

Scoping Review: Evaluations of pre-employment screening practices for child-related work that aim to prevent child sexual abuse

Appendices 2 and 3: Data extraction forms for scoping review

Parenting Research Centre and the
University of Melbourne

Commissioned by the Royal Commission into
Institutional Responses to Child Sexual Abuse



Scoping Review: Evaluations of pre-employment screening practices for child-related work that aim to prevent child sexual abuse

Project team

The Royal Commission into Institutional Responses to Child Sexual Abuse commissioned and funded this research project. It was carried out by the following researchers:

Dr Sandra South, PhD

Research Fellow, Knowledge Exchange and Implementation, Parenting Research Centre

Prof. Aron Shlonsky, PhD

Professor of Evidence Informed Practice, Department of Social Work, School of Health Sciences, University of Melbourne

Dr Robyn Mildon, PhD

Director of Knowledge Exchange and Implementation, Parenting Research Centre

**Ms Anastasia Pourliakas, MPsyCh.
(ClinPsych)**

Research Officer, Parenting Research Centre

Ms Jessica Falkiner

Research Assistant, Parenting Research Centre

Mr Adrian Laughlin

Research Assistant, Parenting Research Centre

Disclaimer

The views and findings expressed in this report are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect those of the Royal Commission. Any errors are the author's responsibility.

The scoping review was conducted between January and March 2014, and papers and reports dated after this time were not included.

Published date

February 2015

Copyright information

South, S, Shlonsky, A, & Mildon, R. 2014, Scoping Review: Evaluations of pre-employment screening practices for child-related work that aim to prevent child sexual abuse, Royal Commission into Institutional Responses to Child Sexual Abuse, Sydney.

ISBN 978-1-925118-90-2

© Commonwealth of Australia 2014

All material presented in this publication is provided under a Creative Commons Attribution 3.0 Australia licence (www.creativecommons.org/licenses).

For the avoidance of doubt, this means this licence only applies to material as set out in this document.



The details of the relevant licence conditions are available on the Creative Commons website as is the full legal code for the CC BY 3.0 AU licence (www.creativecommons.org/licenses)

Contents

Appendix 2: Blank data extraction form	4
---	----------

Appendix 3: Completed data extraction forms for each of the 25 included evaluations	5
--	----------

1.1	Abel et al. (2012)	5
1.2	Attorney-General's Department (2011)	7
1.3	Bichard (2004)	10
1.4	Braga (1993)	13
1.5	Brannan et al. (1993)	15
1.6	Budiselik et al. (2009)	17
1.7	Budiselik et al. (2010)	19
1.8	Davis & Wells (1994-1995)	21
1.9	Department of Health (1996)	24
1.10	Government of Ireland (2009)	27
1.11	Hanafin & Brooks (2008)	35
1.12	Hanly (2010)	38
1.13	Herman (1995)	42
1.14	Joint Committee on Child Protection (2006)	45
1.15	Kirkwood (1992)	47
1.16	Kozlowski (2000)	48
1.17	Kutz (2010)	50
1.18	Ministry of Social Development (2012)	53
1.19	National Crime Agency (NCA) (2013)	55
1.20	Productivity Commission (2010)	57
1.21	Smith & Aitken (2012)	59
1.22	Sonntag (2012)	63
1.23	U.S. GAO (1997)	65
1.24	U.S. GAO (2011)	68
1.25	Waul Webster & Whitman (2008)	70

Appendix 2: Blank data extraction form

Citation and Extraction details	
Person extracting data	
Date of data extraction	
Author (or Organisation if no author) and Year	
Publication Type	
Title	
Full citation of paper	
Pre-employment Screening Approach Explored	
Type of Pre-employment Screening or Relevant Employment Prohibition Explored	
Target Group (i.e. the type of child-related work addressed)	
Jurisdiction(s)/Location	
Evaluation Details	
Relevant Aims of the Study	
Evaluation Methodology	
Sample Selection/Selection of Participants (including number of cases/events examined)	
When the Cases Examined Occurred/Time-Period Explored	
Relevant Outcome Measures	
Key Findings	
Relevant Key Findings (as reported by evaluation authors)	

Appendix 3: Completed data extraction forms for each of the 25 included evaluations

1.1 Abel et al. (2012)

Citation and Extraction details	
Person extracting data	SS
Date of data extraction	23/02/2014
Author (or Organisation if no author) and Year	Abel et al. (2012)
Publication Type	Journal article
Title	Development and validation of classification models to identify hidden child molesters applying to child service organizations
Full citation of paper	<p>Abel, G. G., Wiegel, M., Jordan, A., Harlow, N., Hsu, Y. S., & Martinez, M. (2012). Development and validation of classification models to identify hidden child molesters applying to child service organizations. <i>Children and Youth Services Review</i>, 34(7), 1378-1389. doi: 10.1016/j.childyouth.2012.03.017</p> <p><i>Note Corrigendum published in 2013:</i> Abel, G. G., M. Wiegel, et al. (2013). ""Development and validation of classification models to identify hidden child molesters applying to child service organizations": Corrigendum." <i>Children and Youth Services Review</i>, 35(1): 204.</p>
Pre-employment Screening Approach Explored	
Type of Pre-employment Screening or Relevant Employment Prohibition Explored	Classification models derived from linear regression analyses designed to identify individuals who have a higher likelihood of having sexually touched underage individuals (17 years of age or younger) in the past
Target Group (i.e. the type of child-related work addressed)	Staff or volunteers applying for organizations caring for children
Jurisdiction(s)/Location	N/A see Evaluation Methodology
Evaluation Details	
Relevant Aims of the Study	"The goal of the present study was to develop a screening methodology to identify individuals who have a higher likelihood of having sexually touched underage individuals (17 years of age or younger) in the past." (p.1382)
Evaluation Methodology	<p>Development and validation of a classification model</p> <p>"[...] the current study built on part of an existing sexual abuser-specific assessment instrument, the Abel Assessment for sexual interest™ (AASI) and</p>

	<p>adapted it for use with the general population (Abel, Huffman, Warberg, & Holland, 1998; Abel, Lawry, Karlstrom, Osborn, & Gillespie, 1994; Abel et al., 2001). A pool of variables was identified in the AASI data, which included some of the “red flags” proposed by McCormack and Selvaggio (1989) and others. Then based on a sample of community volunteers (non-sexual abusers) and individuals who had sexually abused children but were concealing this from evaluators (concealing sexual abusers of minors), two classification models were developed: one for males and one for females. The classification models used penalized least squares regression analyses. The models were tested for age and race bias, and were cross-validated using bootstrapping methods.” (p.1382)</p>
<p>Sample Selection/Selection of Participants</p> <p>(including number of cases/events examined)</p>	<p>“The model building sample included two groups: non-sexual abusers and concealing sexual abusers of minors.</p> <p>The non-sexual abuser sample came from two sources: community volunteers and individuals who had taken previous versions of a screen to identify those who had a higher probability of sexually abusing children.” (p.1382)</p> <p>“Individuals comprising [... the concealing sexual abusers of minors] group had to have been convicted of molesting a child, denied the current accusation/charge of sexually abusing a child, have the evaluating therapist report his or her belief the client was an abuser, and either have been accused of sexual abuse by children from more than one family or have been convicted of a sex crime against a child (see Fig. 3). The concealing child sexual abusers had all been referred to a specialized sex offender program for evaluation or treatment for the sexual abuse of a child or adolescent.” (p.1382)</p> <p>“The male model building sample included 2316 concealing sexual abusers of minors and 764 volunteers determined to be non-abusers. The female sample contained 102 concealing sexual abusers of minors and 658 volunteers determined to be non-abusers.” (p.1382)</p>
When the Cases Examined Occurred/Time-Period Explored	N/A see Evaluation Methodology
Relevant Outcome Measures	<p>Specificity of the models- i.e. the proportion of negatives which are correctly identified as such</p> <p>Sensitivity of the models- i.e. the proportion of actual positives which are correctly identified as such</p>
Key Findings	
<p>Relevant Key Findings</p> <p>(as reported by evaluation authors)</p>	<p>“For the male classification model, the specificity [<i>the proportion of negatives which are correctly identified as such</i>] was 90.3% and the bootstrapped sensitivity [<i>the proportion of actual positives which are correctly identified as such</i>] was 51.0%. For the female classification model, the specificity was 90.0% and the sensitivity was 37.1%. Thus, this classification model was able to correctly identify approximately 50% of men and 40% of women who have sexually abused a child in the past.” (abstract, p.1378)</p>

1.2 Attorney-General's Department (2011)

Citation and Extraction details	
Person extracting data	SS
Date of data extraction	23/02/2014
Author (or Organisation if no author) and Year	Attorney-General's Department (2011)
Publication Type	Report
Title	Review of the operation of Subdivision A of Division 6 of Part VIIC of the Crimes Act 1914. Final Report.
Full citation of paper	Attorney-General's Department (2011) <i>Review of the operation of Subdivision A of Division 6 of Part VIIC of the Crimes Act 1914. Final Report</i> . Australian Government
Pre-employment Screening Approach Explored	
Type of Pre-employment Screening or Relevant Employment Prohibition Explored	Sharing of criminal history information about a person's spent, pardoned and quashed Commonwealth convictions under Subdivision A of Division 6 of Part VIIC of the Crimes Act 1914
Target Group (i.e. the type of child-related work addressed)	Child-related work (working with children)
Jurisdiction(s)/Location	Australia
Evaluation Details	
Relevant Aims of the Study	<p>"Subdivision A allows information about pardoned, quashed or spent convictions to be disclosed to and taken into account by prescribed persons or bodies for the purpose of assessing whether a person is suitable for work with children. This serves as an exception to the general rule that such information is not to be disclosed or taken into account." (p.1)</p> <p>"The object of Subdivision A is to help protect children from sexual, physical and emotional harm.³ In conducting the review, the Attorney-General's Department sought to establish whether the availability of information about Commonwealth pardoned, quashed and spent convictions has helped to achieve this objective by improving screening agencies' decision-making when assessing people's suitability for working with children." (p.5)</p>
Evaluation Methodology	Analysis of responses to questions asked as part of the Attorney General's Review of the operation of Subdivision A of Division 6 of Part VIIC of the Crimes Act 1914 (see Sample Selection/Selection of Participants)

<p>Sample Selection/Selection of Participants</p> <p>(including number of cases/events examined)</p>	<p>“On 30 June 2011, the Minister for Justice, the Hon Brendan O’Connor MP, wrote to prescribed screening agencies, Government agencies and a range of other organisations to gather information and views about the operation of Subdivision A. Responses were requested by 11 August 2011.</p> <p>Responses were received from all prescribed screening agencies and 16 other bodies. A list of agencies and bodies that provided responses is at Appendix A.” (p.4)</p>
<p>When the Cases Examined Occurred/Time-Period Explored</p>	<p>Cases between the <i>Crimes Amendment (Working With Children—Criminal History) Act 2010</i> (Cth) in March 2010 and the time that this survey was conducted (30 June 2011- see Sample Selection/Selection of Participants)</p>
<p>Relevant Outcome Measures</p>	<p>“Prescribed screening agencies were asked the following questions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Has access to criminal history information about a person’s spent, pardoned and quashed Commonwealth convictions enhanced your agency’s decision-making when determining whether individuals are suitable for working with children? If yes, how and in what ways? <p>It would be particularly useful if you could provide information or data about the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - the number of instances in which information about a person’s pardoned, quashed or spent Commonwealth convictions has led to a finding that someone is not suitable for working with children - the number of checks conducted that have taken into account information about a person’s pardoned, quashed or spent Commonwealth convictions - the types of Commonwealth conviction that are being disclosed to your agency, or - any other information which you consider relevant.” (p.5) <p>- “Other bodies were invited to share any views on the operation of the provisions.” (p.6)</p>
<p>Key Findings</p>	
<p>Relevant Key Findings</p> <p>(as reported by evaluation authors)</p>	<p>Screening agency views: The utility of information about a person’s spent, pardoned and quashed Commonwealth convictions (provided under Subdivision A) when determining whether individuals are suitable for working with children</p> <p>“All screening agencies expressed the view that information provided under Subdivision A has improved their ability to assess risks to children, particularly in light of its role in the broader ECHIPWC [<i>Exchange of Criminal History Information for People Working with Children between the Commonwealth, States and Territories</i>] scheme. Having access to more extensive information about a person’s criminal history allows a more thorough assessment to be made about that person’s suitability and has increased screening agencies’ confidence in their decisions.” (p.6)</p> <p><i>Quantitative data:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Examples of cases as described by screening agencies in which information provided under Subdivision A has resulted in a person being denied permission to engage in child-related work are given. For some States’ screening agencies (Victoria, Queensland and Western Australia), some limited quantitative data was available and reported on the number of cases in which this was the case.

	<p>- “However, there is a low level of statistical information available about the Commonwealth criminal history information being provided to screening agencies.” (p.16)</p> <p>- “At present, there is only one confirmed instance in which a person has been denied permission to work with children on the basis of Commonwealth criminal history information shared under Subdivision A.” (p.16)</p> <p>Other bodies’ views on the operation of the provisions</p> <p>- “Responses from the Salvation Army Australia Eastern Territory and the National Children’s and Youth Law Centre expressed support for the scheme while acknowledging the importance of issues relating to a person’s right to privacy, rehabilitation and employment.</p> <p>- The Salvation Army Australia Eastern Territory emphasised the importance of ensuring that differences in legislation between the Commonwealth, States and Territories do not lead to varying degrees of quality and thoroughness in the conduct of Working with Children Checks across Australia.” (p.13)</p> <p>- Responses indicated concerns about the disclosure of information about pardoned and quashed convictions, the disclosure of convictions relating to any type of offence, the absence of a definition of ‘working with children’ under Subdivision A and the effectiveness of the safeguard</p> <p>- “Several responses considered the disclosure of information about pardoned and quashed convictions to interfere with a person’s right to exoneration” (p.13)</p> <p>- “The Law Council noted concerns expressed by the Law Society Northern Territory about the ability of the Northern Territory about the ability of the Northern Territory’s privacy requirements to operate effectively in very small communities.” (p.15)</p> <p>- “The Office of the Australian Information Commissioner and other privacy bodies noted the desirability of screening agencies being subject to applicable privacy laws.” (p.15)</p> <p>- “No formal complaints about the operation of Subdivision A have been received by the Office of the Australian Information Commissioner. State and Territory privacy bodies that responded to the review and prescribed screening agencies are also unaware of any formal complaints.” (p.16)</p> <p>- “Information from screening agencies indicates that they continue to comply with relevant safeguards. These safeguards help ensure that information provided under Subdivision A is only disclosed where there is a legislative requirement to do so, and is treated in accordance with relevant privacy laws. In addition, the safeguards help ensure that avenues exist for reviewing screening agencies’ decisions and that those decisions are made in accordance with relevant frameworks for assessing a person’s suitability for work with children.” (p.17)</p> <p>- “The Attorney-General’s Department acknowledges the range of concerns that have been expressed about Subdivision A. Although information received by the review does not suggest that the provisions have had an unjust impact on people seeking to work with children, further monitoring is required to establish with greater certainty whether or not any issues are arising” (p.17)</p>
--	---

