

Recordkeeping issues arising from the public hearings of the Royal Commission into Institutional Responses to Child Sexual Abuse

Viviane Hessami*

Viviane Hessami is a Research Assistant and Teaching Associate in the Centre for Organisational and Social Informatics, Monash University, where she is collaborating on research projects to improve access to archives and records. She completed a Graduate Diploma in Information and Knowledge Management, with a specialisation in Library, Archives and Records Management in March 2015. She had previously received a BA (Honours) with a specialisation in History from the University of Liège (Belgium) and an MA in South East Asian Studies from the University of Kent (United Kingdom) and gained her PhD in Political Science at Monash University in 2000.

The Royal Commission into Institutional Responses to Child Sexual Abuse was set up in January 2013 to investigate child sexual abuse in institutional contexts and to focus its recommendations on addressing systemic issues. Recordkeeping issues are at the core of the problems that institutions face when dealing with child sexual abuse although the Royal Commission did not address them systematically in 2013–14. The present article analyses the recordkeeping issues that arose in the public hearings held by the Royal Commission up to October 2014. It shows that recordkeeping issues that appeared in different contexts provide evidence of critical failures in the recordkeeping systems of the institutions under study. It then highlights three implications for professional practice: the need for the professional associations to step up and advocate for a hearing on recordkeeping issues, the importance of putting in place appropriate systems to preserve the records of the Royal Commission, and the need to raise awareness about the complexity of the recordkeeping issues in the institutions that deal with out-of-home care and to develop recordkeeping systems that better meet the needs of the children in care and that support the prevention, detection, reporting and prosecution of child abuse.

Keywords: inquiries; records; recordkeeping; out-of-home care; professional associations; advocacy

Introduction

The research for this article was conducted in order to contribute background information for the National Summit on Setting the Record Straight for the Rights of the Child, which Monash University's Centre for Organisational and Social Informatics plans to convene in late 2016.¹ It analyses the archival and recordkeeping issues that have arisen in the public hearings of the Royal Commission into Institutional Responses to Child Sexual Abuse (henceforth referred to as Royal Commission) up to October 2014 with a particular focus on the hearings that relate to children who have grown up in out-of-home care. It is part of an ongoing project which will continue to analyse the work of the Royal Commission as it unfolds. The present article is divided into four

*Email: vivianeh2102@gmail.com

sections. The first one describes the context that led to the establishment of the Royal Commission and the work that it did up to October 2014. The second section explains the methodology that was used in conducting research for this article. The third section presents the main findings of the research, and the fourth section discusses some implications for the archival and recordkeeping professions that can be inferred from the research's findings.

Background to the Royal Commission into Institutional Responses to Child Sexual Abuse

Many inquiries have been conducted in Australia in the past 20 years into child abuse in institutions, both at the federal and at the state levels,² which have dealt with specific groups of people, in particular the Stolen Generations,³ British and Maltese Child Migrants⁴ and children who grew up in institutional care, known as Forgotten Australians.⁵ However, all these inquiries had limited terms of references, and, over the years, it became clear that a broader inquiry at a national level was required in order to address the systemic issues that had appeared in all the inquiries.⁶

The Royal Commission was set up by letters patent on 11 January 2013 to investigate what institutions and governments should do to address the impact of past child sexual abuse in institutional contexts, to better protect children against child sexual abuse in the future, and to achieve best practice in encouraging the reporting of incidents and in responding to reports of child sexual abuse in institutional contexts.⁷ Its terms of reference required it to focus its inquiry and recommendations on systemic issues, and to submit an interim report by 30 June 2014 and a final report by 31 December 2015.

