

## Scottish Child Abuse Inquiry

Witness Statement of

BND

1. My name is BND. My date of birth is 1968. My contact details are known to the Inquiry.

### Background

2. I have obtained the following qualifications; a B.Sc. in Agricultural Food Marketing from Aberystwyth in 1990, a B.Th. in Theology from Nottingham in 1993, an Independent Schools PGCE from Buckingham in 2008, three GCE A-levels and nine GCE O-levels.
3. My employment history is as follows; from 1994 to 1997, in from 1997 to 2002, at Loretto School from 2002 to 2010, from 2010 to 2015, housemaster at Loretto School from 2014 to 2017 and at School from 2017 to present. We moved into the boarding house at Loretto School in 2014 and the post began 2015. The wanted me to work out a fuller notice period and the school and myself were content that it could be done, in terms of taking only. That arrangement was in place until early 2015.

### Employment with Loretto School, Musselburgh

4. I was at Loretto School from 2002 to 2010. I was responsible for duties which included preparation and a role with the whole school community. In addition to

██████████ duties, I was effectively the ██████████ department. I taught ██████████ from primary 4 up to 5th form, including GCSE, although the year groups I was required to teach did vary somewhat over time. I also taught ██████████ to some year groups from 2006 onwards and helped with games coaching throughout this time. Games coaching included rugby, lacrosse, athletics and football.

5. After leaving in 2010, I was asked to provide ██████████ cover for two further terms, the appointment of my successor having faltered. This I did and so effectively ceased to be ██████████ from ██████████ 2011.
6. In a second period of employment at Loretto School, I was housemaster of Seton House. Seton House was the junior boys' boarding house where the youngest pupil was 11 and the eldest 16. Over this time I also taught ██████████ from second to fifth forms. I held similar games responsibilities during this employment. I was not responsible for ██████████ duties as such, although I did cover for the then ██████████ when he was off sick for about a term. This was from ██████████ 2014 to ██████████ 2017.
7. When I was recruited references were taken up from the ██████████ and ██████████ with, I think, an initial one year probationary period. The post had been advertised in the ██████████ Times. There was an extensive and fairly rigorous interview procedure that covered a couple of days and involved meetings with several members of staff, headmaster, deputies and ██████████ to the senior school. ██████████ was the main prerequisite and General Teaching Council for Scotland, GTCS, registration was not required at that stage.
8. In the second period of employment, GTCS registration had become necessary and so I sought and gained registration during that time. References were taken up from the ██████████.
9. The post of ██████████ answered directly to both head and deputy head. The head was the ultimate line manager, but on a day-to-day basis dealings were more frequently with his deputies. Within the ██████████ department the head of ██████████ was my line manager. With regard to sport, the director of sport.

10. Informal meetings with the head and deputies occurred frequently, but formal monitoring and appraisal took place as part of a cycle. Liaison was likewise freely available at an informal level, with planned meetings with the head about twice per half term. These usually involved discussion of upcoming [REDACTED] services and academic [REDACTED].
11. As houseparent, the deputy head pastoral was immediately in line, with Vicegerent involved as well.
12. There was a New Staff Training programme at the start of the first academic year and in-service training at the beginning of most terms. The school did fund attendance at a Scottish Council of Independent Schools training session for houseparents in 2015.

### **Policy**

13. I did not have responsibility for policy in relation to the care of children, other than reading and observing them, in common with all staff.
14. My perception was that policies were introduced and reworked to reflect the changing technological, social and legal climate of the day.

### **Strategic planning**

15. I did not have responsibility for strategic planning for the school.
16. My recollection of the school's strategic approach was that there was a shift in emphasis from "mind, body and spirit" to "a small school, big on heart and big on opportunity." Strategy appeared to revolve around numbers, keeping going was an issue, as in there were genuine financial concerns at the time; and also provision – trying to make the best possible educational, academic and sporting provision for the boys and girls.

### **Other staff**

17. Initially, I did not manage staff employed at the school. Latterly the assistant houseparents in Seton reported to me within the overall structure. There was not much by way of standardised appraisal, as there were 3 different assistant houseparents during the eight terms I was in post, between 2015 and 2017. The first assistant housemaster was Geoff Harbison, who was excellent. So excellent that he was the obvious choice to be housemaster of Hope House when that came available in 2015. He was replaced by Fiona Monk. We had a good year together, but she unfortunately became ill on the first day of the 2016 to 2017 academic year and was signed off for the term. She left the post as a result of that illness and was replaced by Michael MacDonald in January 2017.