1.3 Bichard (2004)

Citation and Extraction details	
Person extracting data	SS
Date of data extraction	21/02/2014
Author (or Organisation if no author) and Year	Bichard (2004)
Publication Type	Report
Title	The Bichard Inquiry Report
Full citation of paper	Bichard, M. House of Commons (2004) <i>The Bichard Inquiry Report</i> London, U.K.
Pre-employment Screening Approach Explored	
Type of Pre-employment Screening or Relevant Employment Prohibition Explored	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Employment interview process <p><i>As outlined in the guidelines of the Department for Education and Skills (DfES) "Recruitment and Selection Procedures: vetting teachers and staff who will have contact with children":</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Examination of the applicant's employment history - Reference checks <p><i>As according to the arrangements set out in Home Office Circular 47/93</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Police vetting checks
Target Group (i.e. the type of child-related work addressed)	<p><i>Employment interview, employment history and reference checks:</i> Teachers and other staff (as according to the guidelines of the DfES)</p> <p><i>Police checks:</i> "people who were applying to local authorities or schools for work that would give them 'substantial unsupervised access, on a sustained or regular basis ... to children under the age of sixteen'." (p.179)</p>
Jurisdiction(s)/Location	U.K.- Cambridgeshire and Humberside. The murders were committed in Soham, Cambridgeshire.
Evaluation Details	
Relevant Aims of the Study	<p>"This Inquiry was set up by the Home Secretary to:</p> <p>'Urgently enquire into child protection procedures in Humberside Police and Cambridgeshire Constabulary in the light of the recent trial and conviction of Ian Huntley for the murder of Jessica Chapman and Holly Wells. In particular to assess the effectiveness of the relevant intelligence-based record keeping, the vetting practices in those forces since 1995 and information sharing with</p>

	other agencies, and to report to the Home Secretary on matters of local and national relevance and make recommendations as appropriate.’ “ (p.1)
Evaluation Methodology	Public Inquiry
Sample Selection/Selection of Participants (including number of cases/events examined)	Public Inquiry into a single case
When the Cases Examined Occurred/Time-Period Explored	The events preceding the murders of Jessica Chapman and Holly Wells in 2002. Including allegations of eight sexual offences between 1995 and 1999 (in Humberside) and the employment and vetting of Ian Huntley at Soham Village College in late 2001.
Relevant Outcome Measures	<p><i>Interviews with the Principal of the school (Soham Village College) where Ian Huntley (the applicant) was employed. These interviews covered:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The employment interview process - Whether or not the school’s examination of the applicant’s employment history and reference checks conformed to the guidelines of the Department for Education and Skills (DfES) <i>Recruitment and Selection Procedures: vetting teachers and staff who will have contact with children.</i> <p><i>An examination of the police check procedures followed by the personnel service provider, EPM and Soham Village College. Including interviews with key staff at EPM and the Principal of the school.</i></p> <p><i>An examination of the vetting-related procedures of Cambridgeshire Constabulary and Humberside Police. This included interviews with key staff members.</i></p>
Key Findings	
Relevant Key Findings (as reported by evaluation authors)	<p><i>Employment interview process at Soham Village College</i></p> <p>“In his evidence, Mr Gilbert [the school Principal] recognised that the interview could have been more focused and that more guidelines might be useful.” However, such guidelines were available in “the 1992 report by the Committee of Inquiry, chaired by Norman Warner, <i>Choosing with Care</i>” (p.55)</p> <p><i>Soham Village College’s examination of the Ian Huntley’s employment history</i></p> <p>“Mr Gilbert accepted that checking for any gaps in an applicant’s employment history, and obtaining a satisfactory explanation, formed an important part of recruitment. However, he had no recollection of going through the dates with Huntley at the interview to find out exactly when one period of employment started and another stopped.” (p.56)</p> <p>Thus, the procedure stated in the guidelines of the Department for Education and Skills (DfES) <i>Recruitment and Selection Procedures: vetting teachers and staff who will have contact with children</i> was not followed. (see pp.55-56)</p> <p><i>Soham Village College’s reference checks</i></p>

	<p>Only 'open' or 'to whom it may concern' style references were provided (p.56).</p> <p>Thus, the procedure stated in the DfES guidelines (see above) that " 'References should always be taken up, and should be obtained directly from the referee. It is not good practice to rely solely on references or testimonials provided by the candidate.' " was not followed (p.57).</p> <p>" None of the open references provided by Huntley addressed [...the candidate's suitability to work with children ...]. However, as the school did not contact any of the referees or follow up the references in any way, this issue was never raised with them. Mr Gilbert [the school Principal] accepted that the references should have been followed through and that not to have done so was a mistake." (p.57)</p> <p><i>Police Check Process of the Soham Village College and the personnel service provider, Education Personnel Management (EPM)</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - "Mr Gilbert believes that Huntley provided a driving licence, passport or birth certificate, but cannot recall which. The guidance given to schools by EPM when Home Office Circular 47/93 was issued was that the proof-of-age document should be the birth certificate." (p.58) - Huntley was offered the position at Soham Village College on the 9 November 2001 (p.57), before the Police Check Form was even completed (exactly when the form was filled in could not be recalled by Soham Village College, p.58). The author concludes that "There was no reason why the police check process could not have been completed before Huntley started work at the school." (p.107) <p><i>The vetting-related procedures of Cambridgeshire Constabulary and Humberside Police</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The Humberside Police "had taken an unacceptably long time for management to make the CPD available for vetting purposes" (p.96) - One form of police check conducted by Cambridgeshire Constabulary (the PNC check) was only conducted in the applicant's changed name 'Ian Nixon' but not his birth name 'Ian Huntley' (p.69) - There were several other 'mistakes' made during the vetting process by Cambridgeshire Constabulary (see page 103), including a failure to anticipate and prepare for the increased volume of applications following the Cambridgeshire Constabulary's Criminal Record Bureau's (CRB) launch (p.106). The author concludes that "The errors and failings I have identified were serious, but not systemic and corporate." (p.107)
--	--

1.4 Braga (1993)

Citation and Extraction details	
Person extracting data	SS
Date of data extraction	21/02/2014
Author (or Organisation if no author) and Year	Braga (1993)
Publication Type	Journal article
Title	Experiences with alleged sexual abuse in residential program: I. Case vignettes
Full citation of paper	Braga, W. D. (1993). Experiences with alleged sexual abuse in residential program: I. Case vignettes. <i>Residential Treatment for Children & Youth</i> , 11(1), 81-97. doi: http://dx.doi.org/10.1300/J007v11n01_06
Pre-employment Screening Approach Explored	
Type of Pre-employment Screening or Relevant Employment Prohibition Explored	"reference check for prior history of child abuse, a legally mandated procedure" (p.85). No further information provided.
Target Group (i.e. the type of child-related work addressed)	No information provided, see also Type of Pre-employment Screening or Relevant Employment Prohibition Explored
Jurisdiction(s)/Location	Not stated directly, but likely New York as the New York Child Abuse Prevention Act of 1985 is mentioned multiple times
Evaluation Details	
Relevant Aims of the Study	"to illustrate the wide variety of complex circumstances that are categorized as alleged sexual abuse and to comment on the learned lessons as these cases were managed clinically and administratively." (p.81)
Evaluation Methodology	Four case vignettes are presented and briefly discussed. "These have been disguised sufficiently to protect confidentiality, but effort was made to maintain content areas unaltered." (p.83)
Sample Selection/Selection of Participants (including number of cases/events examined)	Four cases that came to the author's attention while working as a psychiatric consultant to various therapeutic settings in the years 1984-1991. <i>Note that case vignettes 2-3 concern child-child sexual behaviour in OOH and alleged sexual abuse by staff at schools and are therefore not considered here.</i>
When the Cases Examined Occurred/Time-Period Explored	The events presented in case vignette 1 (the only case of relevance for the purposes of this review, see Sample Selection/Participants) "occurred prior to the implementation of the New York Child Abuse Prevention Act of 1985" (p.83)

Relevant Outcome Measures	No information is reported on how the information presented in the vignettes was acquired (other than by personal experience with the cases- see Sample Selection/Participants).
Key Findings	
Relevant Key Findings (as reported by evaluation authors)	<p><i>Case 1- 16-year old girl in residential treatment programme with history of sexual abuse accuses a young male worker on night shift of attempting to sexually molest her</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Worker's reference check for prior history of child abuse came back negative. However a call to local police revealed that he had given the agency a pseudonym when hired and was wanted by the military authorities. - "In this case, finger-printing might have alerted us for his AWOL status as well as his pseudonym." (p.87) <p><i>Note that the other three vignettes presented in this study concern child-child sexual behaviour in OOHC and alleged sexual abuse by staff at schools and are therefore not considered here.</i></p>

1.5 Brannan et al. (1993)

Citation and Extraction details	
Person extracting data	JF
Date of data extraction	21/02/2014
Author (or Organisation if no author) and Year	Brannan, Jones, & Murch (1993)
Publication Type	Report
Title	Castle Hill Report: Practice Guide
Full citation of paper	Brannan, C., Jones, J. R., & Murch, J. D. (1993). Castle Hill Report: Practice Guide. Shrewsbury: Shropshire County Council.
Pre-employment Screening Approach Explored	
Type of Pre-employment Screening or Relevant Employment Prohibition Explored	The registration of private residential schools, with a focus on: - Verification of staff qualifications (in this case the proprietor and Head of School's)
Target Group (i.e. the type of child-related work addressed)	Staff at private residential schools
Jurisdiction(s)/Location	Britain- Shropshire
Evaluation Details	
Relevant Aims of the Study	To provide a case study/Inquiry into a case of a Principle that sexually abused students.
Evaluation Methodology	Public Inquiry
Sample Selection/Selection of Participants (including number of cases/events examined)	Public Inquiry into a single case
When the case examined occurred/time period explored	The inquiry began in April 1989 and ended in July 1989 following several allegations dating back to December 1987
Relevant Outcome Measures	"The inquiry involved the joint interviewing of 106 young men from different authorities all of whom had, at one time been placed at Castle Hill School" (p.2)
Key Findings	

<p>Relevant Key Findings</p> <p>(as reported by evaluation authors)</p>	<p>“The detailed background of Ralph Morris is not included as a ghoulish reminiscence, rather an attempt to highlight the ease with which he was able to fool the system. His presenting image was accepted without question and his impressive list of qualifications never verified” (p.27)</p> <p>“The history of Castle Hill suggests the need for more rigorous checks and balances to ensure high quality care provision. Some suggested means of achieving this would be:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) The confirmation and validation of staff qualifications and backgrounds b) The duties and responsibilities of the registration and inspection unit need to be defined in relation to the child protection role of the local authority” (p.27)
---	---

1.6 Budiselik et al. (2009)

Citation and Extraction details	
Person extracting data	JF
Date of data extraction	21/02/2014
Author (or Organisation if no author) and Year	Budiselik, Crawford, & Squelch (2009)
Publication Type	Journal Article
Title	The Limits of Working with Children Cards in Protecting Children
Full citation of paper	Budiselik, W., Crawford, F., & Squelch, J. (2009). The Limits of Working with Children Cards in Protecting Children. <i>Australian Social Work</i> , 62(3), 339-352. doi: 10.1080/03124070902964624
Pre-employment Screening Approach Explored	
Type of Pre-employment Screening or Relevant Employment Prohibition Explored	Criminal record checks as mandated by the <i>Working with Children</i> (Criminal Record Checking) 2004 Act (and the associated working with children (WWC) card)
Target Group (i.e. the type of child-related work addressed)	"all employees and volunteers in child-related work" (p.340)
Jurisdiction(s)/Location	Western Australia, Australia
Evaluation Details	
Relevant Aims of the Study	To explore WA's Working with Children Act and identify limits to its effectiveness
Evaluation Methodology	Three case studies
Sample Selection/Selection of Participants (including number of cases/events examined)	<p>Three cases that appealed the WA Department for Child Protection (DCP)'s decision to issue them with a negative notice:</p> <p>"WA's Working with Children (Criminal Record Checking) 2004 Act (the Act) was passed on 1 February 2006." (p.340)</p> <p>"To 30 June 2008, the DCP had issued 128,147 cards and 46 negative notices. Of the individuals issued with a negative notice, eight appealed the DCP's decision to the Tribunal (Department for Child Protection, 2008). Of these eight cases, three have now been decided. Subsection 105(2) of the State Administrative Tribunal Act 2004 (WA) allows for appeals of the Tribunal's decisions to a court only on a question of law. Two of the decided cases involved appeals to the Western Australian Supreme Court of Appeal (the Court). These three cases are now discussed in more detail." (p.343)</p>

When the case examined occurred/time period explored	<p><i>Case 1-</i> Applied for a Working with Children card in April 2006</p> <p><i>Case 2-</i> Applied for a Working with Children card in 2006</p> <p><i>Case 3-</i> Not clear exactly when a Working with Children card was applied for. According to other details reported it was most likely between Feb 2006 (when the Act was passed) and June 2008 (see Sample selection/Participants).</p>
Relevant Outcome Measures	Not stated directly but cite and take direct quotes from tribunal records
Key Findings	
Relevant Key Findings (as reported by evaluation authors)	<p>“These three cases raise concerns about the value of cards as a child abuse prevention measure” (p.350)</p> <p>Limitations to the cards effectiveness include:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Exemptions from requiring a card- “The Act makes provision for a number of exemptions including: when a volunteer is under the age of 18; in most circumstances when a parent volunteers, provided their child participates in the activity; short-term visitors to WA; and employers of children” (p.347) 2. WA’s inability to access criminal records internationally and from other Australian jurisdictions-“The state does not have the agreements in place with other countries or the means to check relevant overseas records, which is significant given the 2001 census showed that 27% of the state’s population were born overseas (Australian Bureau of Statistics, 2006). Additionally the state’s checking unit is unable to obtain information from all other Australian states and territories about a person’s criminal record” (p.347) 3. The screening not extending to the relevant records of people who do not have a criminal record-“It is considered by these authors to be inconsistent that information derived by child protection workers from a state-sanctioned child abuse investigation, substantiated to the satisfaction of expert and appropriately delegated professional officers and used as the basis of removing a child from their parents or prosecuting a case in the Children’s Court or determined in other courts, cannot be used to assess a person’s suitability for a card. Currently such information only comes into play if the person who applies for a card is one of a small percentage of applicants who has been charged or convicted of a relevant offence.”. (p.348) 4. Costs and duplication with the federal governments’ National Police Certificate system 5. A limited role for child protection expertise.

1.7 Budiselik et al. (2010)

Citation and Extraction details	
Person extracting data	SS
Date of data extraction	22/02/2014
Author (or Organisation if no author) and Year	Budiselik et al. (2010)
Publication Type	Journal article
Title	Acting in the best interests of the child: a case study on the consequences of competing child protection legislation in Western Australia
Full citation of paper	Budiselik, W., Crawford, F., & Squelch, J. (2010). Acting in the best interests of the child: a case study on the consequences of competing child protection legislation in Western Australia. <i>The Journal of Social Welfare & Family Law</i> , 32(4), 369-379. doi: http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/09649069.2010.539356
Pre-employment Screening Approach Explored	
Type of Pre-employment Screening or Relevant Employment Prohibition Explored	Criminal record checks as mandated by the <i>Working with Children (WWC) (Criminal Record Checking) 2004 Act</i> (and the associated working with children (WWC) card)
Target Group (i.e. the type of child-related work addressed)	Child-related employment including “individuals working under an employment contract, on a voluntary basis or in a religious organisation” (p.370)
Jurisdiction(s)/Location	Western Australia, Australia
Evaluation Details	
Relevant Aims of the Study	“In the discussion that follows, the application of the WWC Act is considered in the context of the John Citizen case, in which a negative notice was issued, alongside the consequences that arose in relation to competing child protection and child welfare legislation.” (p.370)
Evaluation Methodology	Single case study
Sample Selection/Selection of Participants (including number of cases/events examined)	No information provided on how this particular case was selected.
When the Cases Examined Occurred/Time-Period Explored	The events surrounding the case of <i>CEO, Department for Child Protection v. John Citizen</i> in 2007

Relevant Outcome Measures	No information provided on where the information presented in this case study was obtained. Tribunal records are cited.
Key Findings	
Relevant Key Findings (as reported by evaluation authors)	<p>“In this case, the fact that the grandparents were caring for Barry under a state protection order is classified as ‘child-related work’. Therefore, the grandparents had to have WWC cards, which Mr Citizen was not able to get as he had a conviction for a serious criminal offence [attempted incest and indecent assault, see below]. The consequence of this was that Barry had to be removed from their care and separated from his sibling who was not under the care of a protection order.” (p.377)</p> <p>“Moreover, the DCP was aware of John Citizen’s convictions for attempted incest and indecent assault but this did not seem to be a barrier to him being a child carer following the psychological assessments.” (p.377)</p> <p>“In order to resolve this statutory conflict, it would seem that the DCP had limited options: it could have sought to have Barry’s protection order discharged by the Children’s Court, so his grandparents could care for him and his sister; or it could have removed Heather from her grandparents’ care, if they were deemed to be unsafe. [...]”</p>

