



SURREY POLICE

*With you, making
Surrey safer*

www.surrey.police.uk

OPERATION OUTREACH REPORT

Detective Superintendent Jon Savell

Published 29/04/2015

Contents page

1. Introduction
2. Source material and limitations
3. Duncroft School
4. Management of Duncroft School
5. Staff at Duncroft School
6. Discipline at Duncroft School
7. Visitors to Duncroft School
8. The Police criminal investigation
9. Summary of offences
10. Referral to Crown Prosecution Service
11. Conclusion

1. Introduction

- 1.1 It has been widely reported that between 2007 and 2009 Surrey Police conducted an investigation into reports made against Jimmy Savile at Duncroft School in Staines, Surrey (hereinafter referred to as 'Duncroft' for ease of reading). This investigation was conducted under the operational name of Ornament.
- 1.2 The depth, quality and governance of this investigation were subject to a separate report written by Detective Supt Savell and published on 11 January 2013.
- 1.3 In the wake of the ITV Exposure programme and significant public interest Surrey Police received information reported by a number of residents of Duncroft who reported abuse by Savile. The time period of these offences was wider than the original Operation Ornament investigation time period of 1977 to 1979.
- 1.4 Operation Outreach was the subsequent investigation set up by Surrey Police in response to reports of sexual abuse committed by Jimmy Savile on teenage girls in the 1970s at Duncroft.
- 1.5 The aim of Operation Outreach was to carry out a police enquiry to
- Determine the period of time that Savile was visiting Duncroft and report on the activity of Savile at Duncroft.
 - Ascertain who was resident at the school at the time and whether they were a victim or witnesses of abuse by Savile or what they knew of the sexual abuse taking place.
 - Commission a closing report into the activity of Savile at the conclusion of the enquiry and any subsequent criminal investigation
- 1.6 It became apparent that there was the potential for staff to have known abuse was occurring but either deliberately ignored what was happening or were aware and actively aided the abuse by continuing to allow Savile to visit and have access to the girls.

The further aim of Operation Outreach was to carry out a police investigation to

- Determine who the staff were at Duncroft at the time of Savile visiting and their knowledge of the sexual abuse and any suspected criminal offences committed by them
 - In conjunction with the CPS to consider prosecuting staff who are suspected of committing criminal offences
 - Determine if there were any other visitors to Duncroft during the agreed time period who committed offences against the residents and present this evidence to the CPS for consideration of a prosecution.
- 1.7 Offences of abuse against Duncroft pupils that occurred on BBC premises do not form part of this report.

2. Source Material and Limitations

- 2.1 **Surrey Police obtained all available material held by Barnardo's and MIND for the relevant time scale.** Initially the relevant time scale was believed to be 1971 – 1979, as there was no information of Savile attending prior to 1971, and he was not believed to have attended after the school closed temporarily in 1979. As the investigation progressed it became apparent that this time scale could be narrowed, as discussed in the 'Police criminal investigation' section later in this report.
- 2.2 Documents relating to Duncroft held in archive by Barnardo's were reviewed by Operation Outreach. These documents include day books, log books, management reports, meeting minutes, newspaper clippings and correspondence. Relevant documents were also obtained from MIND, and from previous staff members. Some pupil personal files were obtained from Barnardo's with the consent of those ex pupils.
- 2.3 Detail about Duncroft in this report has been taken from the Barnardo's documents relevant to the 1960s and 1970s and the management view at that time.
- 2.4 The log books were handwritten and therefore sometimes presented reading difficulties. Most entries are dated but some are not, or some books have faded or torn edges where dates or other details have been lost. Day books were completed by various staff members with usually no record as to who authored each entry. Evaluation with regards to sources had to be made on an entry-by-entry basis where subjective information (such as accounts of arguments/incidents between pupils etc) was evaluated differently to more factual based information (such as records of

telephone calls, social worker visits etc). One cannot account for what might not have been recorded. **There are clear lapses in recording, sometimes over long periods, and also some errors in recording.**

