

Submitted Date	05-Jun-2018 13:25
Total Time Taken	2190.48
Come-back-Later Code	33YG47QX84
1. Is this an individual response or are you officially responding on behalf of an organisation?	Individual
2. Please provide your name	Rev Dr P A McGavin
3. Please indicate your stakeholder group(s) :	Clergy/Religious
8. Please select the state(s) and/or territory(s) you are based in?	New South Wales
Do you consent to your identifying details being published, in addition to your responses, on the CPSL website?	Yes, CPSL can publish my identifying details
General feedback relating to the Standards	
1. The National Catholic Safeguarding Standards are: - Easy to understand	Agree
1. The National Catholic Safeguarding Standards are: - Presented in a logical manner	Agree
1. The National Catholic Safeguarding Standards are: - User-friendly	Agree
1. The National Catholic Safeguarding Standards are: - Consistent and accurate in their use of terminology	Agree
2. I/we believe that the National Catholic Safeguarding Standards create conditions that will increase the likelihood of identifying and reporting harm to children in Catholic entities.	Agree
3. I/we believe that the National Catholic Safeguarding Standards will facilitate appropriate response to disclosures, allegations and suspicions of harm to children in Catholic entities.	Agree
4. I/we believe that the National Catholic Safeguarding Standards will reduce the likelihood of harm to children in Catholic entities.	Agree

Please provide further explanation regarding your choice of responses to questions 1 to 4, either by providing a general comment below and/or providing specific comments against each Standard in the next section of the Survey.

5. General/Overall comments on the National Catholic Safeguarding Standards

The survey states feedback only on Standards 1 - 10. But there is a huge gap in these standards: they do not ensure that those who run the Safeguarding Programs are appropriately qualified. I have experience with persons who are inadequately qualified and who bring "their own agenda" to the program. Specification of competencies to run the program need articulation; and these need to be broad-based (for example, include understanding processes of psycho-sexual development). Also lacking is adequate safeguards for those against who complaints are raised: there must be complete transparency, and accountability by the Safeguarding Personnel, and there must be expeditious handling of issues (indefinite sidelining of clergy, with attendant derogation of their status should not be allowed). There must be greater clarity of the personal responsibilities of Bishops and other Superiors.

On 7.1.2 of "at least annual refresher": I have gone through these and learned nothing new. We live in an electronic age, and we should receive electronic posts of all updates, and be required by a specified date to return a post that we have read and understood the updates. We should not be treated like children who need classroom exposition. Most of my life I have been a priest/tertiary-educator, and I am a self-educator. There need to be smarter ways of ensuring that church personnel are kept up-to-date, and this requires flexibility in administration. The process tends to operate like a computer-based program, where there are only "right"/"wrong" boxes to tick. This is not intelligent. CPSL needs to move to intelligent and discriminatory (that is, with ethical discrimination and social discrimination) in practice. We are not "all the same".

Standard 1: Committed leadership, governance and culture

<p>1. How would you rate this Standard in relation to safeguarding children from harm in Catholic entities?</p>	<p>Effective</p>
<p>1a. Please explain your response.</p>	<p>The program reads like an "information curriculum"; whereas the really critical issues are character (that is, moral character) and understanding that is cast in a context of understanding social processes and understanding psychological processes (including psycho-sexual development).</p>
<p>2. What are the key challenges and opportunities for improvement in relation to the topic covered by this Standard? Will the National Catholic Safeguarding Standards address and alleviate these challenges?</p>	<p>The key challenge is to keep Bishops (and other Superiors) responsible; otherwise they become just "rubber stamps" for a bureaucratic process. The central focus must be people, even before process.</p>
<p>3. What are the main challenges and obstacles you can foresee to the implementation of, and achievement of compliance with, these Standards?</p>	<p>The main challenge is that they be understood and applied intelligently. An analogy is the street cameras that catch photography of exceeding 40km zones. These zones may be on the other side of the street from the school; the school may be a senior high school; the school may have high and spiked steel fencing; there may be no egress along the 40km street (egress from an adjoining street); there may be pedestrian traffic lights. But it still costs hundreds of dollars to exceed 40km. The analogy is an example where there is need for intelligent application and accurate reading of social circumstances and vulnerabilities. In brief, the main challenge will be for the program to be administered intelligently.</p>
<p>4. Are there any gaps in the Standard, Criteria, Indicators or Implementation and Evidence Guide that you can identify, or areas that have not been covered?</p>	<p>The biggest gap is equity applied to the person against whom a complaint is made. The next biggest gap is overt statement that the program is targeted (to children; to vulnerable persons) and is not a simply across-board that can be used in a cavalier way.</p> <p>the next biggest gap is that persons administering the program are adequately equipped to do so (they should have had an intelligent education; not a "training").</p> <p>The next biggest gap is to ensure that the</p>

