



Measuring and Ranking Diocesan Online Financial Transparency: 2018

In the wake of ongoing revelations about the clerical sexual abuse crisis, genuine financial transparency will be an essential step in rebuilding the trust of U.S. Catholics in our bishops. We must be sure that our gifts to the Church cannot ever again be used to cover up crimes against our children. Some bishops have made a public commitment to financial transparency, while others reveal almost nothing about the financial operations of their dioceses. This report is one tool in the hands of faithful Catholics who want to understand how their donations are being used, to help them exercise good stewardship of the gifts God has given them.

The Nature of the Review

The heart of VOTF's 2018 review consists of a 10-question worksheet that touches on several areas of financial accountability and transparency. The same questions were used to review diocesan transparency in 2017. They are described in detail in Appendix A. They were developed by a committee composed of VOTF officers and members, several of whom possess life-long experience in the fields of accounting and finance. Special emphasis was given to making the questions as objective as possible in order to minimize the role of personal opinion. Each question has a point value between 5 and 15 points. The maximum total score achievable is 60 points.

Why is Financial Transparency Important?

In the absence of clear and accessible financial reports, certified by audits, as well as properly implemented collection and reporting protocols, the funds donated by the members of a diocese are susceptible to fraudulent diversion by clergy or by laity; they may also be used in settlements to keep clerical sexual abuse under wraps or for other purposes that do not support the mission of the church. Guarding against such diversion and misuse is a responsibility of all the Faithful, not just the pastors or bishops. Every Catholic shares in the responsibility to ensure that funds donated for Church work actually go towards those purposes. Without access to financial reports and information on diocesan finance councils, budgets, and the overall financial health of a diocese, ordinary Catholics cannot exercise their full responsibility of stewardship or verify where their donations to the diocese go.

These can be donations made directly at the diocesan level, such as money given in response to an annual appeal, or made indirectly through the diocesan tax or *cathedraticum* that is paid by their parish to the diocese. By the same token, parishioners in parishes that do not issue financial reports to their members should request that their pastors issue quarterly or annual financial reports so they are able to determine how their donations that stay in the parish are being used.

If the extent of the settlements made by bishops to hide clerical sexual abuse had become known through transparent financial reporting when the abuse reports first started breaking—long before 2002—lay Catholics would have been aware that the abuse was not a rare exception, but widespread. If they had demanded change then and the bishops had implemented it, many children could have been spared the devastation that often comes in the wake of such abuse. Some cases of abuse would still have occurred, but the abuse would have been reported, not covered up, and abusers called to account for their crimes. Victims of serial abusers would have been protected.

2018 Summary and Highlights

In the 2018 review, the average overall score achieved by all the 177 territorial dioceses in the U.S. (including 32 archdioceses) was 39.7 out of 60, or 66% if scoring were on a percentage basis. This represents an increase of 5% over the 2017 average score. While the transparency scores of 21 dioceses dropped from 2017 to 2018, more than 70 had higher scores and some achieved very significant increases. The Archdiocese of Omaha went from a dismal 26 to 56, and the Diocese of Orlando from 26 to a perfect score of 60, tying with the Diocese of Burlington, which also scored a full 60 points. However, Burlington received a qualified opinion¹ whereas Orlando received an unqualified (good) opinion on its audit.

The Diocese of Santa Rosa was the only one of 177 to post the ‘highlights’ or any aspect of their Finance Council meetings—another significant factor in diocesan transparency. (You can read the accounts at http://www.santarosacatholic.org/lay_consultative_bodies.)

After the publication of the 2017 report, some dioceses contacted VOTF to discuss the review or clarify the nature of the questions in the worksheet. It is gratifying to note that some of them have achieved significant increases in their 2018 scores. The Diocese of Ft. Wayne-South Bend, for example, had a score of 34 in 2017 and a 56 in 2018.

Table 1 (page 3) shows the dioceses with the highest and lowest scores in 2018. Thirteen dioceses scored 56 or higher in 2018. Eleven dioceses scored 19 or lower. As in the 2017 review, there was no correlation of scores with diocesan size or geographic region.