- 2.5 The investigation also gathered statements from victims of abuse, witnesses, and other ex pupils and staff who contacted Surrey Police following an appeal for information, and the attempts to locate as many pupils and staff from the relevant time period as possible.
- 2.6 **In total, Operation Outreach has generated 278 Actions and has registered 44 Statements, 300 Officer Reports, 26 Interview Records, 724 Messages, 84 Exhibits and 891 Other Documents.**

3. Duncroft School

- 3.1 Duncroft was established as a school for twenty-four girls in 1949 under the administration of the National Association for Mental Health (NAMH, later called MIND – the management structure of Duncroft is described in more detail later in this report). It was a *'pioneer experiment designed to take in girls of above average intelligence who were emotionally disturbed'*. Apart from the social care and education provided by the staff there were also facilities for psychiatric care and treatment. In the early 1950s a hostel for eight girls of working age was established at a house in Windsor. In the early 1960s extensive new buildings were added including the Education Unit and a purpose-built hostel on the school grounds. This was named 'Norman Lodge'. The old house in Windsor was sold to the Youth Hostel Association. The school now had places for thirty-eight girls in total – thirty in the school and eight in Norman Lodge.
- 3.2 As detailed in the Duncroft documents provided to Surrey Police, the aim was to *'provide care, control and treatment in a planned environment where social recreational, education, vocational and psychiatric resources are available to give a total approach to each girl and her family. The long term object is to enable the girl to develop her sense of identity with achievement, emotional maturity, stability of behaviour, and so to enable her to find a place in society that is satisfying personally and acceptable socially.'*
- 3.3 **Duncroft admitted girls aged 14 to 16 years** inclusive who were of *'average and above average intelligence'* and who had *'problems of adjustment occasioned by emotional, educational and/or social difficulties'* and were in need of residential care. However as time went on and changes occurred

in the strategic expectations of residential care Duncroft was under pressure to take more difficult and aggressive pupils.

- 3.4 Education was provided, albeit a '*flexible curriculum*', with pupils having the opportunity to sit external examinations, and a wide range of leisure activities was encouraged.
- 3.5 When Barnardo's took over management of the school in 1976 a new development plan was put in place to modernise the school but never came to fruition. The school closed at the end of 1979, with reports citing depleted pupil numbers and management difficulties. It reopened in 1982 to be run jointly by Barnardo's and the Sisters of the Good Shepherd Order. The school formally closed on 1 April 1991.
- 3.6 Duncroft was situated on the outskirts of Staines-upon-Thames town. The school itself was initially made up of one main building which was then added to over time. The main house was set in large grounds; a vast proportion of which has now been developed into a housing estate. The house itself was later developed into apartments. There are no detailed plans still in existence of the inside of the main house during the relevant period, so the following description of the layout of the school has been gathered from staff and pupil accounts, and documentation available from that time.
- 3.7 The ground floor of the old house consisted mainly of an entrance hall, Principal's office, staff room, a TV common room, music common room, dining room and kitchen. On the first floor were the pupil dormitories, bathrooms and staff accommodation.
- 3.8 The Education Unit was built in the early 1960s and linked to the main house at first floor level. The school rooms were on the ground floor. The Intensive Care Unit was situated on the first floor along with further staff accommodation.
- 3.9 The hostel, Norman Lodge, was situated on the far side of the campus, about 50 yards from the main house.
- 3.10 The Intensive Care Unit (ICU) was a self-contained unit. It was located on the first floor, across the link bridge from the main old building, consisting of three single bedrooms, one '*very secure room*', a sitting/dining room, a kitchen and toilet facilities. The '*very secure room*' is what pupils sometimes refer to as the '*padded room*'. It is clear from Duncroft

documents that all the rooms were built for *'security and safety'* whilst aiming to also be *'pleasing and domestic'*. The security aspect meant built-in furniture, non-glass mirrors, and limitation of edges, ledges, hanging rails, hooks, pipes, and consideration about the weight and nature of every moveable object in the unit. The documents also specify a *'separate single suite of room and lavatory, all with total security and safety'*. In a manager's report from May 1978 there is reference to a *'padded secure room'*. From the documents it can be seen that this was simply a single room with extra safety precautions including some 'padding' where necessary.