The Royal Commission submitted its interim report on 30 June 2014 as scheduled. This report includes two volumes. The first one reports on what the Royal Commission had done up to June 2014 and what it still had to do to fulfil its terms of reference, while the second volume consists of a representative sample of 150 individual stories of victims of abuse.⁸ By the end of May 2014, the Royal Commission had received 1632 written submissions about allegations of abuse in more than 1000 institutions. It had held 1677 private hearings during which survivors of abuse had been able to speak with one of the commissioners in a private setting, and 12 public hearings, which had concentrated on case studies that warranted further investigation.⁹ It had also conducted an extensive research program that focused on four broad areas: prevention, identification, response and justice for the victims. By the end of June 2014, 21 projects had been conducted and 30 more were underway, and seven issue papers had been produced on issues ranging from working with children checks to redress schemes.¹⁰ Two roundtables had also been held in April and June 2014, bringing together experts from a variety of fields to discuss the prevention of child sexual abuse in out-of-home care, and working with children checks.¹¹

When it submitted its interim report, the Royal Commission requested an extension of its final reporting date by two years until 15 December 2017, which it argued was necessary to enable it to accomplish its mandate. This extension, which was approved by the Australian Government in September 2014,¹² should make it possible for the Royal Commission to organise additional private sessions with people who want to share their testimony, especially those who belong to 'hard-to-reach groups', to hold the estimated 70 public hearings that have been identified as necessary to fully meet its

terms of reference by covering all the systemic issues, and to carry the necessary research to provide a sound grounding for its recommendations.¹³

Methodology

The present article focuses on the public hearings held by the Royal Commission up to 1 October 2014. By that date, 17 case studies had been organised and reports had been published for the first two. The first step of the investigation consisted of reading the opening address for each of the case studies. This revealed that 6 out of 17 were relevant for out-of-home care (see appendix 1). All of these dealt with historical issues, although case studies 11 and 17, which focused on the Christian Brothers Homes in Western Australia and on Retta Dixon Home in Darwin, respectively, also addressed current policies and procedures. For this reason, these two case studies were selected for further investigation, as well as case study 12, which, although not directly relevant for out-of-home care as it dealt with a Western Australian Anglican school, looked at best practices in policies and registration procedures. Moreover, some of the other case studies that do not relate to out-of-home care, in particular case studies 1 and 2, for which reports had been published, also provide some insights into recordkeeping issues that can be extended to apply to out-of-home care situations. These two studies were therefore also examined in more detail. The second stage of the investigation consisted of reading through the transcripts of the selected case studies and the supporting documentation that accompanied them, which is published separately on the website of the Royal Commission as 'exhibits lists' for each case study.

Results: recordkeeping issues arising from the case studies

The investigation of the public hearings of the Royal Commission revealed that archival and recordkeeping issues were not addressed systematically during the hearings. None of the case studies dealt with archival or recordkeeping issues in any length or depth. However, all the historical case studies show evidence of systemic failures to create records at the time the abuse incidents occurred. A common pattern was that when children tried to report abuse, they were not believed, no record was made and often they were punished for reporting the abuse. Another common pattern was for the report of abuse not to be passed on to the responsible authorities within the institutions or to the police, which meant they were not being investigated. This lack of communication inside the institutions, often resulting from an atmosphere of fear and intimidation, enabled the authorities in charge to claim that they did not know anything about the alleged abuses. The most extreme case of denial that appeared in the hearings is that of Reverend Trevor Leggott, who had been General Director of Australian Indigenous Ministries (formerly Aboriginal Inland Mission) since 1996. Reverend Leggott told the commissioners under oath that he had never been notified of any allegations of abuse having occurred in a home controlled by his organisation and that he could not find any mention of incidents in his organisation's records. He even claimed that he did not hear anything about it and was not contacted by the police when a case about sexual abuse in a home formerly controlled by Aboriginal Inland Mission went to court in Darwin in 2002.¹⁴

A common problem identified in several of the case studies is that many historical records that date back to the time of the abuse have been lost or destroyed. For example, the Western Australian Department for Child Protection and Family Support could

not locate any record relating to inspections of the institutions in the 1940s–1960s or any policy or procedure outlining how the inspections required by the *Child Welfare Act 1947* (WA) were conducted.¹⁵ Interestingly, the Royal Commission’s investigation uncovered some records of inspections by the Western Australian Child Welfare Department.¹⁶ Unfortunately, no indication is made in the transcripts or on the website of the Royal Commission of where and how they were found. However, we can presume that they were held in the State Records Office of Western Australia’s archives since these inspections had been carried out by state government officials.¹⁷

Some of the case studies that deal with more recent issues address the suitability of the policies and procedures in place to prevent and detect abuse. For example, case study 12, which relates to an Anglican school in Perth, discussed the issue of best practices in school policies and registration procedures, while case studies 1 and 2 discussed the recruitment procedures of Hunter Aboriginal Children Services and of YMCA New South Wales, respectively, and case study 15 looked at the policies and procedures of Swimming Australia (see appendix 1). The discussion of policies and procedures is interlinked with recordkeeping issues because the implementation of policies and procedures requires the creation and preservation of records and the existence of the required records can attest to the implementation of the policies and procedures.