1.8 Davis & Wells (1994-1995)

Citation and Extraction details	
Person extracting data	SS
Date of data extraction	22/02/2014
Author (or Organisation if no author) and Year	Davis & Wells (1994-1995)
Publication Type	Journal article
Title	Effective Screening of Child Care and Youth Workers
Full citation of paper	<p>Davis, N., & Wells, S. (1994-1995). Effective Screening of Child Care and Youth Workers. <i>Children's Legal Rights Journal</i>, 22-27.</p> <p><i>Note: The data presented in this study are based on that collected and published in another, longer, report by the American Bar Association (ABA) Center on Children and the Law (a study contracted by the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency prevention (OJJDP)) with the same title:</i></p> <p>Wells, S., Davis, N., Dennis, K., Chipman, R., Sandt, C., & Liss, M. (1995) <i>Effective Screening of Child Care and Youth Service Workers</i>. American Bar Association (ABA) Center on Children and the Law. Washington, DC.</p> <p><i>Unfortunately, this report is no longer available (Howard Davidson, Director, ABA Center on Children and the Law, personal communication, 16th of January 2014). Therefore, it was unable to be included in this scoping review.</i></p>
Pre-employment Screening Approach Explored	
Type of Pre-employment Screening or Relevant Employment Prohibition Explored	Screening mechanisms used by the agencies included in this study, including “reference checks, applications, interviews, criminal record checks, child abuse registries, testing (drug/alcohol, psychological), and observations (job, home visits)” (p.2)
Target Group (i.e. the type of child-related work addressed)	Child and youth-serving agencies: “a broad spectrum of agencies classed by primary services: day care, schools, hospitals, juvenile facilities, youth development, and foster care” (p.22)
Jurisdiction(s)/Location	U.S.- National survey
Evaluation Details	
Relevant Aims of the Study	“in 1992 the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (OJJDP) contracted with the American Bar Association Center on Children and the Law to examine the screening practices currently used nationwide in child and youth service settings, and outline what is known about the effectiveness of these practices.” (p.22)

Evaluation Methodology	<p>National Survey</p> <p>“The national survey involved collection of data from a broad spectrum of agencies classed by primary services: day care, schools, hospitals, juvenile facilities, youth development, and foster care.”</p>
<p>Sample Selection/Selection of Participants</p> <p>(including number of cases/events examined)</p>	No information provided on how the surveyed agencies were selected or how many agencies received and replied to the survey than that provided under ‘Evaluation Methodology’ above.
When the Cases Examined Occurred/Time-Period Explored	Not stated clearly- responses seem to reflect current practices at the time of the survey which was likely conducted in or around 1992 (see Relevant Aims of the Study).
Relevant Outcome Measures	<p>“The National Survey conducted as part of this study collected data from child and youth-serving agencies on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - the screening mechanisms they use (including costs, timeliness of information, quality and perceived effectiveness) [...] - their opinions on the need for specific national child and youth worker screening policies - whether they had identified any applicants they considered unsuitable to work with or around children, and - whether they experienced any valid cases of abuse involving a staff person.” (p.2, SS’s own punctuation)
Key Findings	
<p>Relevant Key Findings</p> <p>(as reported by evaluation authors)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The majority of respondents conduct basic screening of <i>potential employees</i> (including personal interviews, reference checks with past employers, confirmation of educational status, and criminal record checks (state and local checks are more common than FBI checks)) - Personal reference checks and personal interviews are the most common screening mechanisms of <i>volunteers</i>, criminal record checks are conducted in a third of the cases (state and local checks are more common than FBI checks) - Less than 10% use psychological testing, home visits, mental illness/psychiatric testing, home visits, mental illness/psychiatric history checks, alcohol or drug testing, or state sex offender register checks on <i>potential employees and volunteers</i> <p>Perceived effectiveness of background screening approaches</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - “<i>Employer reference checks</i> were most frequently selected as one of the three most effective screening mechanisms by day care centers, hospitals, public school districts and private schools; <i>personal interviews</i> were perceived as the more effective practice by youth development organizations and foster care agencies. An equal number of juvenile detention/corrections facilities perceived both employer reference checks and personal interviews to be their most effective practice.” (p.23)

	<p>- 47% of those agencies using state criminal record checks ranked these as one of their top 3 most effective screening practices</p> <p>- only about 1/3 agencies rated FBI checks, and less than a 1/4 local checks, as one of their top 3 most effective screening practices</p> <p>- “Less than one-fourth of respondents (22 percent) said they identified any unsuitable <i>employees</i> during screening; only 8 percent screened out <i>volunteers</i> they deemed unsuitable.</p> <p>- Organizations which, at a minimum, use “basic” screening but no criminal record checks, were almost equally as likely to identify unsuitable applicants as those that do basic screening and at least one type of criminal record check.” (p.23)</p> <p>Cost and timeliness of selected background screening mechanisms</p> <p>- “Over half of respondents (52 percent) reported that information was not provided on a timely basis and 46 percent said that the criminal record screening process was too time consuming, creating delays in hiring.” (p.24)</p> <p>Effect on the willingness of qualified people to apply for positions</p> <p>- “87 percent said that conducting criminal record checks did <i>not</i> reduce the number of qualified persons willing to take a position within their agency/organization.” (p.24)</p> <p>Relationship between whether or not agencies conduct criminal background checks and valid abuse involving staff</p> <p>- “10 percent of responding organizations which use criminal record checks had any valid reports of abuse, compared to 5 percent of those which do not check criminal records.” (p.24)</p> <p>Opinions on the usefulness of a national registry of child abusers for screening</p> <p>- “58 percent of responding organizations recommended the development of a national registry of child abusers for screening purposes, making it the most frequently selected recommendation; training and education on available background screening, and how to identify potentially abusive staff were the number two and three recommendations.” (p.24)</p>
--	---

1.9 Department of Health (1996)

Citation and Extraction details	
Person extracting data	SS
Date of data extraction	06/03/2014
Author (or Organisation if no author) and Year	Department of Health (1996)
Publication Type	Report
Title	Report on the Inquiry into the Operation of Madonna House
Full citation of paper	Department of Health (1996) <i>Report on the Inquiry into the Operation of Madonna House</i> . Dublin.
Pre-employment Screening Approach Explored	
Type of Pre-employment Screening or Relevant Employment Prohibition Explored	Staff recruitment and selection procedures, including garda vetting, interviews, format of application forms, reference checks, and verification of educational and employment background.
Target Group (i.e. the type of child-related work addressed)	Staff at the children's home "Madonna House"
Jurisdiction(s)/Location	Republic of Ireland, "Madonna House" - a home operated by the Sisters of Charity
Evaluation Details	
Relevant Aims of the Study	<p>"In September, 1993, the then Minister for Health was informed by the Eastern Health Board that the Board, in cooperation with the Garda Síochána, was investigating allegations of sexual abuse and other misconduct made against a number of members of staff at Madonna House." (p.vii)</p> <p>"The purpose and remit of the Inquiry was to carry out a review for the Sisters of Charity of the management and operation of Madonna House. This process was principally concerned with an inquiry into the qualifications, competence, and the manner in which care duties were discharged by staff members at Madonna House in the light of various allegations made." (p.5)</p>
Evaluation Methodology	Inquiry
Sample Selection/Selection of Participants (including number of cases/events examined)	<p>Inquiry into multiple allegations of abuse at Madonna House</p> <p>"The Inquiry Team could identify no significant differences in the experiences and histories of the children admitted to care in the 1970s and early 1980s from those of the young children admitted to care more recently.</p>

	Of the nine former long-stay residents of Madonna House interviewed by some members of the Inquiry Team, all except one had allegedly experienced incidents of either physical or sexual abuse while in care in Madonna House.” (p.94)
When the Cases Examined Occurred/Time-Period Explored	<p>Inquiry was opened in September 1993 to investigate allegations of sexual abuse against staff at Madonna House dating back to children admitted to care in the 1970s (see also Relevant Aims of the Study and Sample Selection/Selection of Participants)</p> <p>“On 31 May, 1994, the Sisters of Charity announced that Madonna House was to be phased out.” (p.vii)</p> <p>“The sexual abuse for which Staff Member A was subsequently convicted took place over an approximate five-year period between 1985 and 1990.” (p.93)</p>
Relevant Outcome Measures	“This Inquiry was voluntary in nature. The Inquiry Team did not hear evidence on oath. It did not have any power of subpoena and could not require any particular person to assist us, nor indeed could we dictate the manner or extent of any such assistance. The Inquiry Team in its work adopted a procedure of seeking information and explanations from various current and former staff members, former residents, and other persons connected with Madonna House in an informal and private setting.” (p.5)
Key Findings	
Relevant Key Findings (as reported by evaluation authors)	<p><i>Describe shortcomings in management staffs' actions in relation to the recruitment and selection of staff:</i></p> <p>“In relation to staff selection, the Assistant Resident Manager's duties as described included assisting the Resident Manager with staff recruitment, development and training. The Assistant Resident Manager has described this job description to the Inquiry Team as "a work of fiction". There is no evidence of his being involved in anything other than sitting in at interviews for new staff. He has stated that the actual responsibility for staff selection, securing of references etc. rested with the Resident Manager.</p> <p>Two other Staff Members had some involvement in staff selection, but in discussion with the Inquiry Team distanced themselves from authority or responsibility in this regard.</p> <p>The Resident Manager acknowledged her awareness of the relevant guidelines regarding recruitment and states that she "didn't specifically decide" not to follow them. It was "not a conscious decision ... had to get right staff immediately etc".</p> <p>The Resident Manager stated that she had "always had C.Vs and letters of application ... would have file and kept it and from that if I felt they had what was needed post offered to them ... there were often times because of resources ... because of pressure from staff ... because of numbers in house and someone out sick ... staff left on their own ... had to pull from what I had available and from those I interviewed get the qualifications I was looking for. If I had to advertise when places came up you are talking about a month; in the meantime what happens to staff or the number of children".” (p.71)</p> <p><i>Relevant recommendations of the inquiry on improved recruitment and selection procedures:</i></p>

	<p>“12.7 Service Contracts each residential children’s centre should have a time-limited service contract with the Health Board which specifies: [...] Recruitment policy [...]” (p.108)</p> <p>“12.8 Boards of Management [...]The Boards of Management should approve and periodically review the policy and procedures of the centre in relation to issues such as recruitment and promotion of staff [...]” (p.109)</p> <p>“12.10 Garda Reports Residential child care workers are involved with the most vulnerable children in society and residential child care positions are qualitatively different from other positions which involve working with children. Consequently, securing Garda reports on potential staff should be compulsory prior to appointment of all grades of staff in children's residential centres.</p> <p>Garda reports should not be seen as a substitute for comprehensive recruitment procedures.</p> <p>Delay has been experienced in other jurisdictions in obtaining police reports. A specified time period for processing of Garda reports should be agreed.</p> <p>Application forms for all positions in children's residential centres should provide for applicants to list convictions and give permission for the securing of all relevant information from the Gardai in Ireland and police forces in other countries.” (p.110)</p> <p>“12.11 Personnel The recruitment of all grades of staff for children's residential centres should be the subject of regulation.</p> <p>The filling of permanent and promotional posts should be the subject of open competition following advertisement with detailed job specifications available.</p> <p>The Department of Health should develop a specimen application form.</p> <p>Detailed records covering the composition of interview boards and arrangements for short-listing of candidates should be maintained.</p> <p>Interview boards should include a nominee of the funding agency and an appropriately qualified person from outside the children's residential centre.</p> <p>References should be obtained directly by the Resident Manager from previous employers. Specific inquiries should be made as to whether there is any impediment or concern regarding the applicant's capacity to provide care for vulnerable children.</p> <p>The educational and employment background of candidates should be checked and verified prior to employment. [...]” (p.110)</p> <p><i>Comments on progress in implementation of recommendations:</i></p> <p>“Vetting of Applicants for Employment</p> <p>1.21 New directions have also been issued by the Department of Health in relation to the recruitment and selection of staff for children's residential centres. Under these directions, employers must obtain Garda clearance on all persons being considered for appointment as a member of staff of a children's residential centre. These directions have recently been extended to include the recruitment of staff to any area of the Health Services where they would have substantial access to children or other vulnerable individuals. The directions also require that posts in children's residential centres be advertised and appointments be made by open competition. These measures are in accordance with recommendations made by the Inquiry Team.” (p.xi)</p>
--	--

1.10 Government of Ireland (2009)

Citation and Extraction details	
Person extracting data	SS
Date of data extraction	11/03/2014-12/03/2014
Author (or Organisation if no author) and Year	Government of Ireland (2009)
Publication Type	Report
Title	The Commission to Inquire into Child Abuse. Report (The Ryan Report)
Full citation of paper	<p>Government of Ireland (2009) <i>The Commission to Inquire into Child Abuse. Report (The Ryan Report)</i>. The Stationery Office, Dublin.</p> <p>PDFs of each Chapter in this five-volume report can be retrieved from http://www.childabusecommission.com/rpt/pdfs/ (last accessed 12 March 2014)</p>
Pre-employment Screening Approach Explored	
Type of Pre-employment Screening or Relevant Employment Prohibition Explored	Garda vetting, recruitment and selection with a focus on reference checks and contact with previous employers. Also explore the selection of foster carers.
Target Group (i.e. the type of child-related work addressed)	<p>Primarily Industrial and Reformatory Schools, in addition to:</p> <p>“[...] primary and second-level schools, Children’s Homes, foster care, hospitals and services for children with special needs, hostels, and other residential settings” (p.26, Executive Summary)</p>
Jurisdiction(s)/Location	Republic of Ireland
Evaluation Details	
Relevant Aims of the Study	<p>“The principal functions conferred on the Commission, as laid down in section 4(1) of the Principal Act of 2000 and as amended by section 4 of the 2005 Act, were:</p> <p>(1) (a) to provide, for persons who have suffered abuse in childhood in institutions during the relevant period, an opportunity to recount the abuse, and make submissions, to a Committee,</p> <p>(b) through a Committee—</p> <p>(i) to inquire into the abuse of children in institutions during the relevant period,</p> <p>ia) to inquire into the manner in which children were placed in, and the circumstances in which they continued to be resident in, institutions during the relevant period,</p> <p>(ii) to determine the causes, nature, circumstances and extent of such abuse, and</p>

	<p>(iii) without prejudice to the generality of any of the foregoing, to determine the extent to which—</p> <p>(I) the institutions themselves in which such abuse occurred,</p> <p>(II) the systems of management, administration, operation, supervision, inspection and regulation of such institutions, and</p> <p>(III) the manner in which those functions were performed by the persons or bodies in whom they were vested, contributed to the occurrence or incidence of such abuse,</p> <p>and</p> <p>(c) to prepare and publish reports pursuant to section 5.” (pp.1-2, Volume I- Chapter 1 “Establishment of the Commission to Inquire into Child Abuse (CICA)”)</p>
Evaluation Methodology	<p>Commission to inquire into the abuse of children in Irish institutions, including sexual abuse. Information sources included written statements, oral hearings and examination of official records and documents.</p> <p>“The Commission comprised two separate and distinct Committees which were required to report separately to the Commission as a whole: the Confidential Committee, and the Investigation Committee. [...]</p> <p>The specific mandate of the Confidential Committee was to hear the evidence of those survivors of childhood institutional abuse who wished to report their experiences in a confidential setting. [...]</p> <p>The powers of the Investigation Committee¹⁰ were, inter alia:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • to direct the attendance of witnesses,¹¹ • to direct the production of documents,¹² and • to give such other directions that appear to be reasonable, just and necessary.¹³ <p>The Investigation Committee also had the power:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • to require the discovery of documents,¹⁴ • to furnish interrogatories (or questions) which must be replied to,¹⁵ and • to require parties to admit facts, statements and documents.¹⁶ <p>The evidence obtained was presumed to be prima facie evidence of the matters to which it related.¹⁷ Finally, the Investigation Committee also had the power to take evidence of a person’s conviction for abuse of a child as evidence before the Committee of that abuse.¹⁸” (pp.3-4, Volume I- Chapter 1 “Establishment of the Commission to Inquire into Child Abuse (CICA)”)</p>
<p>Sample Selection/Selection of Participants</p> <p>(including number of cases/events examined)</p>	<p>“The Confidential Committee heard from 1,090 witnesses who applied to give oral evidence of abuse they experienced in Irish institutions.” (p.3, Volume I- Chapter 1 “Establishment of the Commission to Inquire into Child Abuse (CICA)”)</p> <p>The Investigation Committee conducted investigations into all institutions where the number of complainants was more than 20. (p.2, Executive Summary)</p> <p>The Investigation Committee sent questionnaires to, and conducted hearings with, “the Department of An Taoiseach, the Department of Finance, the Department of Justice, Equality and Law Reform, the Department of Education and Science, and the Department of Health and Children. Statements were received from all of the 18 Religious Congregations that contributed to the Redress Fund, and statements were received from 10 survivor groups.” (p.8, Volume I- Chapter 1 “Establishment of the Commission to Inquire into Child Abuse (CICA)”)</p>