	<p>program is administered in an "education" manner, rather than in a "training" manner; the latter degenerates to unintelligent protocol that does inadequately grapples with the complex issues that are engaged and the complex discernments that are to be made by persons engaging with children or vulnerable persons (and, of program, with persons generally).</p>
<p>Standard 2: Children are safe, informed and participate</p>	
<p>1. How would you rate this Standard in relation to safeguarding children from harm in Catholic entities?</p>	<p>Effective</p>
<p>1a. Please explain your response.</p>	<p>Excuse me, I did not notice the "Standard 1" heading on the previous page, and so my previous page gives my overall responses.</p>
<p>2. What are the key challenges and opportunities for improvement in relation to the topic covered by this Standard? Will the National Catholic Safeguarding Standards address and alleviate these challenges?</p>	<p>See above</p>
<p>3. What are the main challenges and obstacles you can foresee to the implementation of, and achievement of compliance with, these Standards?</p>	<p>See above</p>
<p>4. Are there any gaps in the Standard, Criteria, Indicators or Implementation and Evidence Guide that you can identify, or areas that have not been covered?</p>	<p>See Above</p>
<p>Standard 3: Partnering with families, carers and communities</p>	
<p>1. How would you rate this Standard in relation to safeguarding children from harm in Catholic entities?</p>	<p>Effective</p>
<p>1a. Please explain your response.</p>	<p>See Standard 1 responses</p>
<p>2. What are the key challenges and opportunities for improvement in relation to the topic covered by this Standard? Will the National Catholic Safeguarding Standards address and alleviate these challenges?</p>	<p>See above</p>

3. What are the main challenges and obstacles you can foresee to the implementation of, and achievement of compliance with, these Standards?	See above
4. Are there any gaps in the Standard, Criteria, Indicators or Implementation and Evidence Guide that you can identify, or areas that have not been covered?	See above
Standard 4: Equity is promoted and diversity is respected	
1. How would you rate this Standard in relation to safeguarding children from harm in Catholic entities?	Effective
1a. Please explain your response.	See Standard 1 responses
2. What are the key challenges and opportunities for improvement in relation to the topic covered by this Standard? Will the National Catholic Safeguarding Standards address and alleviate these challenges?	See above
3. What are the main challenges and obstacles you can foresee to the implementation of, and achievement of compliance with, these Standards?	See above
4. Are there any gaps in the Standard, Criteria, Indicators or Implementation and Evidence Guide that you can identify, or areas that have not been covered?	This illustrates the problem: it is program driven, rather than listening to what the respondent is saying: let the respondent use own voice.
Standard 5: Robust human resource management	
1. How would you rate this Standard in relation to safeguarding children from harm in Catholic entities?	Effective
1a. Please explain your response.	Please see responses to Standard 1
2. What are the key challenges and opportunities for improvement in relation to the topic covered by this Standard? Will the National Catholic Safeguarding Standards address and alleviate these challenges?	see above
3. What are the main challenges and obstacles you can foresee to the implementation of, and achievement of compliance with, these	see above