¹ A qualified opinion is an adverse statement issued by a professional auditing firm after it has conducted an audit of a corporate entity’s financial statements.

Measuring and Ranking Diocesan Online Financial Transparency: 2018

Table 1 – Highest and Lowest Financial Transparency Scores in 2018
(archdioceses in bold)

Top Scores (56 to 60 points)			Bottom Scores (12 to 19 points)		
Diocese	Score	Audited Report?	Diocese	Score	Audited Report?
Orlando FL	60	Yes	Harrisburg PA	19	No
Burlington VT	60	Yes*(Qualified)	Orange CA	19	No
Atlanta GA	59	Yes	Santa Fe NM	19	No
Baltimore MD	59	Yes	Salina KS	18	No
Sacramento CA	59	Yes	Brownsville TX	10	No
Bismarck ND	56	Yes	Knoxville TN	15	No
Bridgeport CT	56	Yes	Lubbock TX	15	No
Buffalo NY	56	Yes	Portland OR	15	No
Des Moines IA	56	Yes	Tulsa OK	15	No
Ft. Wayne-South Bend IN	56	Yes	Grand Island NE	13	No
Milwaukee WI	56	Yes	St. Thomas VI	12	No
Omaha NE	56	Yes			
San Diego CA	56	Yes			

It is worth noting that the dioceses in Pennsylvania whose failures to protect children were the subject of the recent grand jury investigation fared poorly in the 2018 review, with an average score of 33.5 as compared to the national average of 39.7.

Results of the 2018 Review

Table 2 shows average scores for all 177 dioceses in the USCCB in the 2017 and 2018 reviews. Details of the data for 2018 may be found in the data tables at the end of the report. The changes in average scores are incremental but generally increasing.

Table 2 - Average Diocesan Scores in 2017 and 2018

Question	1	2	3 & 4	5	6	7	8	9	10	Total
Max. Score	5	5	15	5	5	5	5	5	10	60
2017	3.6	4.6	8.1	4.9	4.1	4.8	2.1	2.3	2.1	36.5
2018	4.3	4.5	9.0	5.0	4.5	4.9	2.4	2.5	2.6	39.7

Table 3 - Changes in Diocesan Scores from 2017 to 2018

Scores	Dioceses	Archdioceses	Total	% of Total
Increased	58	14	72	41%
Decreased	18	3	21	12%
No Change	69	15	84	47%
<i>Total</i>	<i>145</i>	<i>32</i>	<i>177</i>	<i>100%</i>

Table 3 shows the nature of the changes in individual diocesan scores that occurred between 2017 and 2018.

Out of the 177 U.S dioceses, 84 (47%) had no change in their scores. VOTF had advised all dioceses that a second review would be conducted in 2018, giving adequate time for them to make changes to their websites. Although a number of dioceses with unchanged score were in the top 25%, these results suggest that a sizable percentage of the low-scoring dioceses were not motivated to make significant improvements in their online financial transparency between the 2017 and 2018 reviews. In addition, 12% of diocesan scores actually dropped from 2017 to 2018.

On the other hand, 72 dioceses (41%) posted gains in their scores—sometimes very significant gains. Among archdioceses, the standout was the Archdiocese of Omaha, which increased its score from 26 to 56. The top-scoring archdioceses were Atlanta and Baltimore, both scoring 59. Milwaukee tied with Omaha for third place, both scoring 56.

Among dioceses, the Diocese of Orlando increased from 26 in 2017 to a perfect score of 60 and a tie with Burlington for first place. Other notable improvements include Lexington (increasing from 19 to 47), San Diego (31 to 56), and Trenton (15 to 40).

Figure 1 (page 5) shows the 15 dioceses with the most improved scores. Figure 2 (page 6) shows the 15 dioceses whose scores dropped the most.

Figure 1 – Most Improved from 2017 to 2018





Figure 2 – Regressing from 2017 to 2018



Posting of Audited Financial Reports

The availability of current audited financial reports on a diocesan website is in many ways the hallmark of financial transparency. In the case of the 2018 review, a current audited financial report would cover fiscal year 2017. Because timeliness of reporting is of key importance, only current audited reports receive the maximum 15 points on questions 3 and 4. Reports that are 1-2 years old receive only 10 points and reports that are 3-4 years old receive only 5 points. Beyond that, no points are awarded for a financial report.