	<p>For a full list of the 18 Religious Congregations see p.15, Volume I- Chapter 1 “Establishment of the Commission to Inquire into Child Abuse (CICA)”</p> <p>For a full list of the 10 survivor groups see p.28, Volume I- Chapter 1 “Establishment of the Commission to Inquire into Child Abuse (CICA)”</p> <p>The institution where the abuse took place was identified in the report, but the person or each person who committed the abuse was only named if he or she had been convicted of an offence in respect of abuse (p.4, Volume I- Chapter 1 “Establishment of the Commission to Inquire into Child Abuse (CICA)”)</p>
When the Cases Examined Occurred/Time-Period Explored	<p>“The ‘relevant period’ of the inquiry was from 1940 to 1999, but the Commission had power to extend it in either direction. The Commission exercised this power for the Investigation Committee by extending the beginning of the period back to 1936, by a decision of 26th November 2002. The relevant period for the Confidential Committee was determined to be between 1914 and 2000, being the earliest date of admission and the latest date of discharge of those applicants who applied to give evidence of abuse to that Committee.” (p.5, Volume I- Chapter 1 “Establishment of the Commission to Inquire into Child Abuse (CICA))</p>
Relevant Outcome Measures	<p>Retrospective case studies/inquiries into multiple cases of abuse at Irish institutions. Evidence included witness statements, court proceedings (where available) and other official records maintained by the institutions (for example files from the Christian Brothers’ archives in Rome, p.110, Volume I- Chapter 7 “St Joseph’s Industrial School, Artane (‘Artane’), 1870-1969” and archives from the office of the Rosminian Order in Rome, p.31, Volume II- Chapter 2 “St. Patrick’s Industrial School, Upton (‘Upton’), 1989-1996”)</p> <p>The Confidential Committee heard confidential witness statements. These are collated and summarised by factors such as type of abuse, perpetrator and location.</p> <p>The Investigation Committee sent out questionnaires to State institutions and Religious Congregations which addressed issues such as: “[...] (c) the timing and manner in which allegations of child abuse emerged as an issue in respect of institutions under the management or regulatory control of the body; (d) a brief account of the protocols or procedures, which were in place from time to time within the body which were designed to prevent, investigate or deal with allegations of child abuse; [...]” (p.8, Volume I- Chapter 1 “Establishment of the Commission to Inquire into Child Abuse (CICA)”)</p> <p>Oral hearings were also conducted by the Investigation Committee with key government officials, representatives of Religious Congregations and survival groups.</p>
Key Findings	
Relevant Key Findings (as reported by evaluation authors)	<p><u>The Investigation Committee Report on Institutions, Volumes I-II</u></p> <p><u>Selected Relevant Excerpts from Inquiries into specific cases of sexual abuse and the institutional responses to this abuse</u></p> <p><i>The Congregation of Christian Brothers, Chapters 6-13 of Volume I</i></p>

	<p>“The documentation made available to this Committee disclosed that allegations of child abuse, and particularly child sexual abuse, were a recurring and persistent problem for the Congregation.” (p.86, Volume I- Chapter 6 “The Congregation of Christian Brothers”)</p> <p>“No contemporaneous information exists concerning the criteria that were used to assess the suitability of Brothers for particular postings. However, the records of the Congregation show that, on a number of occasions, individuals who were accused of sexual abuse were transferred to other residential or day schools. In some cases, Brothers who had been sexually abusing children were, in their later careers, appointed to senior positions within the Province. When asked at the Phase I hearing for Letterfrack [one of the Christian Brothers’ schools] how this had happened, Br Gibson explained that, because the leadership in the Congregation changed every 12 years, there was no memory within the organisation of offences committed before that. He acknowledged that there was a personal file for each Brother and concluded that these files were not consulted in making appointments.” (pp.79-80, Volume I- Chapter 6 “The Congregation of Christian Brothers”)</p> <p><i>Chapter 14 presents a case study exploring the case of ‘Mr John Brander’ who began his career as a Christian Brother and, after sexually abusing boys, was granted dispensation from his vows and went on to progress through six different schools where he continued to sexually abuse children.</i></p> <p><i>Cappoquin Industrial School run by the Sisters of Mercy, Chapter 8 of volume II</i></p> <p>The case of Mr Restin, a lay care worker, is explored. He sexually abused boys at Passage West Industrial School Co Cork (another school run by the Sisters of Mercy) and then moved to work at Cappoquin Industrial School where he was subsequently convicted of child sexual abuse. The Resident Manager at St Joseph’s Industrial School, Sr Vita, made a Garda statement saying that she had “sent word to Cappoquin Orphanage through a nun here that [Mr Restin] was not a suitable person to be with children.”. However, Mr Restin “said that he assumed he would have sought a reference from Sr Vita for the course and for his move to Cappoquin, but there was no record of any such request or reference on file in either Cappoquin or Passage West.” (p.382, Volume II- Chapter 8 “St Michael’s Industrial School, Cappoquin, County Waterford (‘Cappoquin’), 1877-1999”)</p> <p>The Investigation Committee concluded that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> “- Mr Restin’s unsuitability for work with children was clear from his time in Passage West, but that information was not effectively communicated to Cappoquin. - Although his unsuitability to take part in a childcare course was known to the management of Passage West and to the Department Inspector, he was able to remain in his position in Cappoquin. - If proper inquiries had been made, he should not have been employed in Cappoquin.[...] (p.383, Volume II- Chapter 8 “St Michael’s Industrial School, Cappoquin, County Waterford (‘Cappoquin’), 1877-1999”) <p><i>St Joseph’s Industrial School run by the Sisters of Charity, Chapter 14 of Volume II</i></p> <p>The case of Thomas Pleece, a care worker at St Joseph’s who sexually abused children is described. A volunteer at the school recalls reporting the sexual abuse of residents by Thomas Pleece to the Resident Manager, Sr Astrid, after being approached and told of the abuse my residents. However, Sr Astrid was adamant that she had not been told of sexual abuse and that Thomas Pleece was asked to resign due to physical abuse. Thomas Pleece went on to other</p>
--	--

	<p>positions working with children, including fostering two young boys who he sexually abused.</p> <p>"In September 1977, Thomas Pleece got a job in a probation hostel in Cork which accommodated boys in their late teens. He assumed they would have sought a reference from St Joseph's for him there, although he did not see one. He and his wife applied to foster two young boys in 1978. They were vetted before being accepted. He said that it never crossed his mind that the fact that he had been asked to leave for sexual abuse in Kilkenny was a disadvantage to his application for foster children: [...]</p> <p>He assumed that they would have contacted his previous employers but, as this was during the period when he still had regular contact with Sr Astrid and the convent, he was not concerned that he would not be given a reference by them." (p.530, Volume II- Chapter 13 "St Joseph's Industrial School, Kilkenny, 1873-1999")</p> <p>Sr Astrid, the Resident Manager, is cited as saying "I remember getting phone calls from different places where Thomas Pleece applied when he left St Joseph's. I know the only answer I ever gave was "I wouldn't have Thomas Pleece back in St [Joseph's]" – or I wouldn't reply." (p.533, Volume II- Chapter 13 "St Joseph's Industrial School, Kilkenny, 1873-1999")</p> <p>The Investigation Committee concluded that:</p> <p>"Having dismissed Thomas Pleece, Sr Astrid should not have given him a reference for another job that would bring him into contact with children." (p.533, Volume II- Chapter 13 "St Joseph's Industrial School, Kilkenny, 1873-1999")</p> <p><u>The Confidential Committee Report on Institutions, Volume III</u></p> <p><i>Confidential Committee abuse reports (Volume III- Chapters 7,9 and 13-18)</i></p> <p>Chapter 7 "describes the nature and extent of abuse reported in evidence to the Committee by 413 male witnesses in relation to 26 Industrial and Reformatory Schools in Ireland." (p.53, Volume III- Chapter 7 "Record of Abuse (male witnesses)"). "Two hundred and forty two (242) male witnesses (59%) made 253 reports of sexual abuse in relation to 20 Schools." (p.78, Volume III- Chapter 7 "Record of Abuse (male witnesses)").</p> <p>Chapter 9 "summarises the nature and extent of abuse reported to the Committee by 378 female witnesses in relation to Schools in Ireland that admitted girls." (p.133, Volume III- Chapter 9 "Record of Abuse (female witnesses)"). "There were 128 reports of sexual abuse from 127 female witnesses (34%)." (p.150, Volume III- Chapter 9 "Record of Abuse (female witnesses)").</p> <p>Chapter 13 "presents witness evidence of abuse in schools and residential services¹ providing care and education for children with special needs as a result of learning, physical, visual, hearing or speech impairment and disability." (p.235, Volume III- Chapter 13 "Special needs schools and residential services"). "Thirty six (36) of the 58 witnesses who reported abuse in schools and residential services for children with special needs reported being sexually abused. The 36 reports were from 29 male and seven female witnesses in relation to 10 separate special needs facilities." (p.243, Volume III- Chapter 13 "Special needs schools and residential services").</p> <p>Chapter 14 "presents the evidence provided to the Confidential Committee by witnesses in relation to their experiences of abuse in Children's Homes in Ireland over a period of 73 years between 1919 and 1992. The majority of</p>
--	--

	<p>Children's Homes, previously known as orphanages and approved schools, were managed by Catholic religious communities or Boards of Trustees affiliated to Protestant churches. In latter decades a number of Children's Homes were managed and funded by State agencies. [...]Sixty one (61) witnesses, 38 male and 23 female, gave evidence to the Committee about their experiences of abuse in 19 Children's Homes." (p.263, Volume III- Chapter 14 "Children's Homes"). "Twenty nine (29) witnesses, 20 male and nine female, reported being sexually abused in 15 Children's Homes." (p.277, Volume III- Chapter 14 "Children's Homes").</p> <p>Chapter 15 presents evidence "from 24 witnesses, eight male and 16 female, who reported being abused while in foster care. The reports related to 22 foster care placements." (p.303, Volume III-Chapter 15 "Foster care"). "The Committee heard 15 reports of sexual abuse from two male and 13 female witnesses in relation to foster care placements. The reports relate to 13 foster homes." (p.308, Volume III-Chapter 15 "Foster care").</p> <p>Chapter 16 "summarises witness reports given in evidence to the Confidential Committee in relation to 18 different facilities categorised under the general heading of Hospitals." (p.327, Volume III- Chapter 16 "Hospitals"). "Fourteen (14) witnesses reported being sexually abused [...] The 14 reports of sexual abuse refer to 12 different hospital facilities [...]" (p.334, Volume III- Chapter 16 "Hospitals").</p> <p>Chapter 17 "presents evidence given to the Confidential Committee by 70 witnesses, 56 male and 14 female, of their experiences of abuse in schools in Ireland between 1932 and 1992." (p.349, Volume III- Chapter 17 "Primary and secondary-level schools"). "Forty (40) witnesses, 34 male and six female, made 40 reports that they were sexually abused in 35 schools: 23 primary, 11 second-level and one vocational/technical school." (p.355, Volume III- Chapter 17 "Primary and secondary-level schools").</p> <p>Chapter 18 "presents evidence from witnesses about a range of other settings that were outside the main groupings already covered in this Report. These included residential laundries, hostels, Novitiates, short-term residential services for children and adolescents, and other residential settings. The facilities were generally funded and managed either by the State or by voluntary agencies." (p.373, Volume III- Chapter 18 "Residential Laundries, Novitiates, Hostels and other Out-of-home settings"). "Ten (10) witnesses, eight male and two female, made 10 reports of being sexually abused in eight residential settings." (p.378, Volume III- Chapter 18 "Residential Laundries, Novitiates, Hostels and other Out-of-home settings").</p> <p><u>Relevant Conclusions of the Commission, Volume IV- Chapter 6</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - "Sexual abuse was endemic in boys' institutions. The situation in girls' institutions was different. Although girls were subjected to predatory sexual abuse by male employees or visitors or in outside placements, sexual abuse was not systemic in girls' schools." (p.453, Volume IV- Chapter 6 "Conclusions") - "Cases of sexual abuse were managed with a view to minimising the risk of public disclosure and consequent damage to the institution and the Congregation. This policy resulted in the protection of the perpetrator. When lay people were discovered to have sexually abused, they were generally reported to the Gardai. When a member of a Congregation was found to be abusing, it was dealt with internally and was not reported to the Garda." (p.454, Volume IV- Chapter 6 "Conclusions")
--	--

	<p>- “The recidivist nature of sexual abuse was known to religious authorities [...] Contrary to the Congregations’ claims that the recidivist nature of sexual offending was not understood, it is clear from the documented cases that they were aware of the propensity for abusers to re-abuse.” (p.454, Volume IV- Chapter 6 “Conclusions”)</p> <p>- “When confronted with evidence of sexual abuse, the response of the religious authorities was to transfer the offender to another location where, in many instances, he was free to abuse again. Permitting an offender to obtain dispensation from vows often enabled him to continue working as a lay teacher.” (p. 454, Volume IV- Chapter 6 “Conclusions”)</p> <p>- “Sexual abuse by members of religious Orders was seldom brought to the attention of the Department of Education by religious authorities because of a culture of silence about the issue. [...] Men with histories of sexual abuse when they were members of religious Orders continued their teaching careers as lay teachers in State schools. (p.455, Volume IV- Chapter 6 “Conclusions”)</p> <p><i>Conclusions based on witness statements of the Confidential Committee</i></p> <p>- “The predatory nature of sexual abuse including the selection and grooming of socially disadvantaged and vulnerable children was a feature of the witness reports in relation to special needs services, Children’s homes, hospitals and primary and second-level schools. Children with impairments of sight, hearing and learning were particularly vulnerable to sexual abuse.” (p.458, Volume IV- Chapter 6 “Conclusions”)</p> <p>- “Children in isolated foster care placements were abused in the absence of supervision by external authorities. They were placed with foster parents who had no training, support or supervision. The suitability of those selected as foster parents was repeatedly questioned by witnesses who were physically and sexually abused.” (p.458, Volume IV- Chapter 6 “Conclusions”)</p> <p><u>Relevant Recommendations of the Commission, Volume IV- Chapter 7</u></p> <p>- “ Management at all levels should be accountable for the quality of services and care. Performance should be assessed by the quality of care delivered. The manager of an institution should be responsible for: [...] <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Vetting of staff and volunteers • Ensuring that staff are well trained, matched to the nature of the work to be undertaken and progressively trained so as to be kept up to date [...]” (p.463, Volume IV- Chapter 7 “Recommendations”) </p> <p>- ““Children First: The National Guidelines for the Protection and Welfare of Children’ should be uniformly and consistently implemented throughout the State in dealing with allegations of abuse.” (p.464, Volume IV- Chapter 7 “Recommendations”)</p> <p><i>Note: The latest version of the Guidelines referred to in the Recommendation directly above are listed in Appendix 1 of this Scoping Review report under “Frameworks or Guidelines”:</i></p> <p>Department of Children and Youth Affairs (2011) Children First: National Guidance for the Protection and Welfare of Children. Dublin.</p> <p><i>These guidelines include the following relevant section on p.5:</i></p>
--	--

	<p>“Consistent with the principles of Children First, every organisation, both public and private, that is providing services for children or that is in regular direct contact with children should:</p> <p>(i) ensure best practice in the recruitment of staff or volunteers, which includes Garda vetting, taking up of references, good HR practices in interviewing, induction training, probation and ongoing supervision and management; [...]”</p>
--	---