A careful examination of the transcripts and of the published reports of the public hearings shows that recordkeeping issues arose in different contexts and in relation to various types of issues. These can be classified into five broad categories:

1. **Recordkeeping issues in the recruitment process.** For example, not writing down the content of oral references and not recording the steps that were taken when checking an applicant’s background were found to be in contravention of the organisation’s policies and to lead to an unsuitable candidate being hired by YMCA in case study 2.¹⁸ Similarly, the failure to check an employee’s work with children assessment was recorded in case study 1 as a significant shortcoming that led to the employment of a person with a criminal record by Hunter Aboriginal Children Services.¹⁹
2. **Recordkeeping issues relating to the creation and capture of accurate records of events or allegations.** Most case studies show evidence of shortcomings in this regard. The issue is discussed several times in case study 12, in which teachers who had found one of their colleagues’ behaviour inappropriate were asked by the commissioners why they had not made written complaints, and the school authorities at the time were asked why they had not made records of oral ‘informal’ complaints. The inquiry linked the lack of written records to the absence of policies specifying the procedures that should have been followed in cases where teachers harboured concerns about the behaviour of one of their colleagues.²⁰
3. **Recordkeeping issues relating to the reporting process.** In many cases, reports of abuse were not investigated because the authorities to which they were entrusted did not act upon them or did not notify their superiors (for example, in case studies 11, 12 and 17). The absence of a confidential reporting system was noted in case study 2 as a factor that discouraged staff from reporting policy breaches and concerning behaviours.²¹
4. **Recordkeeping issues relating to communication within the institutions.** Recordkeeping issues arose when information was only communicated orally or when other sections of an organisation were not informed that a staff member

had been issued with a warning.²² Although this is not specifically mentioned in the case studies on which the author focused, most of the historical cases of sexual predators being transferred from one place to another were presumably characterised by a lack of information being transferred with them.

5. **Recordkeeping issues relating to accessing the records.** These types of issues most commonly arose around cases of records that could not be found because they had been lost or destroyed, as in case study 11.²³ Access to their records by survivors of abuse was not discussed in the hearings the author focused on for this article.

Discussion: implications for professional practice

1. Access to the records of the Royal Commission

In order to make sense of the hearings, the supporting documentation that was tabled in front of the commissioners also has to be consulted. However, it is published separately on the website of the Royal Commission, which complicates the task of locating the relevant documents. Moreover, the exhibits are referred to during the hearings sometimes by their tab number in the tender bundle,²⁴ sometimes by exhibit number,²⁵ which makes it difficult to locate them in the relevant exhibit list since the lists are not numbered and, at least in the instance of case study 11, do not appear to follow the same order. For example, tab 20 mentioned during the 20 April 2014 hearing²⁶ is not the 20th item in the corresponding exhibit list. Furthermore, some supporting exhibits quoted during the hearings could not be located at all in the exhibit lists.²⁷ Most importantly, the written submission of a scheduled key witness (Richard Strickland, Chief Executive Officer of the Western Australian Department of Education Services) who was excused from appearing in front of the commissioners after he submitted a written submission²⁸ could not be located on the website of the Royal Commission.²⁹

The fact that the supporting documentation is uploaded separately from the transcripts of the hearings that they document raises the question of whether or not the two types of records will be preserved together when the Royal Commission winds down its website, which is essential to make sense of the hearings. The archival and record-keeping professions should put in place an appropriate framework to preserve these testimonies and make them available for future inquiries and future research so that the witnesses, in particular the survivors of abuse, do not have to repeat their testimony. As Cate O'Neill has argued for the submissions to the Forgotten Australians inquiry, these records constitute a rich archive that needs to be preserved.³⁰ The archival profession should ensure that submissions that have been made publically available on the website of the Royal Commission are not subjected to a 20-year lockdown when they are sent to the National Archives of Australia. The Council of Australasian Archives and Records Authorities announced in October 2014 the formation of a working group to support the management of the records created by the Royal Commission and the accessibility of the records called as evidence.³¹ It is to be hoped that this working group will extend its role to the management of the preservation of the records after the Royal Commission completes its work.