### **Recruitment of staff**

18. Initially I was not involved in the recruitment of staff at the school at all. I was involved with the appointments of assistant houseparents within Seton House in 2015 and 2016.
19. The post was advertised internally because it was seen as a logical career progression for someone wanting to make boarding provision more of a focus. There were full interviews on both occasions with myself, the Vicegerent, the deputy head pastoral all present. It was a competitive process.
20. References in each case were from internal line managers. Vicegerent, Nigel Bidgood, will have discussed these references with the Head and then also with myself and the deputy head pastoral. There was an element of known quantity about all of the candidates, as the appointments were internal.

### **Training of staff**

21. I was not at all involved in the training or personal development of staff in the first instance. Following the assistant houseparent appointments in 2015 and 2017 there was a practical “how do we run this house together” element. Specific policies were still produced and disseminated centrally.
  
22. Loretto was always reasonably keen to fund and assist in the finding of relevant training and personal development programmes. For example, they supported me in taking a two day [REDACTED] stay at [REDACTED] in Hawarden on a more or less annual basis. There was never an issue with staff attending subject-specific training days. Specialist Practitioner Qualification and Boarding School Association training programmes were required and encouraged for boarding staff in later years and quite possibly before, though I don't know. The school funded part of my Post Graduate Certificate in Education, PGCE, course at Buckingham and happily gave me the time to attend it in 2007.

#### **Supervision/staff appraisal / staff evaluation**

23. I was not involved in supervision, staff appraisal or staff evaluation at all initially. I would have been involved with assistant houseparent staff appraisals in Seton had they been in post long enough to be appraised. In terms of supervision, there was a formal element in terms of scheduling and rotas as well as regular feedback on the day-to-day running of the house. The house logbook was used by some for this, although more usually email or personal conversation were used to convey any issues.
  
24. Staff were appraised on a formal basis annually, so far as I remember. The exact nature of “appraisal” varied, in fact developed, over the years and I suspect with role undertaken as well. I think that appraisal was a developing idea throughout that period. I may well be wrong, but it seemed more formal the more substantial the post, or the aspect of the post under consideration. For example, more rigour around academic roles than assistant coaching roles in sports. That is how it appeared to me and not necessarily what was actually the policy or practice of the School. Certainly appraisal contained elements of self-reflection and analysis as well as

formal interviews and discussion of role under [redacted] QSF [redacted] s [redacted] SNR [redacted] and subsequently. It appeared less formal but nonetheless was taken seriously under Michael Mavor.

### **Living arrangements**

25. From 2002 to 2006 I lived in a school-owned property off site. From 2006 to 2010 I lived in Pinkie House housemaster's flat. Pinkie House had a connecting door through to a corridor that was occupied by 6th form male pupils but which was generally only used for fire safety purposes when we lived there. The acting housemaster lived at the end of that corridor in a self-contained flat. Our residence had its own external entry point that was not shared. From December 2014 to July 2017 I lived in Seton House housemaster's flat. This was separate accommodation with its own entry but it had two connecting doors to residential corridors in the junior boys' boarding house.
26. Some staff lived in school-owned accommodation offsite. Some had school-owned accommodation onsite. Housemasters, assistant housemasters and also some matrons and residential tutors had to live in school accommodation due to house roles. House main entries were all on numbered keypad locks. In general, there was very little accommodation that had direct links to pupil residential areas that was not occupied by house staff. The exception being Pinkie House, which had the Head's accommodation within it as well as our flat when we lived there.
27. Most of the accommodation that had direct links to pupil areas was inhabited by housemasters, assistant housemasters and matrons all of whom were house staff and had a direct role in the running of the boarding house. That was true of Seton, Hope, Balcarres and Holm. Pinkie House had the head's house and a housemaster's flat, which we lived in. As the house was not being used fully for boarders from 2006 to 2010 an annexe, which boarders lived in, had the assistant housemaster's flat incorporated in it. He was responsible for the boarders. In practice, our connecting door stayed closed throughout, as did the head's connecting door to the house.

28. Housemasters, assistant housemasters, any matrons and cleaning staff as well as residential tutors and visiting tutors who were performing boarding house duties had access to the children's residential areas. Other staff were allowed to visit boarding houses, but entered through house offices and accessed communal areas and not residential areas. Site workers carried out maintenance tasks during the working day, when pupils were in school.