1.11 Hanafin & Brooks (2008)

Citation and Extraction details	
Person extracting data	SS
Date of data extraction	23/02/2014
Author (or Organisation if no author) and Year	Hanafin & Brooks (2008)
Publication Type	Report
Title	Analysis of submissions made on national review of compliance with "Children First: National Guidelines for the Protection and Welfare of Children"
Full citation of paper	Hanafin, S., & Brooks, A.-M. (2008) <i>Analysis of submissions made on national review of compliance with "Children First: National Guidelines for the Protection and Welfare of Children"</i> . Office of the Minister for Children and Youth Affairs. Minister for Health and Children. Dublin.
Pre-employment Screening Approach Explored	
Type of Pre-employment Screening or Relevant Employment Prohibition Explored	Garda (police) vetting
Target Group (i.e. the type of child-related work addressed)	All those who have contact with children
Jurisdiction(s)/Location	Republic of Ireland
Evaluation Details	
Relevant Aims of the Study	"The key focus was on the extent to which each area of the [Children First] guidelines was being implemented. Provision was also made on the response form for information to be reported on the extent to which the principles of best practice in child protection were being adhered to. These included issues such as [...] whether every action and procedure ultimately considers the overall needs of the child." (p.3)
Evaluation Methodology	<p>Analysis of submissions made on national review of compliance with "Children First: National Guidelines for the Protection and Welfare of Children"</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - "Descriptive statistics were undertaken on quantitative data generated through the structured response form, facilitated by the Keypoint software. - A thematic analysis was undertaken on all qualitative data submitted." (p.3)
Sample Selection/Selection of Participants	"One hundred submissions were received using the structured response form and a further 36 received in addition to these." (p.3)

(including number of cases/events examined)	<p>“More than two-thirds of the submissions were made on behalf of an organisation (n = 69) and a further 28 were received from individuals. Three respondents chose not to indicate whether their submission was made on behalf of an individual or an organisation. Respondents were asked to identify whether they were ‘service providers’ (72%), ‘service users’ (4%) or ‘other’ (24%). A little more than one-third of submissions (37%, n = 31) were received from male respondents. 16% of respondents requested that the content of their submission remain confidential.” (p.3)</p> <p>“As part of a broader review of the <i>Children First: National Guidelines for the Protection and Welfare of Children</i> (1999), interested parties were invited by the Office of the Minister for Children (OMC) to make a submission. Invitations were issued through an advertisement placed in the following national and local newspapers:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 6 Sunday newspapers on 19 March 2006 (including the Irish language newspaper <i>Foinse</i>); • 4 national newspapers on Monday, 20 March 2006; • 44 provincial newspapers during the week of 20 March 2006. <p>The advertisement also appeared on the OMC’s website (www.omc.gov.ie) and on www.activelink.ie/ce. In addition, organisations and individuals known to be interested in this area were contacted by the OMC and invited to make a submission.” (p.1)</p>
When the Cases Examined Occurred/Time-Period Explored	<p>N/A. See Evaluation Methodology.</p> <p>“The closing date for submissions was Friday, 28 April 2006. Submissions received after this time, however, were also given full consideration.” (p.1)</p>
Relevant Outcome Measures	<p>A complete list of the items in the structured response form are not provided.</p> <p>Open comments (qualitative data) were analysed thematically, one theme was of relevance to this scoping review “Joint working and cooperation between Gardaí and HSE [Health Service Executive]” (p.8) and “Allegations of abuse against employees and volunteers” (p.20)</p> <p>(see Relevant Key Findings for more details)</p>
Key Findings	
Relevant Key Findings (as reported by evaluation authors)	<p>“Joint working and cooperation between Gardaí and HSE [Health Service Executive]” (p.8)</p> <p>- “[...] areas highlighted as problematic in the relationship between the HSE and the Gardaí were: [...] Garda vetting.” (p.9)</p> <p>- “The final issue raised in this section was about Garda vetting and there were a substantial number of comments on this. In essence, a number of organisations reported recruitment difficulties because of the delay involved in getting Garda clearance. As noted in one submission from a voluntary youth organisation:</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;"><i>It is very difficult, bordering on impossible, to get the Garda Síochána to vet prospective leaders.” (p.9)</i></p> <p>“There were recommendations for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Garda vetting to be put on a statutory basis; - additional funding and resources to be made available for this service;

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Garda vetting of all those who have contact with children, including retrospective vetting in respect of employees and volunteers for whom vetting was not available at the time of their recruitment; - regular assessments of progress in implementing the vetting system. <p>In addition, a non-governmental umbrella organisation for children suggested the following changes be made:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - the vetting procedure to be enhanced along the lines of the system in Northern Ireland (which checks for disciplinary procedures and other forms of 'soft information', as well as criminal convictions); - ensure that full background checks are carried out using records from other jurisdictions; - a system to be put in place whereby parents and young people can receive confirmation that groups or organisations have a vetting policy."(pp.9-10) <p>"Allegations of abuse against employees and volunteers" (p.20)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - "Other issues were also identified, relating to: [...] the need for a more comprehensive Garda vetting system [...]" (p.21) - "Following on from that, it was noted that 'Garda clearance', while limited in the amount of information it provides, is nevertheless 'a relevant tool in terms of a comprehensive recruitment and selection process', along with 'taking up references'. - It was suggested, however, that until Garda clearance across <i>all</i> child care workers and volunteers comes into existence, the area will be open to abuse by people. - There were several calls to introduce mandatory Garda vetting of new employees." (p.21)
--	---

1.12 Hanly (2010)

Citation and Extraction details	
Person extracting data	SS
Date of data extraction	12/03/2014
Author (or Organisation if no author) and Year	Hanly (2010)
Publication Type	Journal article
Title	Practices in and attitudes towards staff vetting in children's residential centres in the Republic of Ireland
Full citation of paper	Hanly, C. (2010). Practices in and attitudes towards staff vetting in children's residential centres in the Republic of Ireland. <i>Scottish Journal of Residential Child Care</i> , 9(2), 28-36.
Pre-employment Screening Approach Explored	
Type of Pre-employment Screening or Relevant Employment Prohibition Explored	"two distinct aspects of the vetting process were explored - the attainment of Garda checks and obtaining three written references which are then verified." (p.29)
Target Group (i.e. the type of child-related work addressed)	Non-statutory residential child care sector
Jurisdiction(s)/Location	Republic of Ireland
Evaluation Details	
Relevant Aims of the Study	<p>"The aim of the study was twofold;</p> <p>to explore the practices of residential child care centre managers in vetting staff for employment in residential child care, and</p> <p>to explore the attitudes of these managers towards current vetting requirements in the Republic of Ireland." (p.28)</p> <p>"The author hoped that information on current practice in the area may give some indication of the difficulties experienced by managers in completing the vetting process as per the expected requirements as well as helping to establish some of the reasons why the current guidelines on the area are not consistently adhered to in full by employers in the non-statutory residential child care sector. An exploration of attitudes may lend insight towards the value that these managers place upon vetting practices and may highlight some of the influences on these practices." (p.30)</p>

Evaluation Methodology	Phase one of the research consisted of semi-structured interviews and the second phase of the research consisted of the distribution of a self-completion questionnaire
Sample Selection/Selection of Participants (including number of cases/events examined)	<p>“The target group identified for the purpose of the research was managers of children’s residential centres in the non-statutory sector in the Republic of Ireland. The author had relatively easy and quick access to this group through work colleagues nationally. [...]</p> <p>The participants in the study were chosen by means of purposive sampling. Phase one of the research consisted of eight semi-structured interviews and the second phase of the research consisted of the distribution of a self-completion questionnaire to 69 managers of children’s residential centres out of a total of 70 agencies nationwide. One manager was excluded on the basis of potential bias as the author was involved with this service in her professional capacity at the time of the research being conducted. Forty-three completed questionnaires were returned giving a response rate of 62 percent.” (p.30)</p>
When the Cases Examined Occurred/Time-Period Explored	No information reported on when the study was conducted- responses reflect current practices at the time of the survey and interviews.
Relevant Outcome Measures	<p>“The semi-structured interview questions [phase one of the research] focussed on the manager’s awareness of the wider practice of vetting staff in children’s residential centres, vetting practices within the centre, and the manager’s experience of vetting as a safeguard for children in residential care. [...]</p> <p>The questionnaire [used in phase two of the research] drew on themes and practices which emerged from the interviews and focussed on these in an attempt to ascertain the validity of these findings across a larger and national perspective.</p> <p>In the process of data analysis, which was mainly informed by the grounded theory approach (Glaser and Strauss, 1967), a system of coding was applied to the responses and information gathered in the interviews. The answers presented in the survey were subject to content analysis, which consists of identifying key themes and establishing the frequency with which these themes are present in the data accumulated.” (pp.30-31)</p>
Key Findings	
Relevant Key Findings (as reported by evaluation authors)	<p>The author identified 3 themes that emerged in the analyses, which are summarised here.</p> <p>1. <i>Adequacy of the current system of vetting (i.e. Garda check and three written references)</i></p> <p>Around half of the managers felt that the current vetting arrangements were adequate</p> <p>The other half that felt that they were not adequate referred to issues such as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - A dependency on the honesty of the prospective employer to complete paperwork - Garda checks only highlighting convictions, and not covering suspicions of inappropriate behaviour - Needing to rely on previous employers to provide accurate and honest information when writing references

	<p>- The possible benefits of pro-forma documents when writing references</p> <p>The author noted that the findings presented a dichotomy “Managers in both phases of the research referred to the need to obtain as much reliable and detailed information in a reference on a prospective employee and the dependency on trust in the author of the reference for all relevant information. On the other hand, some of those same managers did indicate reluctance on their own part to make some matters of concern known to prospective employers either in writing or verbally on the basis that their preference was to move the person on from their service.” (p.31)</p> <p><i>2. Vetting as a safeguard for children in residential care</i></p> <p>“[...] only half of participants were of the view that the process of vetting staff is a safeguard for children in residential care and within this group there was emphasis on stating that it is not the only safeguard” (p.32)</p> <p>“Overall managers felt strongly that although vetting did provide a safeguard it was a minimum in terms of safeguards that could be applied and vetting alone could not be depended upon to provide a flawless safeguard to young people in residential care.” (p.32).</p> <p>The importance of gathering and exchanging soft information in a safe and structured environment was indicated by the vast majority of participants.</p> <p><i>3. Influencing factors on the vetting process</i></p> <p>“Four distinct factors emerged from the interviews as influencing managers to comply with vetting requirements. In order of influence, these factors were</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> the legal aspect of vetting; an awareness of past abuse in residential care settings; the registration and inspection process enforced by the Health Service Executive; knowledge obtained by staff members in college on the matter.” (p.32) <p>Delays in the recruitment process due to the time to complete Garda checks was an issue that lead to premature recruitment of staff- only 27% indicated that they would not employ a person without having completed the vetting process.</p> <p>“The role of the HSE Registration and Inspection Service was a significant influence on managers in terms of complying with the expected requirements in the vetting process. Managers referred to this both in their interviews and in the survey. While it is somewhat reassuring to know that a regulatory body does have an impact in ensuring compliance with requirements, it is not influential enough to ensure full compliance rates across the sector.” (p.33)</p> <p><i>Selected relevant conclusions made by the author:</i></p> <p>“Vetting of staff should be placed on a legislative basis as a matter of priority. This legislation should allow for the exchange of ‘soft information’ amongst professionals working in the area of residential child care in order to further safeguard young people.</p> <p>Whilst the author acknowledges that vetting is only one aspect of the safeguarding process for young people in residential care, it is imperative that expected requirements for vetting staff is stringently adhered to at all times.” (p.35)</p>
--	--

1.13 Herman (1995)

Citation and Extraction details	
Person extracting data	SS
Date of data extraction	24/02/2014
Author (or Organisation if no author) and Year	Herman (1995)
Publication Type	Journal article
Title	Appropriate Use of the Child Abuse Potential Inventory in a Big Brothers/Big Sisters Agency
Full citation of paper	Herman, K. C. (1995). Appropriate Use of the Child Abuse Potential Inventory in a Big Brothers/Big Sisters Agency. <i>Journal of Social Service Research</i> , 20(3-4), 93-103. doi: 10.1300/J079v20n03_05
Pre-employment Screening Approach Explored	
Type of Pre-employment Screening or Relevant Employment Prohibition Explored	Child Abuse Potential (CAP) Inventory “The CAP is a 160-item self-administered screening device originally designed to identify physical child abusers in protective services settings (Milner,1986)” (p.94)
Target Group (i.e. the type of child-related work addressed)	Big Brothers/Big Sisters (BB/BS) of America volunteers
Jurisdiction(s)/Location	N/A see Evaluation Methodology
Evaluation Details	
Relevant Aims of the Study	<p><i>Two studies are presented</i></p> <p>Study 1 aim and hypotheses</p> <p>“because the CAP [Child Abuse Potential Inventory] was validated on protective service populations, limited data have been gathered to assess its validity in screening child care workers or volunteers.</p> <p>The goal of the present project was to address this shortcoming by assessing the CAP's accuracy in screening BB/BS [Big Brothers/Big Sisters] volunteers.</p> <p>Three hypotheses were investigated in the first study: (a) the mean CAP Abuse scores for a group of BB/BS volunteers would not differ significantly from the norm data in the CAP manual, (b) the CAP could discriminate between BB/BS volunteers rated excellent versus bad by case managers who worked with the volunteers, and (c) the CAP could discriminate between volunteer applicants</p>

	<p>who were accepted versus rejected by traditional BB/BS screening procedures.” (p.95)</p> <p>Study 2 aim</p> <p>“The CAP was not designed to screen sexual child abusers. [...] The goal of the second study was to assess further the CAP's potential for screening this disorder in community populations such as BB/BS by collecting CAP scores of non-incarcerated sexual offenders against minors.” (p.95) (see also Type of Pre-employment Screening above)</p>
Evaluation Methodology	<p>Study 1:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Compared the average CAP scores for the study population with that for the norm scores listed in the CAP manual. - Examined whether the CAP scores for the study population coincided with the ratings of BB/BS case managers. <p>Study 2:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Examined whether the CAP could be used to identify sexual offenders against minors by examining whether these subjects had CAP scores that were above the cut-off values given in the manual.
<p>Sample Selection/Selection of Participants</p> <p>(including number of cases/events examined)</p>	<p>Study 1:</p> <p>“The total sample consisted of 73 BB/BS volunteers and volunteer applicants.” (p.95)</p> <p>“Case managers [at BB/BS] who supervised volunteers through monthly contact were asked to identify 15 "excellent" (top 10% of all active volunteers) and 15 "bad" volunteers (lower 10%). Informed consents, disclaimer forms, and the CAP were mailed to each of these volunteers. Twelve excellent volunteers and eight bad volunteers completed a CAP protocol [n=20].” (p.96)</p> <p>“Between February 1992 and February 1993, all 53 volunteer applicants to a northwest BB/BS agency completed the CAP.” (p.96)</p> <p>Study 2:</p> <p>“Twenty-one of 26 males from a northwest sexual offender treatment center participated in the study. All had committed a sexual offense against a minor, twelve intra-familial, nine extra-familial. Each was actively participating in treatment which included individual and group work.”</p>
When the Cases Examined Occurred/Time-Period Explored	N/A see Evaluation Methodology
Relevant Outcome Measures	<p>Study 1:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Whether the average CAP scores for the study population differ from the norm scores listed in the manual. - Whether the CAP scores coincide with case managers’ evaluations of volunteers and with existing screening procedures.