2. Need to advocate for a hearing on recordkeeping issues

In 2013–14, recordkeeping issues were not addressed systematically by the Royal Commission although, as our research has shown, many recordkeeping issues that warrant further investigation cropped up during the public hearings. Archival and recordkeeping professionals and, in particular, their professional associations need to step up and advocate for the importance of looking at these recordkeeping issues and to lobby for the Royal Commission to hold a specific hearing to address them. The Victorian branch of Records and Information Management Professionals Australasia has highlighted the importance of recordkeeping issues in its submission to the Royal Commission for issue paper 5 on civil litigation and has called for a hearing on recordkeeping issues,³² but the Australian Society of Archivists (ASA) has been less active. It made a submission to the Royal Commission in November 2012 in which it introduced itself and pointed to the importance of recordkeeping issues, but fell short of advocating for a hearing on recordkeeping issues.³³ Moreover, although it may have been active behind the scenes in helping institutions to prepare their submissions to the Royal Commission and in improving their archival systems, the ASA has not engaged in any further advocacy since November 2012, and the 2014 ASA–ARANZ (Archives and Records Association of New Zealand) conference did not discuss the work of the Royal Commission.³⁴

3. Awareness of the complexity of the recordkeeping issues and of the need for new systems

Archival and recordkeeping professionals need to be aware of the important role played by records in helping survivors of abuse to reconstruct their identity and make sense of their time in ‘care’,³⁵ and of the problems that confront them when trying to access their records due to the lack of uniform frameworks across jurisdictions and across sectors.³⁶ Archival and recordkeeping professionals also need to be conscious of the difficulties involved in designing and implementing effective recordkeeping systems in the agencies and institutions that currently provide out-of-home care services.³⁷

One of the issues that emerged during the hearings for case study 12 is that there is a tension between protecting the privacy of a person whom someone suspects might be abusing children and ensuring that enough documentation is kept for future reference if the case goes to court several years later. The hearing discussed the fine line that must be drawn between the need to have information recorded accurately for possible future use, and the use of that information for disciplinary purposes.³⁸ Moreover, there is also a tension between recording information to meet regulatory purposes and recording information for the children to use later to reconstruct their identity by making sense of where they came from and what happened to them when they were in ‘care’.³⁹ All the potential uses of records must be taken into account when designing the recordkeeping systems used by institutions that provide out-of-home care services. The systems must be designed to allow the creation of records that represent the perspectives of all the actors and their capture and preservation into the recordkeeping systems of the organisations in a way that will accommodate all the potential uses of the records in the future.⁴⁰

Another issue that was raised during the Royal Commission hearings is that of the privacy of the records of the children in care. The issue was brought up by a survivor of abuse who was convinced that the fact that medical staff had unrestricted access to

information in her file about the sexual abuse that she had previously endured may have 'encouraged' a male nurse to later sexually abuse her when she was in hospital for an unrelated problem. She persuasively argued that in order to protect children from suffering further abuse, 'their records should be confidential and only available to those who need to know'.⁴¹ The existence of a link between the knowledge of previous abuse and further abuse has been established in other cases of institutional abuse.⁴² On a more general level, it is common for children growing up in care to feel that nothing in their life is private.⁴³ Given the involvement of large numbers of social workers and professionals in their daily lives, the privacy of their records is difficult to ensure. The 2014 Victorian Auditor-General's audit of residential care services for children found that often too many people have access to the records.⁴⁴ More attention should be paid to the incorporation, in the recordkeeping systems of the institutions that deal with children in care, of levels of security access that protect the privacy of the children, and to their enforcement.