- 3.11 The unit had at least one member of staff on duty at all times, with a bed in the office for 'sleeping in' duty staff. Policy stated *'Vigilance to ensure a weapon-free, drug-free environment means supervising access of girls from the main school; searching of girls entering the unit [...] Similar controls must be exercised with parents and other visitors, friends or professional; to leave one gap is to undermine the safety of the girls and staff.'* There were separate log books kept for the recording of admissions and discharges from the ICU.
- 3.12 Duncroft paperwork states *'The unit gives the possibility of providing individual intensive care for a girl away from the pressure of the total school group. As in the rest of the school, medical and psychiatric help are also available. A girl may spend in the unit anything from half a day to an average of two weeks, or with adequate safeguards three months at the very most.'*
- 3.13 In practice, pupils would most often be admitted to the ICU on *'return from absconsion'*. This could be due to them being under the influence of drugs, or having self-harmed whilst away, or simply in a distressed state. There are instances of pupils requesting to be placed in the ICU due to arguments with other girls in the school, or simply because those were the only single rooms available in the school for any pupil to be able to withdraw from the group for a short time. Policies around placing a pupil in the ICU were well documented and constantly under review.
- 3.14 The 1978 Manager's Report states *'The unit was designed and set up at a time when a lot of girls were referred who were serious drug-takers and who needed at times a quasi-hospital type care – hence the unit look and feels more like a sick bay or isolation unit'*. The report goes on to discuss how the need for the unit had almost entirely disappeared, with the secure room being used so little that it was obsolete. This is because *'the girls for*

whom it could most appropriately still be used, i.e. those who were showing violent or severely destructive behaviour towards the staff or other girls, were precisely those who were the most difficult to actually put there [...] in short if a girl does not wish to go into the ICU there is little the staff can do to make her.'

- 3.15 Norman Lodge was a hostel in the grounds of Duncroft but separate from the school itself. Pupils could be transferred there for a few months at the end of their time at Duncroft when they had gained employment. The hostel allowed them to have a transition period to adapt to the demands of everyday life whilst still in a supported environment.
- 3.16 Norman Lodge had eight single rooms, accommodation for two to three staff and *'the usual dining room/lounge etc'*. The 'half-way house' role appeared to change slightly nearing the closure of Duncroft, when some pupils were at Norman Lodge but still continuing education at the main house.

4. Management of Duncroft School

- 4.1 In 1973 Duncroft became an assisted community home, with MIND (formally NAMH, rebranded as MIND from around 1972) providing two-thirds of the management and the London Borough of Hounslow one-third. MIND had established, and delegated management to, a committee of twelve managers. Eight of these were nominated by MIND and the remaining four were nominated by the Local Authority (Hounslow Borough). The managers came from various backgrounds, including members of community health boards, a bank manager, a Methodist minister and a probation officer. There appears to have been very little input from MIND during their administration which is commented on in the correspondence by Barnardo's during the changeover to their management, leaving the managers to have *'an increasingly active part in the school as the NAMH lost interest.'*
- 4.2 MIND gave formal notice of their intention to relinquish their administration of Duncroft on 23 January 1975 and as a community home Duncroft would have to transfer either to Local Authority (LA) control or to another voluntary organisation. The management committee was opposed to the idea of LA control, although the cooperation with the LA had been good. Hounslow Borough themselves were not in favour of taking charge of Duncroft for financial reasons.