	<p>Study 2:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Whether sexual offenders against minors had CAP scores that were above the cut-off values given in the manual.
Key Findings	
<p>Relevant Key Findings</p> <p>(as reported by evaluation authors)</p>	<p>Study 1:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - “The average CAP abuse score for these volunteers was 85.56, slightly lower, though not significantly different than the average norm score listed in the CAP manual (91.0; Milner, 1986). This suggests that the volunteer sample in this study was similar to the norm population.” (p.96) - “The mean score for Excellent volunteers [as judged by BB/BS case managers] (44.67) was similar to scores typical of nurturing parents (39.6) (Milner, 1986). [...]The small sample size and the subjective rating system limit the conclusions that can be drawn. Further research is necessary to confirm these findings.” (p.97) <p>Study 2:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - “The average CAP abuse score for these subjects [sexual offenders against minors] was 160.33, significantly higher than the norm score from the manual, however, still below the cut-off score. [...] On average, though, no subscales exceeded their respective cut-off scores.” (p.98) - “Several shortcomings must be noted. The most glaring deficit is the lack of a matched control group of non-sexual offender males. Without such a group, statistical conclusions are inappropriate. Comparison to the norm group is the extent of our work.” (p.98)

1.14 Joint Committee on Child Protection (2006)

Citation and Extraction details	
Person extracting data	SS
Date of data extraction	23/02/2014
Author (or Organisation if no author) and Year	Joint Committee on Child Protection (2006)
Publication Type	Report
Title	Report on Child Protection
Full citation of paper	Joint Committee on Child Protection (2006) <i>Report on Child Protection</i> . Houses of the Oireachtas. Dublin.
Pre-employment Screening Approach Explored	
Type of Pre-employment Screening or Relevant Employment Prohibition Explored	“vetting applicants for employment and other persons through the offices of the Garda Central Vetting Unit.” (p.87)
Target Group (i.e. the type of child-related work addressed)	Sex offenders applying for work with children
Jurisdiction(s)/Location	Republic of Ireland
Evaluation Details	
Relevant Aims of the Study	No clearly stated aim relevant to this scoping review. However, Part VI of the report (“Other Issues and Recommendations”) covers “Sex Offenders Registration and Supervision- Vetting” (Section 15.3, pp.87-88)
Evaluation Methodology	Qualitative analysis/summary of submissions to the Joint Committee on Child Protection
Sample Selection/Selection of Participants (including number of cases/events examined)	“The Committee decided at the outset of its work to invite submissions from interested bodies and to advertise publicly for submissions. These invitations and advertisements resulted in the Committee receiving more than 50 detailed written submissions as well as a substantial volume of correspondence.” (p.5) “The Committee was also pleased to receive a limited number of oral submissions from relevant experts in the areas of criminal law and child protection law, childrens’ rights, the operation of the criminal justice system, child and adolescent psychiatry, and forensic psychiatry.” (p.5)

When the Cases Examined Occurred/Time-Period Explored	N/A. See Evaluation Methodology.
Relevant Outcome Measures	No details given, for example on whether or not the submissions followed a structured response form. (see Evaluation Methodology)
Key Findings	
Relevant Key Findings (as reported by evaluation authors)	<p>“In the submissions made to the Committee, and its analysis of those submissions, two areas of concern emerge. The first is that the system operates on a voluntary basis [... <i>and second</i>] there may be a basis for concern about the suitability of any particular person for employment or other positions involving unsupervised access to children, even in the absence of a previous conviction.” (p.87)</p> <p>Recommendations of the Committee:</p> <p>“The Committee recommends further study of the means by which a comprehensive vetting system incorporating “soft information” might be established, the development of proposals to put in place the necessary statutory and institutional framework, and the provision of resources for their implementation.” (p.88)</p> <p>“The Committee recommends that consideration be given to establishing a statutory framework including provision for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - a register of persons unsuitable for employment with children, based on “soft” as well as “hard” information, especially information arising out of previous employment - an obligation on child-care organisations to vet employees and volunteers - an obligation to report dismissal or other disciplinary proceedings related to allegations of harming a child or inappropriate behaviour towards a child - disqualification from working with children of persons found unsuitable for such work, and - an offence of working with children while disqualified from so doing.” (p.88)

1.15 Kirkwood (1992)

Citation and Extraction details	
Person extracting data	JF
Date of data extraction	21/02/2014
Author (or Organisation if no author) and Year	Kirkwood (1992)
Publication Type	Report
Title	The Leicestershire Inquiry 1992
Full citation of paper	Kirkwood, A. (1992). The Leicestershire Inquiry 1992. Leicester: Leicestershire County Council.
Pre-employment Screening Approach Explored	
Type of Pre-employment Screening or Relevant Employment Prohibition Explored	"The method of selection in use at the time- written application, single interview and two written references" (p.309)
Target Group (i.e. the type of child-related work addressed)	Staff at children's homes
Jurisdiction(s)/Location	England-Leicestershire
Evaluation Details	
Relevant Aims of the Study	"The task of the Inquiry has been to investigate how management responded to complaints and other prima facie evidence of abuse and malpractice or other related matters in Leicestershire's Children's Homes between 1973 and 1986, as well as any other relevant management or personnel management matters during the period or subsequently." (p.309)
Evaluation Methodology	Public Inquiry
Sample Selection/Selection of Participants (including number of cases/events examined)	"An early task of the Inquiry, therefore was to try to identify which complaints or other prima facie evidence of abuse or malpractice had found their way to Management Officers. In doing that, the inquiry was greatly assisted by being afforded by the Leicestershire Constabulary access to the 383 witness statements and voluminous documentary evidence that they had obtained. It was then possible to identify which of those witnesses thought they had made some kind of complaint at the times and to follow what progress, if any, towards Management Officers the complaint had made" (p.4)

	“Although the Inquiry has not been confined to homes in which Mr Beck worked, the period 1973 to 1986 coincides with Mr Beck’s employment in Leicestershire. ” (p.309)
When the case examined occurred/time period explored	The Inquiry opened in January 1992 to assess allegations in the period between 1973 and 1986
Relevant Outcome Measures	Witness statements and documentary evidence
Key Findings	
Relevant Key Findings (as reported by evaluation authors)	<p>“The Report contains an account of a series of complaints which, taken together, establish that in Mr Beck’s successive homes there was a regime of physical, sexual and emotional abuse.” (p.309)</p> <p>“The method of selection in use at the time, by written application, single interview and two written references, was not likely to have shown up significant defects of personality. It is, however noted that it has transpired that one of the references hinted at possible reservations felt by the referee. A discussion with him might well have alerted management. The second referee did not appreciate that Mr Beck had proposed that he do therapeutic work” (p.309)</p>

1.16 Kozlowski (2000)

Citation and Extraction details	
Person extracting data	JF
Date of data extraction	21/02/2014
Author (or Organisation if no author) and Year	Kozlowski (2000)
Publication Type	Report
Title	NRPA Law Review: Duty To Educate Youth about Risk of Sexual Abuse by Volunteers
Full citation of paper	Kozlowski, J. C. (2000). NRPA Law Review: Duty To Educate Youth about Risk of Sexual Abuse by Volunteers. <i>Parks & Recreation</i> , 35(12), 36-41.
Pre-employment Screening Approach Explored	
Type of Pre-employment Screening or Relevant Employment Prohibition Explored	Criminal background check. No further information provided.
Target Group (i.e. the type of child-related work addressed)	Youth volunteer (Scoutmaster)
Jurisdiction(s)/Location	Not stated but believed to be U.S because U.S websites and government papers are cited as measures for pre-employment checks
Evaluation Details	
Relevant Aims of the Study	To highlight a legal case in which the plaintiff, who was repeatedly molested by his scoutmaster, claimed the scouts were negligent in hiring the scoutmaster without a proper background check
Evaluation Methodology	One case presented and discussed
Sample Selection/Selection of Participants (including number of cases/events examined)	No information provided
When the case examined occurred/time period explored	From February 1990 to December 1990
Relevant Outcome Measures	No information provided but direct quotes are included from the Appeals Courts, the Scouts and the Victim

Key Findings	
Relevant Key Findings (as reported by evaluation authors)	<p>"[...] in this particular instance, the court found nothing in the volunteer's background which would have provided a specific warning that this particular individual posed an unreasonable risk to minors." (p.36)</p> <p>As there was "no information accessible to the Scouts that would case them to suspect that Paz had a propensity to molest children" (p.38, citing appeals court decision), the appeals court found that the Scouts were not negligent in their hiring practices.</p>

1.17 Kutz (2010)

Citation and Extraction details	
Person extracting data	SS
Date of data extraction	21/02/2014
Author (or Organisation if no author) and Year	Kutz (2010)
Publication Type	Report
Title	K-12 Education: Selected Cases of Public and Private Schools That Hired or Retained Individuals with Histories of Sexual Misconduct
Full citation of paper	Kutz, G. D. (2010) <i>K-12 Education: Selected Cases of Public and Private Schools That Hired or Retained Individuals with Histories of Sexual Misconduct. Report to the Chairman, Committee on Education and Labor, House of Representatives.</i> US Government Accountability Office. Washington, DC.
Pre-employment Screening Approach Explored	
Type of Pre-employment Screening or Relevant Employment Prohibition Explored	<p>Pre-employment criminal history checks of as mandated by the relevant states laws</p> <p>Employment application appraisal and follow-up of 'red flags' in the form of ambiguous or alarming answers to self-report questions on application forms about the applicant's criminal background</p>
Target Group (i.e. the type of child-related work addressed)	Employees (including teachers, administrative staff, maintenance workers, volunteers, and contractors) at private and public schools
Jurisdiction(s)/Location	U.S., 11 states (Arizona, California, Connecticut, Florida, Illinois, Louisiana, Maryland, Michigan, New York, Ohio, Virginia)
Evaluation Details	

Relevant Aims of the Study	“(1) examine the circumstances surrounding cases where K-12 schools hired or retained individuals with histories of sexual misconduct and determine the factors contributing to such employment actions [...]” (p.2)
Evaluation Methodology	15 case studies
Sample Selection/Selection of Participants (including number of cases/events examined)	<p>“Ultimately, through a combination of our data matching and public records searches, we selected 15 case studies from 11 states.” (p.2)</p> <p>“To select our case studies, we compared social security numbers (SSN) in the Department of Justice’s (DOJ) National Sex Offender Registry (NSOR) to SSNs in employment databases maintained by 19 states and the District of Columbia⁴ and covering approximately the years 2007 to 2009.⁵ From this comparison, we identified hundreds of potential cases of registered sex offenders working in schools.⁶ For each of these cases, we attempted to validate the identity of the offender and verify that their term of employment was after their conviction for a sex offense by using public records searches and contacting employers. We did not conduct any further investigation if we could not confirm that a registered sex offender had gained or retained employment at a school following their conviction. We also searched public records and identified dozens of cases from 2000 to 2010 in which sexual misconduct by school employees ultimately resulted in a criminal conviction.” (p.2)</p>
When the Cases Examined Occurred/Time-Period Explored	2000 to 2010
Relevant Outcome Measures	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - “interviewed related parties, including current and former school officials, law enforcement officials, and representatives from state agencies to investigate the factors contributing to the hire or retention of the individuals in these cases.” (p.2) - “Where applicable, we reviewed police reports, witness statements, court documents, offenders’ personnel files, and employer policy manuals.” (p.2) - “In addition, to the extent possible, we conducted searches to determine whether the sex offenders in our cases had previous criminal histories or were the subject of previous allegations of abuse.” (p.3) - “We also interviewed experts in fields related to child abuse investigations, prosecutions, and prevention.” (p.3)
Key Findings	
Relevant Key Findings (as reported by evaluation authors)	<p>Criminal history checks not conducted</p> <p>“In 10 of our 15 cases, school officials did not perform preemployment criminal history checks [...]. As a result, registered sex offenders were allowed to gain access to both public and private schools.</p> <p>“In 7 of these 10 cases, the offenders had been convicted for offenses against children and in at least 2 of the cases, they subsequently committed sexual crimes against children at the schools where they were working or volunteering.” (p.5)</p> <p><i>Reasons for not conducting criminal record checks:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - they felt that the process was too time-consuming and costly

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - the positions in question would not require daily interaction with children - they do not perform criminal history checks for support staff, such as maintenance workers, until after they have reported to work. (p.5) <p>Inadequate criminal history checks</p> <p>“Schools in eight of our cases told us that they conducted state criminal history checks, which only reveal offenses committed by a prospective employee in the state where it is conducted. [...] Although we did not identify any cases where conducting a state criminal history check resulted in hiring an employee who committed an offense in another state, such an outcome is highly likely.” (p.6)</p> <p>“We identified one school in Michigan that used a name-based criminal history search to hire an administrative employee. This online search required officials to search for the precise name under which an individual’s criminal background is recorded. However, the officials used a common nickname instead of the applicant’s full name, so the search did not reveal his eight convictions, which included various sex offenses. A fingerprint criminal history check would likely have revealed these charges. “ (p.6)</p> <p>‘Red flags’ on employment applications</p> <p>“Many of the schools we spoke with require job applicants to self-report basic information regarding their criminal background, but in three of our cases, schools failed to ask applicants about troubling responses.” (p.7)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - One applicant answered yes to when asked if he had been convicted of “a dangerous crime against children.” - The school could provide no information to suggest that it followed up with the applicant or law enforcement about this admission before hiring the offender - The offender eventually was arrested for sexually abusing a young female student at the school. <p>“In the two remaining cases, applicants did not provide any response when asked about previous criminal history and school officials could not provide evidence that they had inquired about the discrepancy or required the applicant to provide the information.” (p.7)</p>
--	--

1.18 Ministry of Social Development (2012)

Citation and Extraction details	
Person extracting data	SS
Date of data extraction	23/02/2014
Author (or Organisation if no author) and Year	Ministry of Social Development (2012)
Publication Type	Report
Title	The Green Paper for Vulnerable Children: Complete Summary of Submissions
Full citation of paper	Ministry of Social Development (2012) <i>The Green Paper for Vulnerable Children: Complete Summary of Submissions</i> . New Zealand.
Pre-employment Screening Approach Explored	
Type of Pre-employment Screening or Relevant Employment Prohibition Explored	Vetting by police and Child, Youth and Family (CYF)
Target Group (i.e. the type of child-related work addressed)	Workforce for children
Jurisdiction(s)/Location	New Zealand
Evaluation Details	
Relevant Aims of the Study	“The Government released the Green Paper for Vulnerable Children in July 2011, to promote a national discussion about how New Zealand can improve the lives of its vulnerable children.” (p.4)
Evaluation Methodology	<p>Analysis and summary of submissions to The Green Paper for Vulnerable Children</p> <p>“All submissions were given unique identifying numbers, and all submissions were archived. The large number of submissions received and the diversity of the responses meant we had to devise a careful recording system.</p> <p>We grouped the various ideas from the submissions into common categories, and recorded the frequency with which those ideas came up. Using a sample of submissions, our team of analysts finalised a set of broad themes (or “codes”) which were structured into a coding framework. Analysts used this framework to record each submission in specifically-designed databases.</p> <p>Key quotes were also selected from submissions and transcribed into the databases. Some of these quotes have been included in reports on submissions.” (p.7)</p>

<p>Sample Selection/Selection of Participants</p> <p>(including number of cases/events examined)</p>	<p>“Individual members of the public and people who worked with children tended to respond [to question and answer submissions], although some NGOs also submitted in this manner.” (p.6)</p> <p>The number of responses to the different types of Question and answer submissions (see Relevant Outcome Measures) were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 43 Questions- 1,109 responses - Priority 9 questions- 4,035 responses - Postcards- 605 responses (numbers taken from table on p.6)
<p>When the Cases Examined Occurred/Time-Period Explored</p>	<p>N/A See Evaluation Methodology</p> <p>“The Government released the Green Paper for Vulnerable Children in July 2011 [...] Submissions closed on 28 February 2012, although submissions received after that date were counted and included for consideration.” (p.4)</p>
<p>Relevant Outcome Measures</p>	<p>“Question and answer submissions: These submissions answered specific questions posed in the 43-question Green Paper consultation document, the nine priority questions on the free-post submission forms, the questions posed on the www.childrensactionplan.govt.nz or www.saysomething.org.nz websites, the single-question postcards, and online questionnaires, or the questions available through pop-ups on news media websites.” (p.6)</p> <p><i>Questions relevant to this scoping review:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - “What principles, competencies or quality standards should be included in the minimum standards for a workforce for children?” (p.151)
<p>Key Findings</p>	
<p>Relevant Key Findings</p> <p>(as reported by evaluation authors)</p>	<p>“Some submissions identified the importance of thorough vetting of staff and volunteers working with vulnerable children and families.” (p.148)</p> <p>Responses to Question and answer submissions:</p> <p><i>“What principles, competencies or quality standards should be included in the minimum standards for a workforce for children?”</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - “Vetted: A small minority [=below 10 per cent, see p.7] of frontline workers and a minority of the general public and other organisations said workers should be investigated to ensure they do not pose a risk to children.” (p.152)