The existing international standards, such as the ISO 30300 series and ISO 15489, and the jurisdictional standards in the different Australian states, are useful tools for the development of recordkeeping systems that support accountability and transparency and the creation of full and accurate records. Many agencies have adopted suitable records management systems that follow their guidelines, but, in practice, they do not use them effectively.⁴⁵ The main problem confronting agencies and institutions in the residential care sector is that of inadequate resources. Out-of-home care staff are overworked, stressed and under constant pressure. They include a high proportion of casual workers and they have high turnover rates. They deal daily with crisis situations and have more urgent tasks to accomplish than to make records of the children's achievements and milestones.⁴⁶ For the systems to be effectively implemented, the staff must be trained in using them and must be given the resources to do it. The archival and recordkeeping professions have a role to play in developing training programs for record managers, in producing guidelines written in plain language to instruct people on how to implement the standards and use the records management systems effectively and, more generally, in raising awareness about the importance of archival and recordkeeping issues and about their interdependence with other critical issues, and in lobbying for more funding to address the problems that they are confronting.

Conclusion

The analysis of the public hearings of the Royal Commission that was undertaken for this article showed that several archival and recordkeeping issues that warrant further investigation arose during the hearings. Three implications for professional practice were highlighted: the need to put in place a framework to preserve the records of the Royal Commission after it finishes its work; the need for the professional associations to take a more proactive role in lobbying the Royal Commission for a specific hearing on archival and recordkeeping issues; and the need for archival and recordkeeping professionals to be more aware of the complexity of the issues that surround the records of children in institutional care, and to advocate for the development of recordkeeping systems that better meet their needs and that support the prevention, detection, reporting and prosecution of child abuse.

Acknowledgements

The author would like to acknowledge the guidance and support of Joanne Evans and Judith Ellis in writing this article, which started as an assignment during her studies for a Diploma in Information and Knowledge Management at Monash University.

Endnotes

1. Joanne Evans, Sue McKemmish, Elizabeth Daniels and Gavan McCarthy, 'Self-Determination and Archival Autonomy: Advocating Activism', *Archival Science*, 21 April 2015.
2. See Kim Eberhard, 'Unresolved Issues: Recordkeeping Recommendations Arising from Australian Commissions into the Welfare of Children in Out-of-Home Care, 1997–2012', *Archives and Manuscripts*, vol. 43, no. 1, pp. 4–17.
3. Australian Human Rights Commission, *Bringing Them Home: Report of the National Inquiry into the Separation of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Children from Their Families, Appendix 9: Recommendations*, 1997, available at <<https://www.humanrights.gov.au/publications/bringing-them-home-appendix-9-recommendations>>, accessed 20 October 2014.
4. Senate Standing Committee on Community Affairs, *Lost Innocents: Righting the Record – Report on Child Migration*, 2001, available at <http://www.aph.gov.au/Parliamentary_Business/Committees/Senate/Community_Affairs/Completed_inquiries/1999-02/child_migrat/report/index>, accessed 20 October 2014.
5. Senate Standing Committee on Community Affairs, *Forgotten Australians: A Report on Australians Who Experienced Institutional or Out-of-Home Care as Children*, 2004, available at <http://www.aph.gov.au/Parliamentary_Business/Committees/Senate/Community_Affairs/Completed_inquiries/2004-07/inst_care/report/index>, accessed 20 October 2014.
6. Royal Commission into Institutional Responses to Child Sexual Abuse, *Interim Report*, 2 vols, 2014, available at <<http://www.childabuseroyalcommission.gov.au/about-us/our-reports>>, accessed 20 October 2014.
7. Royal Commission into Institutional Responses to Child Sexual Abuse, 'Terms of Reference', 2013, available at <<http://www.childabuseroyalcommission.gov.au/about-us/terms-of-reference>>, accessed 20 October 2014.
8. Royal Commission into Institutional Responses to Child Sexual Abuse, *Interim Report*.
9. *ibid.*, vol. 1, pp. 3–4.
10. *ibid.*, vol. 1, p. 5.
11. Royal Commission into Institutional Responses to Child Sexual Abuse, 'Roundtables', 2014, available at <<http://www.childabuseroyalcommission.gov.au/policy-and-research/roundtables>>, accessed 19 October 2014.
12. Attorney-General for Australia, 'Extension of Royal Commission into Institutional Responses to Child Sexual Abuse', 2014, available at <<http://www.attorneygeneral.gov.au/transcripts/Pages/2014/ThirdQuarter2014/2September2014-ExtensionofRoyalCommissionintoInstitutionalResponsesstoChildSexualAbuse.aspx>>, accessed 20 October 2014.
13. Royal Commission into Institutional Responses to Child Sexual Abuse, *Interim Report*, vol. 1, p. 11.
14. Royal Commission into Institutional Responses to Child Sexual Abuse, 'case study 17 Transcripts', 30 September, 2014, C051, p. 70, available at <<http://www.childabuseroyalcommission.gov.au/case-study/48ee3c7b-a728-4777-b4e4-239d3f75a29b/case-study-17,-september-2014,-darwin>>, accessed 4 October 2014.
15. Royal Commission into Institutional Responses to Child Sexual Abuse, 'case study 11 Transcripts', 30 April 2014, WA15, pp. 81–3, available at <<http://www.childabuseroyalcommission.gov.au/case-study/e7ba58da-609c-4854-aa74-c8992ec75d3c/case-study-11,-april-2014,-perth>>, accessed 3 October 2014.
16. Royal Commission into Institutional Responses to Child Sexual Abuse, 'Exhibits for case study 11, April 2014, Perth', available at <<http://www.childabuseroyalcommission.gov.au/exhibits/e7ba58da-609c-4854-aa74-c8992ec75d3c/case-study-11,-april-2014,-perth>>, accessed 20 October 2014.
17. See in particular exhibits 4 and 5 in *ibid.*, which are mentioned in Royal Commission into Institutional Responses to Child Sexual Abuse, 'case study 11 Transcripts', WA15, pp. 85–6.

