receiving of complaints, and the conduct of investigations of allegations of child sexual abuse, and it provided no training to staff on reportable offences.

When AIM was made aware of an allegation by one of Professor Makarov's students they suspended Professor Makarov for a weekend. After he was charged with the offences and bailed, AIM decided that he should continue to work but be supervised at all times. Despite advice to the contrary this was apparently due to a view that AIM was in a "legal bind" between the risk of prejudicing Professor Makarov's interests at trial and child protection.

The New South Wales Department of Education and Training subsequently advised that Professor Makarov was rated a "high level of risk" but this did not prompt AIM to change its position not to suspend him.

Family and community

[Intentionally blank]

Health Professionals

Case and source of information	<p>11. Dr. Myles Bradbury</p> <p>Addenbrookes Hospital (UK).</p> <p>Scott-Moncrieff, L. and Morris, B. (2015) <i>Independent investigation into governance arrangements in the paediatric haematology and oncology service at Cambridge University Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust following the Myles Bradbury case</i>, Cambridge, Cambridge University Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust (UK).</p>
The perpetrator	<p>Male Consultant Paediatric Haematologist at Addenbrookes' Hospital, Cambridge, UK.</p> <p>Aged 42 when convicted in 2015.</p> <p><i>Known</i> to have abused boys between 2007 – 2013.</p> <p>In 2005 Dr. Bradbury purchased a video with images of naked people, including children. Interpol were made aware of this in 2010.</p> <p>Behaviours of concern at Addenbrookes Hospital were identified in retrospect, but not recognised as significant at the time.</p> <p>Dr. Bradbury was sentenced to 22 years imprisonment in 2015, reduced to 16 years on appeal in 2016.</p>
Known victim(s)	<p>Dr. Bradbury pleaded guilty to 28 offences against children, committed over some 3.5 years against 18 male patients aged between 10-15 years during medical examinations.</p> <p>As well as sexual assaults, the offences included voyeurism by secretly filming patients with a camera concealed in a pen during medical examinations. Two were offences of possession of 16,000 indecent images of children of a similar age to the patients he abused.</p>
Colleagues	<p>The inquiry indicated that no-one interviewed as part of their and the police investigation, including the families of victims, as well as Trust staff, had raised any concern about Dr. Bradbury's behaviour with the Trust, or with anyone else, nor were they aware of anyone else raising a concern.</p> <p>Dr. Bradbury justified not adhering to usual practice and rules by suggesting his "adjustments" to schedules and protocols were in his patients' best interests – e.g. non-chaperoned to appointments to spare boys' embarrassment.</p> <p>The inquiry concluded "We consider that the staff on the (unit) are not to blame for failing to be suspicious of Dr Bradbury's behaviour." (P.13).</p>
Organisational culture	<p>Dr. Bradbury had hierarchical power as a senior medical practitioner, and this was the basis of his ability to circumvent agreed policies and safeguarding rules.</p> <p>The inquiry was generally positive about the Trust, and observed that it had "robust and effective safeguarding governance arrangements, going to Board level." (P.13).</p>
Family and community	<p>Dr. Bradbury was involved in church and Scout groups in the community, and was described as "a man of great charm and persuasiveness" whom everybody trusted.</p> <p>Dr. Bradbury abused vulnerable patients and exploited the doctor/patient relationship to conceal the abuse. When one victim raised concerns with his mother, she responded: "He's a doctor, it must be necessary."</p>

Health Professionals

Case and source of information	12. Dr. Larry Nassar Michigan State University, USA Gymnastics and the US Olympic Committee (USA). McPhee, J. and Dowden, J. (2018) <i>Report of the Independent Investigation: The Constellation of Factors Underlying Larry Nassar's Abuse of Athletes</i> , New York, Ropes and Gray.
The perpetrator	Male team physician and national medical co-ordinator for the USA Gymnastics national team for 20 years. He was also a physician at the School of Osteopathic Medicine at Michigan State University – where he treated the School's gymnasts and other athletes and the team physician to Holt High School, Michigan. Aged 56 when convicted in 2017. <i>Alleged</i> to have abused girls since 1994. Concern about Dr. Nassar was first expressed, by a parent, in 1997. In 2017 and 2018, Dr. Nassar was convicted of 10 charges of sexual offences against female adolescent patients, and of possessing 37,000 child abuse images, as well as a video of him molesting underage patients. In three separate trials, in Federal and State courts, during 2017 and 2018, Dr. Nassar was sentenced, cumulatively, to between 140 and 360 years in prison.
Known victim(s)	Subsequent to Dr. Nassar's conviction, a financial settlement was reached in relation to 332 victims of his sexually abusive behaviour, and it is estimated that overall Dr. Nassar committed thousands of acts of abusive behaviour with over 400 adult and minor victims. Dr. Nassar used physical force, feigned friendship and concern, and the imposing nature of his national position and reputation to enable him to commit acts of abuse which were often physically painful for his victims, as well as to keep them from reporting.
Colleagues	Dr. Nassar's power was derived from his hierarchical and positional authority as the National Medical Coordinator for US Gymnastics, as the most senior physician in the organisation and a Professor of Medicine at Michigan State University. His 20-year position with US Gymnastics created organisational celebrity as the foremost medical expert in the sport. Dr. Nassar used his position and power to justify a medical need for vaginal 'manipulation' as a routine part of his treatment regime, to justify seeing patients unchaperoned, and persuading victims that their discomfort with his procedures was justified. Dr. Nassar used his position and his reputation to convince his patients, their parents, and other physicians that these treatments were medically appropriate, even after complaints were made. During his trial it was concluded that they were in fact primarily for his sexual gratification.