- 4.3 The management committee were aware of a similar MIND home, Springhead Park near Leeds, being considered for take-over by Barnardo's and in April 1975 enquired directly with Barnardo's themselves as to whether they might agree to assume administration of Duncroft. This was eventually decided at a meeting on 23 July 1976 and the transfer occurred on 1 October 1976.
- 4.4 The Barnardo's take over brought with it a much more structured and policy-led approach to the running of Duncroft. This inevitably led to a shrinking of the responsibilities held by the management committee, as well as the dismissal of three managers who were over the age of 70 years by 1 October 1976, and the release of one '*honourary manager*'. Managers still conducted regular, generally monthly, visits to the school which were called '*rota visits*'. A report was then written and presented at the next Manager's Meeting. The Instrument of Management Order from 1 October 1976 when Barnardo's took over states '*Managers shall regularly visit premises belonging to the home for the purpose of ascertaining the condition thereof and shall inform the Organisation of any measures, which, in their opinion are necessary for the proper conduct of the home and maintenance of its premises.*' The Managers were now seen to be sources of professional and supportive help, with the ability to influence rather than having any particular command.
- 4.5 The Barnardo's administration took a much more active role in the format of Duncroft, attempting to bring their policies and procedures up to date and to adapt to the changing needs of the area. Heavily involved with Duncroft were the Divisional Director (Child Care) London Division, with an Assistant and Deputy, who reported to the Director of Child Care and their Deputy. There is a large amount of correspondence relating to the progress of Duncroft and the later decision to close. The need for changes to be made and the apparent difficult relationships within the Duncroft staff management by 1979 meant that the Barnardo's administration decided to close the school at the end of the year, leading to the retirement or redundancy of the senior staff, in order that they might reopen later under new leadership.

5. Staff at Duncroft School

- 5.1 The exact staff compliment changed a little over the years but in general there were the following roles:
- Principal

- Deputy Principal (care)
- 2nd Deputy Principal (care)
- Deputy Principal (education)
- Housemistresses
- Residential Social Workers (RSW) of varying grades
- Teachers (varying scales)

- 5.2 There were also roles of Cook, Domestic, Secretaries and Gardeners/Maintenance. There were a certain number of sessions per week for a Consultant Psychiatrist and a Psychologist, and the local GP tended to be the Medical Officer for the school. Social Workers for the pupils visited regularly, as did Managers conducting their 'rota visits'.
- 5.3 There are various references in the Duncroft paperwork about a divide between care staff and teaching staff. The 'school' side of Duncroft was run somewhat separately to the 'care' side, despite this often being cited over the years as an issue to be dealt with.

6. Discipline at Duncroft School

- 6.1 Discipline at Duncroft took the form of a 'Grouping' system. There were regular 'Grouping' meetings at which pupils would be assigned their 'Group' status, being between Group One and Group Five. All pupils start in Group Three for a minimum of eight weeks. The 'Groupings' had various sanctions and privileges accorded – for example in Group Four there were no outings, shorter leave, no late nights etc. Overall progress or otherwise over a period of a week was the determining criteria for grouping, rather than specific instances of behaviour. There is discrepancy in documents as to whether pocket money was subject to sanction within the grouping system. However there was no inconsistency found in the policy that *'the use of Corporal punishment for girls at Duncroft is forbidden and would not be advocated by [The Principal]'*.

7. Visitors to Duncroft School

- 7.1 Parental visits, where suitable, were encouraged and pupils were generally allowed to be taken out for the day by their parents and have weekends at home. This did depend on their length of stay, their grouping status and the agreement of their Social Worker. Holidays, however, were not subject to the grouping system. Contact with the pupil's home was maintained by their Social Worker primarily.