- The State Records office of Western Australia hold Community Welfare Department files relating to the Christian Brothers Homes for the period 1947–60, Community Welfare Department, Indentures of Child Migrants, 1947–1952, Acc 2868, Items 1–4, AN 320/10, and Community Welfare Department, General Files - Child Migration, 1947–1960, Acc 2868, Items 5–14, AN 320/10, see State Records Office of Western Australia, ‘Passenger Lists and Immigration Records’, 2014, available at <<http://www.sro.wa.gov.au/archive-collection/collection/passenger-lists-and-immigration-records>>, accessed 20 October 2014. The Perth branch of the National Archives of Australia also holds records of inspection of the homes by the Department of Immigration during that period, see for example NAA: PP6/1,1949/H/1168 for Bindoon inspections.
18. Royal Commission into Institutional Responses to Child Sexual Abuse, *Report of case study No. 2: YMCA NSW’s Response to the Conduct of Jonathan Lord*, 2014, pp. 34–7, available at <<http://www.childabuseroyalcommission.gov.au/getattachment/8196fe73-b2df-4cf9-a09b-55b200a84a16/Report-of-Case-Study-no-2>>, accessed 16 September 2014.
 19. Royal Commission into Institutional Responses to Child Sexual Abuse, *Report of case study No. 1: The Response of Institutions to the Conduct of Steven Larkins*, 2014, p. 8, available at <<http://www.childabuseroyalcommission.gov.au/getattachment/56689f9e-95af-4b31-a8c4-440359b5438e/Report-of-Case-Study-no-1>>, accessed 15 September 2014.
 20. Royal Commission into Institutional Responses to Child Sexual Abuse, ‘Public Hearing into the Response of an Independent School in Perth to Concerns Raised Between 1999 and 2009 by Teachers and Others About Another Teacher: Public Hearing 12: Opening Submission of Counsel Assisting’, 24 June 2014, available at <<http://www.childabuseroyalcommission.gov.au/case-study/14ca9ba5-3ab6-4e94-8f87-86f79cd692ac/case-study-12,-may-2014,-perth>>, accessed 1 October 2014.
 21. Royal Commission into Institutional Responses to Child Sexual Abuse, *Report of case study No. 2*.
 22. Royal Commission into Institutional Responses to Child Sexual Abuse, *Report of case study No. 1*, p. 5.
 23. Royal Commission into Institutional Responses to Child Sexual Abuse, ‘case study 11 Transcripts’, WA15, pp. 81–3.
 24. *ibid.*, p. 83.
 25. *ibid.*, p. 85.
 26. *ibid.*, p. 86.
 27. For example, exhibit 0177 mentioned in *ibid.*, p. 85.
 28. Royal Commission into Institutional Responses to Child Sexual Abuse, ‘case study 12 Transcripts’, 20 June 2014, WA34, p. 2, available at <<http://www.childabuseroyalcommission.gov.au/case-study/14ca9ba5-3ab6-4e94-8f87-86f79cd692ac/case-study-12,-may-2014,-perth>>, accessed 21 October 2014.
 29. It is not included in the corresponding exhibit list: Royal Commission into Institutional Responses to Child Sexual Abuse, ‘Exhibits for case study 12, May 2014, Perth’, 2014, available at <<http://www.childabuseroyalcommission.gov.au/exhibits/14ca9ba5-3ab6-4e94-8f87-86f79cd692ac/case-study-12,-may-2014,-perth>>, accessed 21 October 2014.
 30. Cate O’Neill, ‘Accessing the Records of the Forgotten Australians: Learning from the Human Rights Context to Improve Archival Practices and Restorative Justice’, paper presented at the International Council on Archives Congress 2012, available at <<http://ica2012.ica.org/files/pdf/Fullpapersupload/ica12Final00354.pdf>>, accessed 13 October 2014.
 31. Ross Latham, ‘Outcomes from the Latest Meeting of the Council of Australasian Archives and Records Authorities (CAARA)’, blog post, 2014, available at <<http://archiveslive.ning.com/profiles/blogs/outcomes-from-the-latest-meeting-of-the-council-of-australasian>>, accessed 20 October 2014.
 32. Records and Information Management Professionals Australasia, ‘Royal Commission into Institutional Responses into Sexual Abuse – Issue Paper 5 – RIM Professionals Victoria Submission’, 17 March 2014, available at <<http://www.childabuseroyalcommission.gov.au/getattachment/d1ccf922-845c-45ee-9826-cdcef24ad316/19-RIM-Professionals-Victoria-Branch>>, accessed 11 July 2015.
 33. Australian Society of Archivists, ‘Submission by the Australian Society of Archivists Inc. on the Consultation Paper Regarding the Establishment of the Royal Commission into

