

I shared the information with West Yorkshire police but did not get a crime number as the perpetrator had died. I now believe that this would have helped the victim/survivor in experiencing a sense of justice having been done, as he had commented that he had not been heard previously.

This case has now been closed. The outcome has been a financial settlement and the offer of continued communication with me if required. I have updated my file to reflect this outcome

*4.2.2. The extent to which CSAS procedures and policies were followed. In the event that a procedure/policy was not followed, please explain why not:*

The Jesuit policy is on the website and refers to CSAS and NCSAS. In this situation I applied the policy in relation to historical abuse. I contacted the relevant police. I took the case to be discussed at the safeguarding commission following consultation with the Chair and I informed the Provincial. I contacted the school to inform the safeguarding team.

I did not complete this in the procedure timescales as the alleged perpetrator was deceased and therefore of no further risk.

The Jesuit policy reflects the CSAS and NSCS requirements but is limited in describing procedure in different eventualities. It is to be reviewed later this year. I refer to CSAS procedures for more detailed response.

*4.2.3 Whether the CSAS guidance was helpful in responding to these safeguarding matters and why?*

In responding to this and all allegations, I use the CSAS case management documentation; In this case the risk information gathering template and safety plan were not used as the alleged perpetrator was deceased. The records for this priest included the information as it applied to other allegations which were made whilst he was still in ministry.

The records are kept on secure computer base as electronic files and in some instances, I do not have signatures added, we are intending to use a case management system to allow for discrete sharing of relevant files for signature.

The CSAS documentation is very useful in guiding thinking and arranging chronology. In this case to prompt appropriate actions. I have now started to use the updated versions more recently developed.

*4.2.4 Any practical recommendations the witness would like the inquiry to consider that they believe may improve or assist safeguarding within the catholic church*

My learning from this process has been that the complexity of structures can result in information not accurately matching between alleged perpetrators and victim/survivors. For each victim/survivor there may be a number of perpetrators and for each perpetrator there may be a number of victims. I would like to see a system that will effectively cross reference all these.