- 7.2 Under 'Family Casework' in a Duncroft Brochure it states '*a unified approach by the team, consisting of both the Local Authority and residential staff caring for the girl, must be maintained. The staff at Duncroft come into direct contact with the family at visiting times, and much valuable work is undertaken on these occasions as well as at more formal family interviews.*'
- 7.3 All visits were arranged in advance, whether by the Social Worker or the parents directly. Pupils were not allowed phone calls from boyfriends, and had to have permission from their parents as to who they could correspond with in writing. Letters were routinely opened and checked by staff.
- 7.4 Outside activities were encouraged but carefully controlled. Leisure pursuits and participation in local community activities were seen as an important part of a pupil's rehabilitation. Access to the local community was linked to the individual's treatment plan and was reportedly not subject to sanction or privilege dependant on behaviour or 'grouping'.
- 7.5 As Duncroft was the first of its kind and had established itself as a pioneering social experiment, it attracted much attention from all over the world. Even by 1974 its reputation was such that the school was still receiving visitors from various institutions both at home and overseas. The visitor book contains many such entries, documenting visits such as those by students from Hamburg and the U.S.A, although these were much more frequent in the earlier years. Duncroft also had students working on placement at the school, who are occasionally mentioned in the log books.

8. The Police criminal investigation

- 8.1 The evidence reviewed by Operation Outreach shows that Jimmy Savile first visited Duncroft on 21 January 1974, and ceased visiting when the school closed in 1979 for a restructure of management.
- 8.2 Written records show that Jimmy Savile attended Duncroft at least sixteen times between 1974 and 1979. There is evidence from victim and witness accounts that in fact Jimmy Savile visited the school more frequently.
- 8.3 Written records show that Jimmy Savile stayed overnight at Duncroft School on two occasions. Again, there is evidence from victim and witness accounts that he stayed overnight more frequently, whether in his own campervan or in staff quarters.

- 8.4 Jimmy Savile is recorded to have visited the hostel Norman Lodge on two occasions, and also to have visited pupils in the Intensive Care Unit on two occasions.
- 8.5 Jimmy Savile is recorded in log books to have taken pupils out, with a strong indication that they were unaccompanied by staff, on three occasions.
- 8.6 It is evident that Jimmy Savile was given significant access to the grounds and buildings, and it appears that this access was unrestricted and largely unsupervised.
- 8.7 Jimmy Savile is now widely acknowledged to be a serial paedophile who operated throughout his life, encompassing a vast area and targeting a significant number of victims. Operation Outreach has taken the same approach, to the joint NSPCC and Metropolitan Police report, *Giving Victims a Voice* published in January 2013. Operation Outreach does not regard accounts provided by Duncroft victims as unproven allegations, and as such they are referred to throughout this report as 'victims' rather than 'complainants'.
- 8.8 Barnardo's supplied Operation Outreach with details of pupils and staff present during the years 1974-1979 inclusive. This list contained 159 pupils. In the course of the investigation some pupils were identified as having been resident during the relevant time frame but were not present in the pupil list. Details for these pupils were then gained from Barnardo's. In total seven pupils were identified in this way. Operation Outreach identified 166 pupils as being resident at Duncroft for some time during the years 1974-1979.
- 8.9 Fourteen pupils had previously had contact with Surrey Police as part of Operation Ornament. One of these pupils was already recognised as a victim of sexual abuse by Jimmy Savile at Duncroft as part of Operation Ornament.
- 8.10 Two pupils previously in contact with Surrey Police as part of Operation Ornament later disclosed additional details via Operation Yewtree and are also considered to be victims.
- 8.11 Three pupils previously in contact with Surrey Police as part of Operation Ornament were successfully re-contacted by Operation Outreach. A further eight pupils previously in contact with Surrey Police as part of

Operation Ornament were sent letters by Operation Outreach. Of those eight pupils, one replied to the letter and is now considered a witness.