- Institutional Responses to Child Abuse', 26 November 2012, available at <<http://www.archivists.org.au/documents/item/265>>, accessed 13 October 2014.
34. Chris Stueven, personal communication, 6 October 2014.
 35. Care Leavers Australia Network, 'Struggling to Keep it Together: A National Survey About Older Care Leavers Who Were in Australia's Orphanages, Children's Homes, Foster Care and Other Institutions', 2011, available at <http://www.parliament.vic.gov.au/images/stories/committees/fcdc/inquiries/57th/Child_Abuse_Inquiry/Submissions/CLAN_Appendix_1.pdf>, accessed 20 October 2014; Cate O'Neill, Vlad Selakovic and Rachel Tropea, 'Access to Records for People Who Were in Out-of-Home Care: Moving Beyond Third Dimension Archival Practice', *Archives and Manuscripts*, vol. 40, no. 1, 2012, pp. 29–41; Frank Golding, 'Telling Stories: Accessing Personal Records', in Richard Hil and Elizabeth Branigan (eds), *Surviving Care: Achieving Justice and Healing for the Forgotten Australians*, Bond University Press, Robina, Queensland, 2010, pp. 79–99; S McKemmish, 'Evidence of Me...', *Archives and Manuscripts*, vol. 24, no. 1, 1996, pp. 28–45.
 36. Evans et al.; Gavan McCarthy and Joanne Evans, 'Principles for Archival Information Services in the Public Domain', *Archives and Manuscripts*, vol. 40, no. 1, 2012, pp. 54–67.
 37. O'Neill; Evans et al.
 38. Royal Commission into Institutional Responses to Child Sexual Abuse, 'case study 12 Transcripts', 22 May 2014, WA24, p. 40, available at <<http://www.childabuseroyalcommission.gov.au/case-study/14ca9ba5-3ab6-4e94-8f87-86f79cd692ac/case-study-12,-may-2014,-perth>>, accessed 3 October 2014.
 39. Margaret Kertesz, Cathy Humphreys and Cathy Carnovale, 'Reformulating Current Record-keeping Practices in Out-of-Home Care: Recognising the Centrality of the Archive', *Archives and Manuscripts*, vol. 40, no. 1, 2012, p. 48.
 40. Barbara Reed, 'Reading the Records Continuum: Interpretations and Explorations', *Archives and Manuscripts*, vol. 33, no. 1, 2005, pp. 18–43; Kate Cumming, 'Ways of Seeing: Contextualising the Continuum', *Records Management Journal*, vol. 20, no. 1, 2010, pp. 41–52.
 41. Royal Commission into Institutional Responses to Child Sexual Abuse, 'case study 17 Transcripts', 23 September 2014, CO46, p. 68, available at <<http://www.childabuseroyalcommission.gov.au/case-study/48ee3c7b-a728-4777-b4e4-239d3f75a29b/case-study-17,-september-2014,-darwin>>, accessed 5 October 2014.
 42. Stephen Crittenden, 'The Dark Records of Broken Lives', *The Global Mail*, 17 April 2013.
 43. Kertesz et al.
 44. Victorian Auditor-General, 'Residential Care Services for Children', 2014, available at <<http://www.audit.vic.gov.au/publications/20140326-Residential-Care/20140326-Residential-Care.pdf>>, accessed 20 October 2014.
 45. *ibid.*; Des Pearson, 'Reflections on Audits 2006–2012', *Auditing in the Public Interest*, publication of the Victorian Auditor-General's Office, Summer 2012, pp. 1–14, available at <<http://www.audit.vic.gov.au/publications/API/API-Newsletter-Summer-2012.pdf>>, accessed 20 October 2014.
 46. Victorian Auditor-General; Kertesz et al.