1.19 National Crime Agency (NCA) (2013)

Citation and Extraction details	
Person extracting data	SS
Date of data extraction	19/02/2014
Author (or Organisation if no author) and Year	National Crime Agency (NCA) (2013)
Publication Type	Report
Title	The Foundations of Abuse: A thematic assessment of the risk of child sexual abuse by adults in institutions.
Full citation of paper	National Crime Agency (NCA) (2013) <i>The Foundations of Abuse: A thematic assessment of the risk of child sexual abuse by adults in institutions</i> . London, UK.
Pre-employment screening approach explored	
Type of Pre-employment Screening or Relevant Employment Prohibition Explored	Criminal background checks (vetting), reference checks, value-based interviewing
Target Group (i.e. the type of child-related work addressed)	Institutions defined as : "The educational and pastoral strand considers schools, youth groups and youth sports teams; the care category includes residential care homes and secure units; and the corporate and religious group encompasses all faith groups and denominations, as well as companies and charities that engage with children." (p.7)
Jurisdiction(s)/Location	"Case research was limited to England and Wales" (p.7) "all the Case Studies have been sanitised to remove names and identifiable locations" (p.24)
Evaluation Details	
Relevant Aims of the Study	"ii. to identify the common characteristics of institutions which make them higher risk locations for the sexual exploitation or abuse of children and young people; iii. to consult widely with subject matter experts and safeguarding practitioners; and iv. to identify and recommend practical options for addressing the characteristics of institutions that either escalate risk and/or cause individual or organisation-wide risk aversion." (p.7)
Evaluation Methodology	Presents literature review and case studies. "Information on the cases was gathered through open source material including news reports, serious case reviews and inquiries. Open source reporting was verified by talking directly to the case officers involved in the investigation. Additional information was provided by interviews with agencies and officers involved in the cases." (p.24)
Sample Selection/Participants (including number of cases/events examined)	"Following [...a literature review], a scoping exercise was conducted and six cases from each identified strand [i.e. institution category- see Study location] were selected for further analysis and research." (p.7)

	18 cases are presented in Appendix 1 (pp.24-28)
When the Cases Examined Occurred/Time-period explored	No time provided on the period of literature on cases that was examined, no information on when the cases explored occurred or when interviews with case officers and agencies were conducted.
Relevant Outcome Measures	N/A qualitative analysis of information gathered. See Relevant Aims of Study and Relevant Key Findings
Key Findings	
Relevant Key Findings (as reported by evaluation authors)	<p>Relevant case study: "Case Study 9 109. A number of offenders sexually abused children within a care home. A high level of offending took place within this institution, where poor and ineffective management led to failures in escalating concerns and where key reports relating to allegations made by children within the care home were misplaced. Fragmented leadership combined with a demoralised workforce to stifle reporting, and appropriate pathways for making complaints were unclear. Ultimately, this led to poor standards of behaviour towards the children in care becoming widely accepted within the institution and a wide range of abuse – ranging from physical and emotional through to sexual – was perpetrated against children. A lack of effective vetting allowed those with a sexual preference for children to be employed by the care home." (p.26)</p> <p>Recommendations relevant to this scoping review on pre-employment screening: "From the analysis and through liaison with stakeholders and partners, the NCA CEOP Command has produced a number of recommendations for mitigating the potential risk to children from sexual abuse in institutional settings. In some instances stakeholders have presented divergent views regarding particular recommendations – these differences have been highlighted where appropriate. [...]"</p> <p>- Improve Protection Through Safer Recruitment:- whilst effective vetting cannot create entirely safe institutions, its role in reducing offender's access to children, and as a deterrent, cannot be underestimated. Safe recruiting and selection of volunteers goes further than just vetting. References must be insisted upon and followed up and applicants for roles engaging with children should participate in a value-based interview." (pp.21-22)</p>

1.20 Productivity Commission (2010)

Citation and Extraction details	
Person extracting data	SS
Date of data extraction	23/02/2014
Author (or Organisation if no author) and Year	Productivity Commission (2010)
Publication Type	Report
Title	Contribution of the Not-for-Profit Sector. Research Report.
Full citation of paper	Productivity Commission (2010) <i>Contribution of the Not-for-Profit Sector. Research Report.</i> Canberra.
Pre-employment Screening Approach Explored	
Type of Pre-employment Screening or Relevant Employment Prohibition Explored	Background checking of volunteers to protect vulnerable clients (both police checks and Working with Children checks)
Target Group (i.e. the type of child-related work addressed)	Volunteers at not-for-profit organisations
Jurisdiction(s)/Location	Australia
Evaluation Details	
Relevant Aims of the Study	<p>“The Commission has been asked to undertake a research study into Australia’s not-for-profit (NFP) sector. The objectives of the study are to: [...]”</p> <p>- identify unnecessary impediments to the efficient and effective operation of NFPs and measures to improve their productivity [...]” (p.1)</p> <p>“Chapter 10 addresses workforce issues, where NFPs face distinct challenges regarding volunteering and underfunding of government funded services.” (p.10)</p>
Evaluation Methodology	<p>Analysis of submissions to the Productivity Commission in response to an issues paper</p> <p>“In conducting the study, the Commission is to: [...] seek public submissions and consult widely with State and Territory Governments, government agencies, the community sector, business, and other interested parties” (p.v)</p>
Sample Selection/Selection of Participants	<p>“The Commission [...]”</p> <p>- released an issues paper calling for submissions on April 7 2009 [...]</p>

(including number of cases/events examined)	<p>- undertook consultations in most states and territories with representatives from across the NFP sector as well as government agencies that engage the sector in the delivery of services or draw on the sector as intermediaries or advisers. [...]</p> <p>- In addition, it held meetings with specific interest groups as well as various state and Commonwealth agencies.</p> <p>- The Commission received a total of 319 submissions. A list of consultations and submissions is provided in appendix A. " (p.11)</p>
When the Cases Examined Occurred/Time-Period Explored	N/A. See Evaluation Methodology and Key Findings.
Relevant Outcome Measures	No details given, for example on whether or not the submissions followed a structured response form. (see Evaluation Methodology)
Key Findings	
Relevant Key Findings (as reported by evaluation authors)	<p>From Chapter 10- The not-for-profit workforce</p> <p>"In submissions and consultations, NFPs which are largely dependant on volunteers identified a number of concerns in relation to: [...]</p> <p>- the difficulties associated with the cost and consistency of background checking." (p.250)</p> <p><i>From Section Increasing costs of engaging volunteers- Background checks</i></p> <p>- [...] A concern commonly raised by participants was the cost, amount of administrative work, slow processing times and lack of portability between organisations and across jurisdictions associated with police checks. The cost of police checks across jurisdictions ranges from \$5 to \$52 per volunteer. Furthermore, some jurisdictions require employees and volunteers to obtain both police checks and 'Working with Children' checks." (p.257)</p> <p>Relevant recommendations:</p> <p>"Improving arrangements for effective sector development- Addressing workforce issues" (p.lvii)</p> <p>Current problem:</p> <p>"The regulation of volunteers (such as police checks) is imposing a growing compliance burden." (p.lvii)</p> <p>Proposed response:</p> <p>"Mandatory vetting requirements for working with children and vulnerable people should be streamlined and police checks should be portable within jurisdictions. Portability across jurisdictions should also be explored." (p.lvii)</p> <p>Main benefits of change:</p> <p>"Removing impediments to maximising the contribution of volunteers." (p. lvii)</p>

1.21 Smith & Aitken (2012)

Citation and Extraction details	
Person extracting data	SS
Date of data extraction	22/02/2014
Author (or Organisation if no author) and Year	Smith & Aitken (2012)
Publication Type	Report
Title	Ministerial Inquiry into the Employment of a Convicted Sex Offender in the Education Sector
Full citation of paper	Smith, M., & Aitken, J. Minister of Education (2012) <i>Ministerial Inquiry into the Employment of a Convicted Sex Offender in the Education Sector</i> . New Zealand.
Pre-employment Screening Approach Explored	
Type of Pre-employment Screening or Relevant Employment Prohibition Explored	<p>“- the registration of teachers by the New Zealand Teachers Council in accordance with Parts 10 and 10A of the Education Act 1989, including the authorisation of a limited authority to teach</p> <p>- policies and procedures established for those purposes, including vetting (Section 139AZD of the Education Act 1989)</p> <p>- the recruitment and hiring procedures employed by school boards of trustees and/or principals” (pp.5-6)</p>
Target Group (i.e. the type of child-related work addressed)	Education sector
Jurisdiction(s)/Location	New Zealand
Evaluation Details	
Relevant Aims of the Study	<p>“the processes by which a convicted sex offender was able to be employed in the education sector in New Zealand” (p.2)</p> <p>“The Inquiry has therefore directed its investigation toward identifying and commenting on the management and effectiveness of processes [...] such as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • registration providing an authority to teach, together with vetting arrangements • recruitment and hiring processes in schools of teachers and others who may be involved with children attending a school [...]” (p.5)
Evaluation Methodology	Ministerial Inquiry

Sample Selection/Selection of Participants (including number of cases/events examined)	Ministerial Inquiry into a single case (see Relevant Aims of the Study)
When the Cases Examined Occurred/Time-Period Explored	The events prior to the arrest of 'Miki' in 2012 (see p.53-55)
Relevant Outcome Measures	Interviews of people employed at involved government agencies, relevant organisations, as well as parents, boards and staff of the several affected schools (p.7) No further information provided
Key Findings	
Relevant Key Findings (as reported by evaluation authors)	<p>"The use by Miki of the law and administrative processes to steal the identity of Person X, and the utilisation of that stolen identity, and with it the teaching qualifications held by Person X that enabled Miki to gain entry to the education system, provides an almost fictional scenario." (p.6)</p> <p>Registration and related vetting of teachers by the New Zealand Teachers Council (NZTC)</p> <p>"To gain full registration, a teacher must have at least two years teaching experience and, as attested by the principal of the school and one other senior teacher, have successfully completed a mentoring and induction programme.</p> <p>[...]We were advised that this attestation is not invariably a rigorous process, and in general, we understand, school principals and senior staff members on whom the NZTC relies are highly likely, and generally for good reason, to report positively on the teacher concerned."</p> <p>"The Inquiry noted several registration-related matters that merit Council attention:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. the risks arising (most acutely in the current Miki case) when a name is changed on the register for any number of legitimate and fraudulent reasons, and the number is retained but any or all initial or earlier name(s) are expunged from the NZTC record b. the reason for any name change sought or recorded on the register [... see also p.78] d. substantial tightening up of the means by which the authenticity of academic qualifications from any tertiary provider (including overseas providers), written, telephonic or verbal or emailed attestations as to fitness to teach, good character, previous work history and teaching experience are validated and verified" (p.25) <p><i>Related Recommendations:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - "The Inquiry recommends that a police vet be obtained when any person seeks to move from provisional to full registration. [...] - The Inquiry recommends that any notation, including any information about a change of name(s) and the reason for that name change, made beside a registered teacher's name on the NZTC Register, be readily accessible by any bona fide inquirer (e.g. a potential school employer). [...]

	<p>- The Inquiry recommends that biometric photographic evidence for identity:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. be mandatorily required by the NZTC for any person seeking registration, be held on the Teachers Register, and be accessible to any future employer; and that b. a second biometric photograph be taken of any preferred candidate for an appointment to a school teaching position, or for a LAT; and c. before any appointment is confirmed, compared by the employer with that held on the NZTC Register.” (p.120) <p>Recruitment and hiring procedures employed by school boards of trustees and/or principals</p> <p>“[...] this Inquiry has amply demonstrated three specific issues:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. the current NZTC test of “good character” is necessary but far from sufficient as a means to protect children from the risks of exposure to persons such as Miki b. without close independent monitoring of the way boards handle their hiring role, employment choices made by naïve, ill-prepared or inexperienced trustees and principals will easily trump an otherwise reliable registration and vetting system. This directly exposes children to a variety of unacceptable risks [<i>see also citation below from p.74</i>] c. without greatly improved cross-sector, cross-agency data and Information Sharing, system and process failures will continue to present real (albeit somewhat indirect) risks to the well-being of children in schools.” (p.36) <p><i>Vetting:</i></p> <p>- “a notable gap in the information readily available to boards of trustees is the absence of any reliable register of convicted child sex offenders who could, as in this case, succeed in gaining registration, a practising certificate and employment in any part of the New Zealand education sector” (p.109)</p> <p><i>Interview and reference check process:</i></p> <p>“[...] we found extremely uneven performance amongst boards. For instance, as exemplified in the Miki case:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. candidate interviews are not always conducted and where they are, the appointing board/principal may overly rely on this tool, which best HR practice evidence shows to be quite inadequate b. we found no sound evidence (if any) of consistently careful, thorough reference checks by the boards of schools that had employed Miki. Based on what we were told by NZSTA, ERO, other officials, the unions and principals’ associations, we are not confident that this is well or consistently done throughout the school sector c. nor did we find evidence that boards take up the opportunity provided when applicants consent to a wide search for references, beyond the two or three they may have named. Sometimes none or only one of the named referees is consulted, and it is clear from this Inquiry that few if any efforts are made to authenticate the referee’s suitability, honesty, reliable knowledge of the applicant or any potential conflicts of interest that could affect the value of the reference.” (p.74) <p>Pages 80-81 raise areas of guidance that could be addressed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - How boards verify the identity of a person applying for a teaching position - How, why and when boards decide to make reference checks and who makes these checks
--	--

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - What steps are taken to ensure the appropriateness, impartiality, veracity and relevance of the named referee(s) - What questions are asked of referees <p>Pages 81-82 explore aspects of recommendations that are unique to Māori community (e.g. the weight of an applicant's whakapapa).</p>
--	--

1.22 Sonntag (2012)

Citation and Extraction details	
Person extracting data	SS
Date of data extraction	22/02/2014
Author (or Organisation if no author) and Year	Sonntag (2012)
Publication Type	Report
Title	State Auditor's Office Performance Audit: Protecting Children from Sex Offenders in Child Care, Foster Care and Schools
Full citation of paper	Sonntag, B. (2012) <i>State Auditor's Office Performance Audit: Protecting Children from Sex Offenders in Child Care, Foster Care and Schools</i> . State Auditor. Washington.
Pre-employment Screening Approach Explored	
Type of Pre-employment Screening or Relevant Employment Prohibition Explored	"Washington's child and foster care programs are generally required by law to conduct criminal background checks on all providers, as well as anyone aged 16 or older who lives or works in these settings." (p.3)
Target Group (i.e. the type of child-related work addressed)	Child and foster care providers, as well as anyone aged 16 or older who lives and works in these settings
Jurisdiction(s)/Location	Washington state
Evaluation Details	
Relevant Aims of the Study	<p>"The audit was designed to answer the following question:</p> <p>Can Washington's sex offender database be used to enhance monitoring of state-regulated facilities with children?" (p.3)</p> <p><i>Note that the main focus of this audit is on the monitoring of child and foster care settings and schools by using Washington's sex offender database. However, some of the findings are relevant to this Scoping Review (see Relevant Key Findings)</i></p>
Evaluation Methodology	State audit
Sample Selection/Selection of Participants (including number of cases/events examined)	<p>28 cases were identified and explored in which sex offenders lived in child and foster care homes.</p> <p>"We obtained sex offender and kidnapping registration data (Offender Watch) from WASPC, which included reported offender addresses from 1990 through August 2011, and conducted an electronic data match against the data sources</p>

	<p>shown in Exhibit 3 to determine if offenders currently or previously worked or lived in child or foster care settings or schools.” (p.10)</p> <p><i>Note that they also identified and explored 1 case in which a sex offender worked as a high school janitor undetected for nine years. However, he was employed prior to being convicted of a sex offence. His mandated criminal background check at the time of employment (as mandated by state law) came back clean. Thus, this case is not of relevance to this review of pre-employment screening practices.</i></p>
When the Cases Examined Occurred/Time-Period Explored	28 cases in which sex offenders lived in child and foster care homes occurred between 2002 and 2012 (p.12)
Relevant Outcome Measures	<p>“For identified matches, we did not rely solely on the data from the computer systems; we worked collaboratively with</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - the audited agencies, - WASPC [Washington Association of Sheriff s and Police Chiefs], and - local law enforcement. <p>The matches served as a starting point for further investigation into whether a sex offender currently or previously lived or worked in a state facility with access to children. We relied on numerous sources of corroborating information and investigations by</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - child care regulating agencies, - school districts, and - local law enforcement [...]” (p.11, SS’s own punctuation)
Key Findings	
Relevant Key Findings (as reported by evaluation authors)	<p><i>Note that the main focus of this audit is on the monitoring of child and foster care settings and schools by using Washington’s sex offender database. However, the following findings are relevant to this Scoping Review on evaluations of pre-employment screening:</i></p> <p>Child and foster care homes</p> <p>Identified 28 cases where confirmed sex offenders lived in child and foster care homes.</p> <p>“In 24 of the 28 cases, sex offenders went undetected because providers failed to inform agencies offenders lived in their homes.” (p.4)</p> <p>In the remaining four cases, this occurred because “because administrative rules did not address situations where child and provider share a home.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Administrative rules are clear that when the caregiver comes to the child’s home, only the caregiver must be checked, and - when the child goes to the caregiver’s home, background checks are required for all household members 16 and older. - It was unclear what rule should apply when child and provider share the home.” (p.16 SS’s own punctuation) <p>“In several of these cases, the caregiver and the offender were related” (p.14)</p>