### **Culture within Loretto School**

29. The School had a "family feel" to it. There was a real sense in which people knew one another, by name at least, and there was a broad camaraderie amongst both staff and pupils. I was very happy [REDACTED] to go there, which [REDACTED] did for three years, between 2014 and 2017.
30. There was a fairly disciplined academic environment generally, but also an extensive co-curricular programme to which everybody made some contribution and which meant that children were encouraged as more than just academic entities.
31. I was aware of no rumour or evidence of fagging during the time that I was there.

### **Discipline and punishment**

32. Discipline fell under the purview of the deputy heads generally, but was the responsibility of all. Sanctions available consisted mainly of "bookings" which were kind of written public warnings. Sanctions also included "gatings" which involved the restriction of downtown privileges or of outside boarding house activities with repeated verification required by supervising staff. A further sanction was detention which took place sometimes at lunchtime or after lessons, sometimes on Saturday evenings. There were also varying degrees of exclusion.
33. These punishments were given out by teaching or house staff, except for exclusions which always involved the head.

34. There was a sanction policy for the school that was periodically updated and distributed to all staff. Pupils were kept abreast of rules via distribution of written policies.
35. A full record of more serious sanctions will have been kept centrally, bookings probably less so.
36. As far as I was aware, the responsibility of older pupils with regard to discipline was to model good behaviour. I don't recall them having authority to dish out punishments per se, although that had been the case many years earlier, say in the 1960s.

#### **Day to day running of the school**

37. I was not involved in the day to day running of the school. There was the head, two deputies and the vicegerent as well as other promoted posts. They "ran" the school on a day-to-day basis.
38. The school had a clear whistleblowing policy and generally, everybody seemed to know one another's business. It was quite a small school. I would have expected any abuse or ill-treatment to come to light quite rapidly. Apart from anything else, pupils talked about everything with each other.
39. I suppose somebody with power could always attempt to persuade, threaten or cajole somebody without power to comply with their demands. I was not aware of this happening at Loretto then.

#### **Concerns about the school**



40. I was not aware of the school ever being the subject of concern because of the way in which children and young people in the school were treated. Any complaint would have been taken seriously.

#### **Reporting of complaints/concerns**

41. If any child in the school, or another person on their behalf, wished to make a complaint or report a concern then there was a process in place.
42. In the first place, the process was utilised, through assistant housemasters, the housemaster or designated pastoral leads. Almost invariably house staff were involved due to proximity of contact and because they were known by pupils. If the complaint had been about any of those people, then it would be dealt with by the deputy head pastoral or the head directly. For the most part the process was, necessarily, confidential and so its use or otherwise would not have been broadcast.
43. Complaints would always have been taken seriously. The Scottish boarding school community is small and word does not have to get far before everybody has heard if something is wrong. I think the financial difficulties that led to the closures of Rannoch and St Margaret's schools seemed to have done the rounds before the event. There were also well-publicised issues at Merchiston and Edinburgh Academy whilst I was at Loretto.
44. Complaints would have been recorded centrally and kept on file by the school secretarial staff, I believe.

#### **Trusted adult/confidante**

45. There was always a school counsellor employed. They were paid by the school, but had an "external life" and could always have been visited and spoken to by pupils at any point. They had weekly surgery sessions as well as specific appointments

available. Any member of staff could also be spoken with by any pupil who saw them as their "trusted individual".

46. The expectation on the [REDACTED] in this regard was firstly to be supportive of the structures as they existed. [REDACTED] issues had very much moved away from the [REDACTED] and towards counsellors and housemasters or housemistresses before I even arrived. I had supposed, wrongly, that there would be a considerable [REDACTED] role, as in [REDACTED]. This was just never the case. The expectation of the School was, though, that you would be there as [REDACTED] to pupils and staff alike as needed. I endeavoured to do that. [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Occasionally somebody would want a chat [REDACTED]. The [REDACTED] issues people came to me with were thus [REDACTED] issues such as questions of [REDACTED] rather than issues like self-harm or bullying.

47. The counselling element was always there, as far as I know. I don't know the extent to which this confidential service was used.