- 8.12 Prior to receiving the full list from Barnardo's of pupils present between 1974-1979, Operation Outreach traced and made contact with a further five pupils; three of whom had been named by other victims and two of which were considered to have significant evidence for the investigation after the review of documents. It was ascertained that one of these pupils was also a victim.
- 8.13 Nineteen pupils contacted Operation Yewtree to give accounts relating to Savile, the details of which were then passed to Surrey Police. Four of these pupils were not victims. Two of these pupils were victims who had featured on the ITV Exposure programme. Details of a further victim have been passed to Operation Outreach by Operation Yewtree, after the victim reported to the NSPCC at a late stage in the investigation. Due to living abroad and being unwell, the victim had no awareness of the investigation for some time.
- 8.14 Operation Yewtree retain responsibility for the investigation of four victims of abuse by Savile who were pupils of Duncroft during the relevant time period. This is because, of the instances of abuse on these victims, offences of a more grievous nature took place away from Duncroft and in the geographical area of responsibility of Operation Yewtree. Therefore Surrey Police retained ownership of the investigation relating to twelve Duncroft victims of Savile reported via Operation Yewtree.
- 8.15 In addition, a report of abuse on one pupil by a visitor to Duncroft (not Jimmy Savile) was passed to Operation Outreach by Operation Yewtree (Following consultation this report is being investigated by Operation Yewtree as it links to other ongoing investigations being conducted by them).
- 8.16 Operation Outreach made attempts to trace and contact all the remaining pupils from the list of 166 provided by Barnardo's.
- 8.17 In addition to the above mentioned eight letters (see par. 9.5), Operation Outreach sent a further ninety letters to ex pupils.
- 8.18 Operation Outreach received further responses from sixteen pupils. Of these sixteen, four new victims and two new witnesses were identified.

- 8.19 In total, out of the 166 pupils on the list from Barnardo's, 54 pupils have had contact with Surrey Police during the course of Operation Ornament and Outreach.
- 8.20 Operation Outreach also received one report of abuse by Savile against a visitor to Duncroft.
- 8.21 Despite extensive but proportionate enquiries Operation Outreach was unable to locate thirty-five pupils. Enquiries also established that three pupils had died, two prior to Operation Ornament and one in 2010.

9. Summary of offences

- 9.1 Operation Outreach confirmed that at least twenty-two pupils and one visitor were victims of sexual abuse by Jimmy Savile at Duncroft.
- 9.2 Surrey Police, via Operation Outreach, is the investigating force for nineteen of these victims.
- 9.3 This amounts to at least forty-six offences of abuse. Where a victim stated that a type of abuse occurred 'a few times' or 'many times' is has been counted as two offences with the consideration that the abuse occurred *at least* two times. Any specific offences described have been counted as separate instances. If a victim describes the exact number of occurrences these have been counted as such, and if a victim states a range e.g. 'this type of abuse occurred four-five times' the lowest figure has been counted with the consideration that the abuse occurred *at least* this number of times.
- 9.4 Twenty-five of these offences occurred within the grounds of Duncroft, six occurred within Norman Lodge and fifteen occurred off-site, i.e. not within the grounds of the school or the hostel but suspected to have occurred within Surrey Police's force area, and not within the remit of Operation Yewtree.
- 9.5 Within the grounds of Duncroft, four offences took place inside vehicles brought to the school by Jimmy Savile. To be clear, this means the vehicle was located within the school grounds at the time of the abuse.
- 9.6 One single offence of abuse took place in each of the following locations:
- Dining room

- Kitchen
- Corridor outside Principal's office
- Principal's office
- Entrance
- TV Room
- ICU/Bedroom (victim is unable to specify)

Three offences are described as occurring in the Common Room

Two offences are described as occurring in the Music Room

Four offences are described as occurring in a downstairs corridor

Five offences are described as occurring in unspecified 'communal areas'.