1.23 U.S. GAO (1997)

Citation and Extraction details	
Person extracting data	SS
Date of data extraction	22/02/2014
Author (or Organisation if no author) and Year	U.S. General Accounting Office (GAO) (1997)
Publication Type	Report
Title	Fingerprint-Based Background Checks: Implementation of the National Child Protection Act of 1993.
Full citation of paper	U.S. General Accounting Office (GAO) (1997) <i>Fingerprint-Based Background Checks: Implementation of the National Child Protection Act of 1993. Report to the Honorable Fred Thompson, U.S. Senate.</i> Washington, DC
Pre-employment Screening Approach Explored	
Type of Pre-employment Screening or Relevant Employment Prohibition Explored	Fingerprint-based background checks
Target Group (i.e. the type of child-related work addressed)	Volunteers at 'youth-serving organizations' Other child-related work fields including teachers, foster carers and volunteers (when exploring effectiveness of fingerprint-based background checks)
Jurisdiction(s)/Location	Five states (California, Tennessee, Texas, and Virginia)
Evaluation Details	
Relevant Aims of the Study	<p>"-To what extent have selected states enacted statutes authorizing national background checks of child care providers? Also, what fees are charged for background checks of volunteers, and how do these fees compare with the actual costs in these states?</p> <p>- What effects have these states' laws and related fees had on volunteerism? For instance, have the laws and fees discouraged volunteers from participating in child care programs at nonprofit entities?</p> <p>- Have selected state agencies and other organizations found national background checks a useful screening tool? More specifically, for selected job or position categories in selected jurisdictions, how often have fingerprint-based background checks identified individuals with criminal histories?" (p.1)</p>
Evaluation Methodology	- Interviews

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Descriptive data on the number of FBI criminal background checks resulting in 'hits' and, when such data wasn't available for a state, - Selected case examples
<p>Sample Selection/Selection of Participants</p> <p>(including number of cases/events examined)</p>	<p>"[...] five judgmentally selected states—California, Florida, Tennessee, Texas, and Virginia. Generally, these selections were among the states suggested to us by officials at the public and private organizations mentioned above, that is, knowledgeable officials with national perspectives. Among other considerations, we selected states to reflect a range of (1) laws authorizing background checks and (2) experiences with automated fingerprint services." (p.19)</p>
<p>When the Cases Examined Occurred/Time-Period Explored</p>	<p>Not stated directly. The request for this review was made on January 3, 1996 by Senator Thompson, and was to "review certain implementation issues under the National Child Protection Act of 1993" (p.1). The report was published in 1997.</p>
<p>Relevant Outcome Measures</p>	<p><i>Summarised studies exploring the effect of state criminal background check laws on fees and voluntarism:</i></p> <p>"As applicable and permitted by available data, we reviewed the scope and methodology of the studies identified [...]" (p.23)</p> <p><i>Supplemented the findings of these studies with interviews:</i></p> <p>"we obtained opinions, anecdotes, and other pertinent information from officials at the various national and local nonprofit entities contacted. [...]" (p.23)</p> <p><i>To explore the usefulness of national fingerprint-based national criminal background checks as a screening tools:</i></p> <p>"we obtained both quantitative data (e.g., number of applicants disqualified on the basis of criminal histories [as detected by <i>fingerprint-based</i> background checks]) and qualitative data (e.g., opinions offered by experienced managers responsible for personnel decisions at various organizations) [...]"</p> <p>Note that in some states, quantitative data on fingerprint-based national criminal background checks was not available or insufficient and examples of individuals who had been detected by background checks were instead given by officials.</p>
<h2>Key Findings</h2>	
<p>Relevant Key Findings</p> <p>(as reported by evaluation authors)</p>	<p>"each of the five study states has enacted statutes authorizing national fingerprint-based background checks regarding paid and/or volunteer positions at various types of child care-related organizations, such as public schools, day care centers, and youth sports leagues" (p,4)</p> <p>"Even when national fingerprint checks have been authorized, few volunteers have been checked" (p.7)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Three of five states have authority to request national checks of volunteers - Officials suggest that these checks have been limited because statutes permit rather than require checks

	<p>- That statutes may permit rather than require checks due to concerns about fees and long turnaround times which may be unacceptable for many organizations due to the seasonal or part-time nature of the work</p> <p>- Another reason may be that organizations aren't aware that they are authorised to conduct checks.</p> <p>"Voluntarism apparently not affected by background check laws and related fees, although concerns exist" (p.9)</p> <p>- "because nonprofit youth-serving organizations had requested relatively few national fingerprint-based checks on volunteers, the applicable statutes and related fees do not appear to have negatively affected volunteerism" (p.9)</p> <p>- we identified only two studies—completed in 1994 and 1995, respectively—that had attempted to assess the potential effects of background check fees on volunteerism. Both studies were conducted or sponsored by the Boy Scouts of America. The respondents to both studies generally endorsed the concept that adult volunteers should be required to have a background check, but the respondents also indicated that personal cost was a factor influencing their willingness to maintain their volunteer status. Due to sampling and other methodological limitations, however, neither study can be used to draw conclusions about the overall scouting volunteer population. Also, the reported results are speculative because reactions were solicited regarding fees not actually in place." (pp.9-10)</p> <p>"National [FBI fingerprint-based criminal background] checks may serve as a deterrent and also can identify some unsuitable applicants not readily detectable by other means" (p.10)</p> <p>- "In the opinion of officials at the organizations we contacted, the authority to request national fingerprint-based checks is useful irrespective of the hit rates.</p> <p>- These officials emphasized that although it is not quantifiable, the deterrent effect of the prospect of national background checks is significant—and, indeed, is a factor perhaps more important than any other aspect of such checks." (p.10)</p> <p>- Officials felt that national fingerprint-based checks are an important supplement as they may identify people who change names or move from state to state</p> <p>- Officials felt that such checks should not be solely relied upon as such records may be incomplete or missing for some individuals</p> <p>Examples of cases where individuals with a criminal background were detected when applying for child-related work positions through FBI fingerprint-based criminal background checks (including teachers, foster carers and volunteers) were given. When available, data on the number of FBI fingerprint-based criminal background checks in child-related work fields was also presented.</p> <p>- By presenting this data, the authors conclude that they "were able to identify situations clearly showing the usefulness of national fingerprint-based checks" (p.11)</p>
--	--

1.24 U.S. GAO (2011)

Citation and Extraction details	
Person extracting data	JF
Date of data extraction	21/02/2014
Author (or Organisation if no author) and Year	U.S Government Accountability Office (GAO) (2011)
Publication Type	Report
Title	Child Care: Overview of Relevant Employment Laws and Cases of Sex Offenders at Child Care Facilities
Full citation of paper	U.S. Government Accountability Office (GAO) (2011). Child Care: Overview of Relevant Employment Laws and Cases of Sex Offenders at Child Care Facilities. Report to the Ranking Member, Committee on Education and the Workforce, House of Representatives (Vol. GAO-11-757, pp. 32). Washington, DC.
Pre-employment Screening Approach Explored	
Type of Pre-employment Screening or Relevant Employment Prohibition Explored	<p>Criminal history checks as mandated in the relevant jurisdictions.</p> <p>“The vast majority of states require that criminal-history checks for employees and other staff be fingerprint-based and be conducted in both national and state databases, but many do not specify that the checks must be completed prior to an employee’s start date” (p. 8)</p>
Target Group (i.e. the type of child-related work addressed)	Employees and other residents at child-care facilities
Jurisdiction(s)/Location	United States-Washington D.C, New York, Missouri, Arizona, South Carolina, Kentucky, Illinois, North Carolina, Arkansas
Evaluation Details	
Relevant Aims of the Study	“To identify case-study examples of child care facilities that employed or provided residence to registered sexual offenders who committed serious sexual offenses” (p.2)
Evaluation Methodology	<p>Ten case studies</p> <p>“we identified instances of relatives and acquaintances who knowingly hired offenders to work at child care facilities and facilities that unknowingly hired offenders because they did not perform preemployment criminal-history checks. Our investigation also found instances where child care facilities employing sex offenders operated without licenses or received federal funds” (p.9).</p>

<p>Sample Selection/Selection of Participants</p> <p>(including number of cases/events examined)</p>	<p>“Through a combination of our data matching, review of open-source information, public records, and interviews, and by focusing on the offenders who had been convicted of serious sexual offenses in the past, to include violent sexual offenses and crimes involving children, we selected 10 cases from eight states and the District of Columbia. Of these cases, 8 were selected from open-source information while the remaining 2 were selected from our comparison of SSNs in the NSOR with SSNs in employment databases.” (p.3)</p>
<p>When the Cases Examined Occurred/Time-Period Explored</p>	<p>“First, we compared social security numbers (SSN) that we obtained from the Department of Justice’s (DOJ) National Sex Offender Registry (NSOR) to SSNs in employment databases maintained by 20 states and the District of Columbia for the years 2007 to 2009. [...] We reviewed open sources published between the years 2000 through 2010.” (p.2)</p>
<p>Relevant Outcome Measures</p>	<p>The data are from records including police reports, court documents, and interviews</p>
<p>Key Findings</p>	
<p>Relevant Key Findings</p> <p>(as reported by evaluation authors)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - “In at least 7 of our 10 cases, sex offenders were hired or allowed to reside at both licensed and unlicensed facilities by relatives or acquaintances who were aware of the offenders’ previous offenses” (p.9) - “At least two cases show examples in which licensed child care facilities unknowingly hired employees who were sex offenders because they did not conduct required criminal-history checks. The documents we reviewed and the officials we spoke with indicated that the child care facilities did not perform these checks because of poor oversight and an unclear understanding of background check requirements” (p.11)

1.25 Waul Webster & Whitman (2008)

Citation and Extraction details	
Person extracting data	SS
Date of data extraction	23/02/2014
Author (or Organisation if no author) and Year	Waul Webster & Whitman (2008)
Publication Type	Report
Title	Who's Lending a Hand?: A National Survey of Nonprofit Volunteer Screening Practices
Full citation of paper	Waul Webster, M., & Whitman, J. (2008) <i>Who's Lending a Hand?: A National Survey of Nonprofit Volunteer Screening Practices</i> . The National Center for Victims of Crime. Washington, DC.
Pre-employment Screening Approach Explored	
Type of Pre-employment Screening or Relevant Employment Prohibition Explored	All screening practices, including: interviewing potential volunteers, checking references, background checks using state-wide or national databases (including criminal history, sex offender registry, child protective services and credit history background checks)
Target Group (i.e. the type of child-related work addressed)	Volunteers at nonprofit human service organizations (a wide variety of organizations including adoption, youth sports and recreation, child day care, children's and youths services, religious leadership- youth development, group homes, and youth centres and clubs, Table 1, p.8)
Jurisdiction(s)/Location	U.S.- National Survey
Evaluation Details	
Relevant Aims of the Study	<p>"Specifically, the study sought to answer the following questions:</p> <p>1- What is the current state of background screening of volunteers by human service nonprofits in the United States (i.e., are they conducting background checks and, if so, what kinds of checks)?</p> <p>2- Are there differences in volunteer screening practices among human service organizations based on variables like the size of the organization, whether they have a paid volunteer coordinator, and what population they serve?</p> <p>3- What experiences have organizations had with victimization of clients by unscreened or inadequately screened volunteers that could be instructive for the nonprofit community?" (p.6)</p>

Evaluation Methodology	<p>Telephone survey to answer aims 1 and 2 of the study (see Relevant Aims of the Study above)</p> <p>Aim 3 was answered through interviews with key people to collect anecdotes (see Relevant Aims of the Study above)</p>
<p>Sample Selection/Selection of Participants</p> <p>(including number of cases/events examined)</p>	<p>Telephone survey to answer aims 1 and 2 of the study (see Relevant Aims of the Study above)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - “Survey respondents were drawn from a random sample of 2,251 nonprofit organizations within certain categories of work that had filed Form 990 with the Internal Revenue Service between 1998 and 2006. [...]Organizations with less than \$25,000 in annual gross receipts are not required to submit Form 990 and, therefore, were not included in the sample.” (p.19) - “Executive staff or volunteer coordinators of 517 nonprofit organizations nationwide completed the telephone survey. Completed surveys represent a 23 percent response rate.” (p.19) - The types of organizations surveyed included adoption, youth sports and recreation, child day care, children’s and youths services, religious leadership-youth development, group homes, and youth centres and clubs (Table 1, p.8) <p>Interviews with key people to collect anecdotes- Aim 3 (see Relevant Aims of the Study above)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - “ To develop a list of potential respondents, the National Center sent an online survey to 6,045 victim service providers across the country and to the approximately 500 members of the National Crime Victim Bar Association to ask if they were aware of cases of client victimization by a nonprofit volunteer or employee (not necessarily within their own organization). - The National Center received 145 responses, of which 71 reported knowing of a case of victimization by a volunteer or staff member of a nonprofit organization. - Of these, 17 respondents agreed to a confidential telephone interview. - The National Center completed follow-up phone interviews with seven respondents. Respondents included current and former employees and volunteers of nonprofit organizations and attorneys representing clients who had been victimized by volunteers of organizations where they once received services. - Two of the resulting accounts are included as sidebars in this survey report.” (p.20, SS’s own punctuation)
When the Cases Examined Occurred/Time-Period Explored	<p>The survey was conducted between February and April 2007 (to answer aims 1 and 2- see Relevant Aims of the Study and Evaluation Methodology above)</p> <p>Interviews were conducted between June and July 2007 (to answer aim 3- see Relevant Aims of the Study and Evaluation Methodology above)</p> <p>These surveys and interviews regarded current practice at the time they were conducted.</p>
Relevant Outcome Measures	<p>Telephone survey results (appear to be in response to set questions with multiple-choice answers, however the questionnaire is not provided)</p> <p>Anecdotes collected during interviews to answer aim 3 (see Relevant Aims of the Study and Evaluation Methodology above)</p>

Key Findings

<p>Relevant Key Findings</p> <p>(as reported by evaluation authors)</p>	<p>Survey results (aims 1 and 2- see Relevant Aims of the Study and Evaluation Methodology above)</p> <p><i>Present descriptive statistics describing the number and size of organizations that screen volunteers, as well as the type of screening conducted and how organizations use screening information. E.g.:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - “Twelve percent of the organizations surveyed said they do not screen volunteers at all.” (p.9) - “Most organizations conduct interviews; fewer check references; and fewer still conduct background checks of volunteers.” (p.10) - “The majority of organizations disqualify a volunteer for a child abuse report.” (p.14) - “Most commonly reported obstacle in completing background checks is cost.[...] Nearly one in three organizations that reported experiencing obstacles cited the cost of background checks as the primary challenge. One in four reported that the process takes too long and the organization cannot wait for the results before putting volunteers to work. A handful of organizations [2%, Figure 3, p.13] cited objections from either the volunteers or the staff. The most common responses captured in the “other” category cited delays in receiving information either from the volunteer or from the agency conducting the check.” (p.13) - “Nearly half of organizations indicated that screening has identified inappropriate volunteers. Of the organizations that conduct regular volunteer screening, 46 percent said that their screening process has identified volunteers who were “inappropriate” for their organization. In the context of this survey question, “inappropriate” could have a broad range of meanings, from someone who was found to have a criminal record to someone who did not appear to support the mission of the organization or did not have the appropriate skill set for the position.” (p.14) <p>Relevant anecdote collected during interviews to answer aim 3 of study (to answer aim 3- see Relevant Aims of the Study and Evaluation Methodology above)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - “Victimization by an insufficiently screened volunteer” (p.13). A 10- and 12-year old girl were victimised by their softball coach. The people given as referees said they only knew the person slightly, but this was accepted. Furthermore, a background check was only conducted with local law enforcement. A national check would have revealed that they had committed crimes against children in other jurisdictions. <p><i>Note that one other anecdote was presented in this report (see Sample Selection/Selection of Participants), although this involved a case of an adult victim so is not presented here.</i></p>
---	--



Level 5, 232 Victoria Parade, East Melbourne, Victoria, Australia 3002

E info@parentingrc.org.au
P +61 3 8660 3500
F +61 3 8660 3599
W www.parentingrc.org.au