### **Abuse**

48. The school had a definition of "abuse" that it applied in relation to the treatment of children at the school during my employment. Anything of a sexual, physical, verbal, social or psychological nature, that threatened the livelihood and wellbeing of a child would constitute abuse of children in the eyes of the school.
49. The definition was communicated and explained to staff working at the school through in-service training on a frequent, minimum annual, basis and through written documents including a small card that was carried by all staff and pupils. Or at least was given to them.
50. I don't know when the definition was introduced. It would have changed to reflect the law as that has changed.

### **Child protection arrangements**

51. All relevant government documentation was distributed either in full or in a digested format on a regular basis and at least annually. More usefully, updates would have been given by the safeguarding lead to make people aware of new aspects of the law or trends that might affect pupils at the school, for example "sexting".
52. There was clear instruction on how to handle, and respond to, reports of abuse or ill-treatment of children by staff, other adults, or fellow pupils. We were instructed to listen without prejudice, take seriously without presumption, record and pass on to the safeguarding lead any report of abuse or ill-treatment of a child.
53. There was not much autonomy, including discretion, given to staff, including managerial staff, in relation to these matters. If the report was intended seriously, then it was expected to be taken seriously.
54. The school had child protection arrangements in place to reduce the likelihood of abuse, ill-treatment, or inappropriate conduct by staff, or other adults, towards children at the school. Childline was used and there was advertisement of numbers pertaining to that. There was a clear whistleblowing policy. The overall nature of the school meant that there was an ongoing level of contact and communication between staff and children that allowed for issues of concern to be raised, for example to a tutor, a teacher, a house duty person, a member of house staff team or to more senior members of staff. There was clear training and instruction on what signs to look out for, for example a child covering up arms, signs of fear at certain indicators and so on. The strong staff community meant that people looked out for one another and stopped or warned against risky behaviours. It felt as though there was a good "self-policing" element to staff relationships.
55. I am fairly sure that the bulk of these child protection arrangements were there throughout. Self-harm has become more of an issue as the new century has advanced and policies concerning that will have become clearer and more obviously

delineated as a result. Ditto cyberbullying and other social media related issues. They weren't really a thing initially but moved to the forefront as usage developed. Policies tracked that. I don't know for certain how these arrangements came about, but assume that Government and Care Commission policies will have informed and directed the creation of many if not all of these arrangements.

56. It felt to me as though these child protection arrangements worked.

### **External monitoring**

57. I was aware of inspectors visiting the school. There was a full inspection whilst I was there the first time and certainly I was aware of the Care Commission inspecting and monitoring the school during my second spell of employment there.
58. Inspectors spoke with children individually and in a group. Children were spoken to with and without staff present, I think. The inspectors spoke to me. They gave written feedback with some obvious whole school elements, some boarding only and some house specific.

### **Record-keeping**

59. Initially record-keeping was strong centrally, but became patchy as you moved out from the centre. Mixed media, written and electronic as things developed and changed, won't have helped. Latterly, records were stored onto a central drive and were accessible, selectively by level, on a need to know basis. They were, at that point, better ordered. Many staff kept good academic records, but pastoral records will have been more limited to incident-related material.
60. Anything leading to an allegation or complaint would have been kept centrally, I think. I can't say for certain whether these will have been well-maintained or not, as I never had access to them.

61. Records I was privy to at first were minimal. In house, there was access to a more or less a full range of personal information via the network and I would expect every view or use of that information to have been logged centrally by IT records.
62. There was virtually nothing kept in the [REDACTED], there having been a loss of data with the interim [REDACTED] before I started. By the time I left in 2017, records seemed to be very carefully kept as a whole.
63. I cannot say with any certainty whether it was forensically logged or not when children reported what they considered to be abuse, ill-treatment or inappropriate conduct. Much of that information would have been held confidentially and would not be freely available to staff.

#### **Investigations into abuse – personal involvement**

64. I was once involved in an investigation into a complaint of inappropriate behaviour that involved me. Otherwise I was not involved in any investigations on behalf of the school into allegations of abuse or ill-treatment of children at the school or into inappropriate behaviour by staff or others towards children. I have not been the subject of any other complaint of which I am aware.

#### **Reports of abuse and civil claims**

65. I was not involved in the handling of reports to, or civil claims made against the school by former pupils, concerning historical abuse.

#### **Police investigations/ criminal proceedings**

66. I did not become aware of police investigations into alleged abuse at the school. I have not given a statement to the police or the Crown concerning alleged abuse of

children cared for at the school. I have not given evidence at a trial concerning alleged abuse of children cared for at the school.