Standards?	
4. Are there any gaps in the Standard, Criteria, Indicators or Implementation and Evidence Guide that you can identify, or areas that have not been covered?	see above
Standard 6: Effective complaints management	
1. How would you rate this Standard in relation to safeguarding children from harm in Catholic entities?	Effective
1a. Please explain your response.	Please see responses to Standard 1
2. What are the key challenges and opportunities for improvement in relation to the topic covered by this Standard? Will the National Catholic Safeguarding Standards address and alleviate these challenges?	see above
3. What are the main challenges and obstacles you can foresee to the implementation of, and achievement of compliance with, these Standards?	see above
4. Are there any gaps in the Standard, Criteria, Indicators or Implementation and Evidence Guide that you can identify, or areas that have not been covered?	see above
Standard 7: Ongoing education and training	
1. How would you rate this Standard in relation to safeguarding children from harm in Catholic entities?	Effective
1a. Please explain your response.	Most of us can't have 2 screens open at once, so if you want responses by individual standards, then you need to include individually at the top of the screen the relevant standard!
2. What are the key challenges and opportunities for improvement in relation to the topic covered by this Standard? Will the National Catholic Safeguarding Standards address and alleviate these challenges?	See responses to Standard 1

3. What are the main challenges and obstacles you can foresee to the implementation of, and achievement of compliance with, these Standards?	see above
4. Are there any gaps in the Standard, Criteria, Indicators or Implementation and Evidence Guide that you can identify, or areas that have not been covered?	see above
Standard 8: Safe physical and online environments	
1. How would you rate this Standard in relation to safeguarding children from harm in Catholic entities?	Effective
1a. Please explain your response.	See responses to Standard 1
2. What are the key challenges and opportunities for improvement in relation to the topic covered by this Standard? Will the National Catholic Safeguarding Standards address and alleviate these challenges?	see above
3. What are the main challenges and obstacles you can foresee to the implementation of, and achievement of compliance with, these Standards?	see above
4. Are there any gaps in the Standard, Criteria, Indicators or Implementation and Evidence Guide that you can identify, or areas that have not been covered?	<p>On the online issue, there is need for graduated sensitivity and sensibilities; senior high school students are in a different category from primary school students in this respect, and they need room to make mistakes and discerning guidance in online usage.</p> <p>A blanket approach will lead them to covert activities, and this is not desirable.</p> <p>The same applies especially with seminarians: the history of offences arises from boys/young men not being assisted or even allowed in psycho-sexual/social development, and thus to their being immature and offending adults: discretion is needed and discernment rather than programmatic policing.</p>
Standard 9: Policies and procedures support child safety	
1. How would you rate this Standard in relation	Effective

to safeguarding children from harm in Catholic entities?	
1a. Please explain your response.	Children also need discerning enculturation, so that they do not have a fearful attitude; they need to learn self-protective behaviours without being fearful and undiscerningly defensive. A great difficulty also involves the engagement with parents/carers. I have seen children/young persons quite damaged because of "uptight" parent/carer environments that do not cultivate good discernments about boundary violations.
2. What are the key challenges and opportunities for improvement in relation to the topic covered by this Standard? Will the National Catholic Safeguarding Standards address and alleviate these challenges?	see above
3. What are the main challenges and obstacles you can foresee to the implementation of, and achievement of compliance with, these Standards?	see above
4. Are there any gaps in the Standard, Criteria, Indicators or Implementation and Evidence Guide that you can identify, or areas that have not been covered?	You need to design a questionnaire program that you then have to "code", rather than one that is from the start "code" driven; because respondents will not fit your framework; your coding of responses needs to follow a more viable pattern (of course, I understand that you are trying to make it easy for yourselves, but it does not work for discerning survey work.
Standard 10: Regular improvement	
1. How would you rate this Standard in relation to safeguarding children from harm in Catholic entities?	Effective
1a. Please explain your response.	There is only so much improvement that can be done. It should more reflect what is noticed as deficient (and significantly deficient, not very marginally deficient), and proceed from there: don't create your self-serving "industry"; seek to discriminate functionally.

<p>2. What are the key challenges and opportunities for improvement in relation to the topic covered by this Standard? Will the National Catholic Safeguarding Standards address and alleviate these challenges?</p>	<p>see above</p>
<p>3. What are the main challenges and obstacles you can foresee to the implementation of, and achievement of compliance with, these Standards?</p>	<p>see above</p>
<p>4. Are there any gaps in the Standard, Criteria, Indicators or Implementation and Evidence Guide that you can identify, or areas that have not been covered?</p>	<p>The term "risk assessment" is often used unintelligently by persons who have not had statistical education, and who tend to think that any possibility requires action, whereas it is practical possibilities that require action. We cannot live in a totally "safe" world, and prudence requires a technical understanding of "risk assessment".</p>