Continued on next page

Health Professionals

Organisational culture

The independent investigation suggested that Dr. Nassar acted “within an ecosystem that facilitated his criminal acts.” It goes on to state that “Numerous institutions and individuals enabled his abuse and failed to stop him, including coaches at the club and elite level, trainers and medical professionals, administrators and coaches at Michigan State University, and officials at both United States of America Gymnastics and the United States Olympic Committee. These institutions and individuals ignored warning signs, failed to recognise textbook grooming behaviours, and on occasion dismissed clear calls for help from those being abused by Dr. Nassar. Multiple law enforcement agencies, in turn, failed effectively to intervene when presented with opportunities to do so.” (W).

Family and community

When survivors first began to come forward publicly, some were shunned, shamed, or disbelieved by others in their own communities.

Other Settings

Case and source of information	<p>13. Jonathan Lord</p> <p>YMCA, New South Wales (Australia).</p> <p>Royal Commission Investigation into Institutional Responses to Child Sexual Abuse (2014), <i>Report of Case Study No. 2 YMCA NSW's response to the conduct of Jonathan Lord</i>, Commonwealth of Australia, Sydney.</p>
The perpetrator	<p>Male childcare assistant at a YMCA childcare centre at Caringbah, Sydney, Australia.</p> <p>Aged 26 when convicted in 2013.</p> <p><i>Believed to have abused boys from 2009.</i></p> <p>In 2009 Mr. Lord was dismissed from a YMCA summer camp in the USA for "questionable behaviour" with an 8-year-old male camp attendee. Later that year he started work at the YMCA childcare centre YMCA in Sydney as a childcare assistant. This is the setting where he committed the offences for which he was convicted.</p> <p>By early 2013, Mr. Lord had been convicted of 13 offences involving 12 boys:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">(i) eleven counts of aggravated indecent assault on a person under 16 years; and(ii) two counts of sexual intercourse with a child under 10 and under authority. <p>Mr. Lord was sentenced to 10 years' imprisonment, with a non-parole period of 6 years.</p>
Known victim(s)	<p>While employed with YMCA NSW, Mr. Lord groomed and sexually abused several boys, aged between 6 and 10 years, at YMCA NSW and elsewhere.</p> <p>Many of his offences were committed on YMCA premises and during excursions.</p>
Colleagues	<p>Mr. Lord regularly breached YMCA NSW child protection policies: he was regularly babysitting and attending outside activities with children from YMCA NSW. Both were prohibited activities for all childcare staff.</p> <p>Although some staff and parents knew that Mr. Lord babysat for children outside YMCA hours, they never reported his conduct. In fact, other staff also babysat YMCA children, as did the manager.</p> <p>A further area where Mr. Lord repeatedly breached policies was allowing children to sit on his lap, sometimes when other staff were present. He also used his mobile phone at work to groom children so he could offend against them. Both these activities were in breach of YMCA NSW policy. YMCA Caringbah staff did not identify this behaviour as contrary to the policies.</p>

Continued on next page

Other Settings

Organisational culture

During the period of Mr. Lord's employment, YMCA NSW had over 80 policies in place, and many referred to child sexual abuse and maltreatment. However, the Commission heard expert evidence that the policies were too complex, and sometimes inconsistent and inadequately communicated to staff and parents. Overall, the Commission concluded that YMCA Caringbah did not have an effective system for ensuring that staff and parents were aware of and understood its child protection policies, and that there was a serious breakdown in the application of YMCA NSW's child protection policies at YMCA Caringbah.

The extent of the policy breaches identified suggests a breakdown in communication between management and staff. Although YMCA NSW did have a reporting system, it was ineffective. Some junior staff stated that they felt uncomfortable speaking to their managers, or worried that nothing would be done about their concerns.

In its report, the Commission's concerns were such that it recommended that the YMCA consider whether the General Manager of Children's Services, and the Chief Executive Officer, were fit and proper to hold those positions.

Family and community

Mr. Lord was a generally popular and well-liked member of staff. However, when one mother of a child to whom he showed inappropriate images complained, she did not consider that she received an appropriate response and he went on to commit further offences after that time.

Other Settings

Case and source of information

14. Jimmy Savile

Leeds Teaching Hospitals (UK).

Proctor, S., Galloway, R., Chaloner, R., Jones, C. and Thompson, D. (2014) *The report of the investigation into matters relating to Savile at Leeds Teaching Hospitals NHS Trust, Leeds*; Leeds Teaching Hospitals NHS Trust.