### **Convicted abusers**

67. I do not know if any person who worked at the school was convicted of the abuse of a child or children at the school.

### **Specific alleged abusers**

CRL [REDACTED]

68. I recall CRL [REDACTED] My employment certainly coincided with his between [REDACTED] [REDACTED] and part of [REDACTED] at least, but I am not sure whether all of it. It is a bit of a guess but I think that he was probably late fifties when I left in 2017. I think he was a [REDACTED] teacher who taught either [REDACTED] or both. To me he was a colleague. I did not have any educational, pastoral or academic crossover with him.
69. He was married, but I don't know whether he had children or not. We would talk about [REDACTED] occasionally over lunch. He was interested in most forms of [REDACTED] and complimentary about my own [REDACTED]. He was amiable and polite, though with a slightly hesitant way of communicating due to English being a learned language, I think. I knew him well enough to say hello, stop and chat briefly, but no more socially than that and with almost no academic overlap.
70. I occasionally saw him with children and he was reasonably business-like with them. Such contact was invariably in association with [REDACTED]
71. I did not see him discipline children and I did not see him abuse children. I never heard of him abusing children.

QRO

72. I recall QRO He was employed by the school throughout and also before and after that time. He was probably about late forties when I left in 2017. He was the teacher. I knew him as a colleague. There was no real overlap with , pastoral and academic roles. He did occasionally help to for major services in the school.
73. He produced some excellent while I was there. There were some talented pupils that he really got the best out of. He was married with two kids, well liked children. In terms of home life, they pretty much kept themselves to themselves. He was a good-humoured chap generally. He had suffered from , which occasionally showed itself. He had some good friends, most notably Elaine Logan who was later Head of Glenalmond.
74. I knew QRO quite well. There wasn't that much crossover in our working days, but we did occasionally go out on the same "works drinks" in Musselburgh. Acquaintance more than friend really, but it was always possible to stop and talk together.
75. I did not really see him much with children in a teaching or pastoral capacity. When I did see him in passing he was always polite and courteous with pupils.
76. I did not see him discipline children and I did not see him abuse children. I did not hear of him abusing children.

**Specific allegations of abuse made against me for which there has been no criminal investigation and/or conviction**

77. The complaint against me was made by three female pupils who were in the team that I was coaching at the time. They complained in the first instance, I believe, to their housemistress who would have been Elaine Middlemass, later Logan.



78. The first I knew of the complaint came from the then head, Michael Mavor, who called me to his office, I think on the same day he received the complaint, and questioned me as to the comments made. I think I recall that somebody else was present, but I cannot remember who it was.
79. He detailed a number of foolish comments that I had made over the course of several weeks, that read together sounded even more foolish. Most of them were innuendo based jokes along the lines from "Little Britain" and "I'm Sorry I Haven't A Clue" quotations. I accepted that I had sorely misjudged the situation and shouldn't have used even fairly generic adult humour with pupils. I had also commented on their attire at one point. I told one of them to "put their bum back into their trousers." Their trackies were flying at half-mast. I accepted that that was a crass statement to have made.
80. There was a claim that they had been touched in a manner that was inappropriate to a PE lesson. I had patted someone on the shoulder in mild congratulation and, although to be honest I can't even be sure of this much, might well have put a consoling arm on someone's shoulder when they had been hit in the face by a ball or been knocked by somebody else's [REDACTED] stick. This was a sign of sympathy or exuberance and without any malign intent. Either way, they felt that such contact was inappropriate, as they were fully entitled to do, and they complained about it. I accepted that that was the case and apologised. I asked for my apology to be conveyed to the pupils concerned, whose names I did not know until this inquiry.
81. Any physical contact that was made was made on the wide open spaces of Newfield and in full view of other pupils and staff. I say this to emphasise that nothing sinister whatsoever was done or intended. I have been asked whether I ever put my arms around pupils and hugged them. I cannot remember having put my arms around and hugged any of these three pupils, nor indeed anybody in that team. I am, though, sure that I have hugged pupils and/or been hugged by them after some celebratory events like end of year services, carol services, Loretto Day or suchlike. Not a huge number and not sought out, but the outcome of exuberance at a celebratory



occasion, in the presence of a large crowd doing likewise and usually when parents were there as well.