- 9.7 Within Norman Lodge two offences of abuse occurred in an Office, two in the Living Room, one in the Dining room and one in a bedroom.
- 9.8 Of the abuse that took place off-site, thirteen offences took place inside vehicles brought to the school by Savile. The remaining two offences took place inside another vehicle.
- 9.9 Of the twenty-three victims, ten were abused on a single occasion by Savile and thirteen were abused on at least two occasions by Savile. **Barnardo's assumed management responsibility for Duncroft on 1 October 1976. Five victims were abused seven times after that date, with one victim being abused three times during their stay at Duncroft over a period that spanned before and after 1 October 1976.**
- 9.10 The nature of Jimmy Savile's offending ranged from non-consensual kissing, touching of breasts over clothing, touching of breasts under clothing, vaginal touching, vaginal penetration with hand, forced masturbation, forced oral sex, and other sexual touching.
- 9.11 Under the Sexual Offences Act 1956 the forty-six offences of abuse on Duncroft pupils are all offences contrary to Section 14(1) Indecent assault on a woman. However, if those same offences were considered under current legislation, namely the Sexual Offences Act 2003, they would be described as:
- One offence contrary to Section 1(1) Rape
 - Five offences contrary to Section 2(1) Assault by penetration

- Two offences contrary to Section 4(1) Causing a person to engage in sexual activity without consent
- Thirty-eight offences contrary to Section 3(1) Sexual assault

10. Referral to Crown Prosecution Service

10.1 On 22 May 2014, following completion of enquiries, Surrey Police submitted a file to the Crown Prosecution Service (CPS) for their review in relation to two members of staff employed at Duncroft during the relevant time period. The evidence gathered by police meant that the remaining staff that were traced and interviewed were not considered to be 'suspects' in this investigation.

10.2 The CPS response was received on 19 November 2014 containing advice provided by Senior Treasury Counsel and considered by the Chief Crown Prosecutor. The CPS decision was that, based on all the evidence, there was not a realistic prospect of conviction by a jury.

10.3 The CPS explained their decision to each of the victims as follows:

It is very important to say that, in making a decision not to charge any of the staff, the Police and the Crown Prosecution Service have not decided that you have given a false account of offences against you. The Crown Prosecution Service has proceeded on the basis that your complaint was genuinely made. However, the Crown Prosecution Service have assessed whether a jury would be sure that the complaint was made in circumstances that led the suspects to consider it to be genuine and therefore to act on it. Their ultimate decision is based wholly on an objective view of all the evidence available and the legal considerations.

10.4 Finally, the CPS concluded that despite an investigation that was '*an open minded and rigorous search for the truth*', the test for a prosecution was not met.

10.5 The CPS decision was communicated by hand delivered letter to those victims who said that they had told staff of the abuse. Victims who stated they had not told staff were updated in writing by Surrey Police.

10.6 The solicitors of the two staff members concerned were advised of the CPS decision, and other staff spoken to in the course of the investigation were sent letters from Surrey Police.

11. Conclusion

- 11.1 The scale and type of sexual offending by Jimmy Savile has become widely known and reported on. On 11 January 2013 *“Giving Victims a Voice”* (GVAV) was jointly published by the Metropolitan Police Service and the NSPCC. On the same day *“In the matter of the late Jimmy Savile”* was published by the Director of Public Prosecutions, and *“Report into Operation Ornament”* was published by Surrey Police. On 12 March 2013 *“Mistakes Were Made”* was published by Her Majesty’s Inspectorate of Constabulary. These reports detailed what police knew or should have known about Savile’s offending and what contributed to him not being prosecuted.
- 11.2 *“Giving Victims a Voice”* reported that there had been *‘a significant rise in the level of reporting of past sexual abuse of children. This is believed to be the result of media coverage about Jimmy Savile and victims’ increased confidence that they will be listened to by the authorities.’* (GVAV para.10.5)
- 11.3 Operation Outreach was conducted during a period of increased public understanding of sexual offending by a number of high profile persons across the country.
- 11.4 Surrey Police would like to thank all the victims who supported the investigation. It was only with the support of victims that the Operation Outreach investigation was able to search for the truth and uncover a large number of offences against numerous pupils at Duncroft.