The perpetrator

Male nationally known celebrity in the UK. Sir Jimmy Savile's involvement at Leeds hospitals spanned from 1960 through the 1990s. He volunteered there as a porter and used his celebrity status to take on a role as a fund raiser. He was associated with raising £3.5 million for services at the Infirmary.

Aged 84 when he died in 2011.

Believed to have begun abusing in 1962. The last alleged incident at Leeds Infirmary was in 1999. His victims were both male and female children and adults.

Reports were made by patient victims to staff from the mid-1960s but allegations were not escalated or followed up.

Mr. Savile was never charged or convicted during his lifetime. After his death in 2011 allegations began to emerge about his offending.

Known victim(s)

Sixty accounts of abuse in premises run by the Leeds Teaching Hospitals NHS Trust or its predecessors, were received by the inquiry.

Victims ages ranged from 5 years to 75 years. 19 children and 14 adults were patients at the time of their abuse. In addition, 19 members of staff reported abusive or inappropriate encounters with Mr. Savile.

The majority of his victims were in their late teens or early twenties. The earliest case was in 1962, when Mr. Savile was 36 years old; the most recent in 2009, when he was 82.

Mostly, assaults were opportunistic, and many took place in public areas such as wards and corridors. However, eight cases suggest an element of premeditation: in some instances, this included the grooming of victims and their families over a period of months. Mostly Savile worked alone, but on occasion he was assisted in his abusive behaviour by others.

They ranged from lewd remarks and inappropriate touching, to sexual assault and rape. These encounters took place on wards, in lifts, in corridors, in offices, off site in a local café, in his mother's house, and in his campervan.

Colleagues

Only 4 children and 5 adults reported their experiences at the time to staff or a colleague, but for various reasons were either not considered credible or not appropriately escalated.

Different levels of the organisation held disparate views of Mr. Savile and his value to them. Among staff in the wards and departments he was tolerated because of his celebrity and popularity with patients.

Mr. Savile was, however, seen by many as a nuisance, a disruptive presence in the clinical areas and, towards female staff, a sex pest.

Continued on next page

Other Settings

Organisational culture

Mr. Savile regularly visited wards and departments, both as a porter and as a celebrity. Generally, these would be unannounced visits, at any time of the day or night, and he would chat to patients and staff alike. He was considered to be very popular with patients, and his visits were seen by many as a boost to morale.

Mr. Savile used his personal charisma, and national and local celebrity, to exploit a setting where he had considerable formal and informal power and influence. His flamboyant and “larger than life” persona gave him further licence for eccentric and unconventional behaviour which resulted in him being free to take opportunities to abuse e.g. he was well known for greeting women by kissing their hand, and sometimes licking their arm.

Family and community

He successfully maintained an almost continual presence in the local press associated with his charitable fundraising.

Other Settings

Case and source of information	15. Jimmy Savile Stoke Mandeville Hospital (UK). Johnstone, A. and Dent, C. (2015) <i>Investigation into the Association of Jimmy Savile with Stoke Mandeville Hospital: A Report for Buckinghamshire Healthcare NHS Trust, Amersham; Buckinghamshire Healthcare NHS Trust.</i> Vize, C. and Klinck, B. (2015) <i>Legacy Report – Further Investigation into the Association of Jimmy Savile with Stoke Mandeville Hospital Amersham; Buckinghamshire Healthcare NHS Trust.</i>
The perpetrator	<p>Mr. Savile was involved at Stoke Mandeville between 1968 – 1992. He volunteered as a porter, and used his celebrity status to take on a role as a major fund raiser for the hospital, resulting in a newly built unit – for which he raised funds being named after him.</p> <p>Aged 84 when he died in 2011.</p> <p>From his earliest association with the Hospital Mr. Savile inappropriately touched young female staff.</p> <p>The investigation into Mr. Savile at Stole Mandeville Hospital took the view that enough was known about Savile’s personal conduct by the 1970s to have warranted assertive intervention at a senior level.</p> <p>Mr. Savile was never charged or convicted during his lifetime. After his death in 2011 allegations began to emerge about his offending.</p>
Known victim(s)	<p>Mr. Savile is believed to have committed sexual crimes at Stoke Mandeville between 1968-1992, against 65 female victims and one male victim, aged between 8-40 years – including patients, visitors and staff.</p>
Colleagues	<p>Similar to the experience at Leeds Teaching Hospitals, Mr. Savile seems to have been seen by many as a nuisance, a disruptive presence in the clinical areas and, towards female staff, a sex pest. However, there is no indication of general knowledge of his abusive behaviour.</p>
Organisational culture	<p>The inquiry concluded that it appears that the full extent of Mr. Savile’s consensual and non-consensual sexual behaviour remained unknown to the senior members of the hospital staff for several reasons. These included informal and weak complaints and general information management processes, and a hospital where each ward and department managed its own complaints and concerns internally with very little being brought to the attention of the administration.</p> <p>Disorganised and weak management infrastructure led to a silo-based management of the complaints process. This had the effect of preventing complaints from being resolved appropriately, or coming to the attention of the senior administrative tier.</p>
Family and community	<p>Mr. Savile was generally well regarded publicly and described by a local newspaper as the “patron saint of Stoke Mandeville Hospital.”</p>