82. In relation to the comments made by me, I do not now remember many of the comments made, however, I have no doubt that I would cringe at the memory of many stupid comments that I did make and respond quizzically at a few that I feel I did not.
83. I have been asked whether I said "drinking from the furry cup". I did use the expression. I feel terrible for doing so, as I did when the head read it out to me. It is a direct quote from a line in Little Britain. A pupil had asked me whether a staff member was a Lesbian. I said, "Are you asking me whether she drinks from the furry cup? I have no idea, as it is none of my business, nor of yours." It was an awful expression to use and Michael Mavor left me in no doubt that he thought so too. I'm also appalled with myself that I didn't really do anything to stop a colleague's name from being bandied around and probably indulged it really. It has haunted me sporadically from then and the memory of it was brought shamefully back when reminded of it.
84. I have been asked whether I told a pupil who did languages that she "must use a lot of tongue". I don't remember saying this, but it is quite possible that I did. It is typical of the sort of ill-thought-through, fly comments that I had made at that time, because some people found them funny.
85. I have been asked whether I said that a pupil could make excuses for not having their prep because "it was on a memory stick but your father is a sexual deviant and he used it in a game with your mother". I had forgotten about this statement until this prompt. I recall the head being particularly horrified by it and I also recall disputing it at the time as it was not what I had actually said. It is clear that it didn't come out of thin air though. My sketchy recollection is that a lad had not done his essay and had the lame excuse that it was on his memory stick, but that he couldn't let me see it. I asked him whether that was because he or his parents had used it to record dirty movies or something. Not much better, but not quite as heinous.

86. I do remember that when I bridled at one or two of the comments that the head read out, he made it clear that I was not there to discuss the statements, having accepted that the majority were as spoken, but to be informed of the disciplinary process. I decided not to dispute the allegations nor to bring in a support person, partly out of embarrassment and partly out of fear that it would only escalate matters to a more uncomfortable level than they already were. I regret that choice now. The head did point out to me that I could have a support person in the disciplinary hearing if I wished.
87. Having been advised by the head that I would receive a verbal warning as to future conduct, I elected not to embroil any other colleague or representative in matters about which I was understandably embarrassed. I attended the disciplinary meeting alone. I was then quite surprised to be in receipt of a final written warning as to future conduct. I would have taken a supporting person with me had I foreseen that.
88. The documentation was written down in full by the head's personal assistant, Linda Ogilvie, who no longer works at the school but didn't leave that long ago. The complaint was investigated by the head personally, with reference to the girls and their housemistress.
89. The final outcome was a final written warning.
90. I was distraught. I felt as if the complaint had been taken very seriously indeed and that I had paid quite a heavy price for essentially being a motor-mouth. After I had got over being horrified, I amended my behaviour around the pupils commensurately. I became very aware that there is no such thing as "off duty" or "downtime" in a school and that anything you say or do has to be pretty much whiter than white most of the time.
91. The head advised me to "reflect on what had happened, go to your young family and spend some time looking after them and their needs." I did this and found plenty of peace as a result.

92. I continued to work at Loretto for another 3 years and had, I think, good professional relationships with both staff and pupils thereafter. As far as I am aware, there was no further comeback from either the pupils concerned or their parents and they felt that matters had been dealt with thoroughly and firmly.

### **Leaving the school**

93. I left the school in 2010 to be [REDACTED] of [REDACTED] Musselburgh and left in 2017 to become [REDACTED] at [REDACTED] School.
94. I do not know the content of references the school gave to subsequent employers, but I am aware that the SNR [REDACTED], QSF [REDACTED], will have supplied my reference to [REDACTED] in [REDACTED] and that the head in 2016 and 2017, Graham Hawley will have supplied references to [REDACTED]. I did not tell [REDACTED] of the previous complaint against me, believing that this having been removed from my permanent record, as I was informed in 2010 that it was, meant that it had been dealt with and put into the past permanently. There have been no complaints against me at [REDACTED].

### **Helping the Inquiry**

95. I think that the difficulty with a boarding school situation is that you are together all of the time and some of that time staff are "off duty". But actually you never are. This probably needs to be made clearer right from the start and provision of accommodation and a social environment away from campus and pupil accommodation should be better and more fully available. Otherwise the boundaries between school life and social life become blurred and that is where most misunderstanding and inappropriate behaviour will develop.

**Other matters**

96. 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..... DocuSigned by:  
BND  .....

Dated..... 26 November 2020 .....