Appendix 1. Public hearings of the Royal Commission into Institutional Responses to Child Sexual Abuse up to 1 October 2014

Case study	Relevant for out-of-home care (yes/no)	Historical recordkeeping issues	Ongoing recordkeeping issues
1. Scouts Australia and Hunter Aboriginal Children's Services, NSW	No	Yes	Yes
2. YMCA NSW after-school care	No	Yes	Yes
3. North Coast Children's Home, Anglican Diocese of Grafton, Lismore, NSW	Yes	Yes	No
4. Towards Healing Process, Catholic Church, Qld	Yes (1 out of 4 examples)	Yes	Potentially since this is a continuing process
5. Boys' homes in Indooroopilly, Riverview, Bexley and Goulburn, Salvation Army, NSW-Qld	Yes	Yes	No
6. Catholic Education Office, Catholic school, Diocese of Toowoomba, Qld	No	Yes	No
7. Paramatta Girls' Training School and Institution for Girls in Hay, NSW	Yes	Yes	No
8. Complaint by John Ellis to Towards Healing, Catholic Church, NSW	No	Potentially but not mentioned	Potentially since this is a continuing process
9. St Ann's Special School, Adelaide, Catholic Church, South Australian police, SA	No	Yes	No
10. Salvation Army	Yes	Yes	No
11. Clontarf, Castledare, Tardun and Bindoon Homes, Christian Brothers, WA	Yes	Yes	Yes (also examines current practices of Child Welfare Department)
12. Independent school, Anglican church, Perth, WA	No	Yes	Yes (looks at the school current practices and procedures)
13. Marist Brothers schools in NSW, ACT and Qld	No	Yes	No
14. Catholic Diocese of Wollongong, NSW	No	Potentially but not mentioned	No
15. Swimming Australia, Queensland DPP	No	Yes	Yes (looks at policies and procedures)
16. Melbourne response, Catholic Church, Vic	No	Potentially but not mentioned	Potentially since this is a continuing process
17. Retta Dixon Home, NT	Yes	Yes	Yes (looks at current policies and procedures)