Many large dioceses post multiple financial reports on their website so as to include reports for separate entities such as schools, hospitals and cemeteries. For the purposes of the 2018 financial transparency review, we have considered only the audited financial report for the operations of the main diocesan entity itself.

Measuring and Ranking Diocesan Online Financial Transparency: 2018

The data in Table 4 indicate an 8% increase in the number of dioceses posting current audited financial reports between 2017 and 2018, from 83 dioceses to 97. This may be in part because the reviewers went back at the end of the 2018 review period and gave full credit to any diocese that had posted a current report by September 7, 2018. Since a similar grace period and final check were not part of the 2017 review, this might account for a higher percentage of current reports. In any case, the total number of dioceses posting audited financial reports went from 100 in 2017 to 108 in 2018.

In 2018, 24 of the 177 dioceses provided only online summaries of diocesan finances, often with pie charts and other graphics, instead of audited financial reports. Unfortunately, such self-reporting is not the equivalent of an audit by an independent accounting firm. The Archdiocese of New York is the largest U.S. diocese to post only summary financial data rather than the full audit.

The remaining 45 dioceses, or 25% of the 177, provided *no* financial reporting whatsoever.

Table 4 – Audited Financial Reports Posted in 2017 and 2018

Scores	Dioceses	Archdioceses	All	% All
<u>2017 Review</u>				
Current FY	65	18	83	47%
Not Current	14	3	17	10%
Summary Only	12	4	16	9%
None Posted	54	7	61	34%
<i>Totals</i>	<i>145</i>	<i>32</i>	<i>177</i>	<i>100%</i>
<u>2018 Review</u>				
Current FY	77	20	97	55%
Not Current	9	2	11	6%
Summary Only	18	6	24	14%
None Posted	41	4	45	25%
<i>Totals</i>	<i>145</i>	<i>32</i>	<i>177</i>	<i>100%</i>

Occurrence and Significance of Qualified Reports

After a professional auditing firm has conducted an audit of a corporate entity's financial statements and finds nothing in its audit that would cause it to limit its own endorsement, it gives a "clean" or *unqualified* opinion. A *qualified* opinion, on the other hand, is an adverse statement issued by the auditing firm. By issuing a qualified opinion, the auditor indicates that the entity being audited has not included all parts of its entity in its financial statements or has not followed generally accepted accounting procedures (GAAP, which are the procedures that every entity should follow when preparing its financial statements). The auditing firm will elaborate in its qualified opinion what the entity has failed to do appropriately.

In 2018, nine dioceses posted audited financial reports with qualified opinions. They were Amarillo, Burlington, Evansville, Fargo, La Crosse, Las Cruces, Memphis, Saginaw and Venice. None of these are archdioceses. However, some of the 10 archdioceses that did not post any reports may have received qualified opinions and chosen not to share them publicly.

Overall, it is likely that most dioceses commission yearly audited reports for internal use, but only 55% post current audited reports to their websites—i.e., within nine months of the previously completed year. Another 6% post audited reports but later than the previous cycle. Among the 39% failing to post audited reports at all, some no doubt receive qualified or other adverse opinions.

Receiving a qualified opinion reflects a certain lack of financial transparency, but an audited financial report with a qualified opinion is more transparent than self-reporting alternatives. The auditor's notes on a qualified opinion will provide information about what aspects of the diocesan financial operations are not included in the report or provide other information that would be helpful to lay members of the dioceses seeking to understand the situation.

Members of a diocese with a qualified opinion from its auditor, and in particular the members of the diocesan finance council, should ensure that they understand the significance of the opinion. In order to encourage posting of audited reports, our review did not deduct any points in 2018 if a diocese received a qualified opinion.

Diocesan Finance Councils

Because the role of the diocesan finance council (DFC) is critical in ensuring prudent use of the resources of the diocese, a transparent diocesan financial operation would require that laity have a way of ensuring that lay members of the DFC are “truly expert in financial affairs and civil law, outstanding in integrity,” as Canon 492 specifies. Question 8 in our review asks if the members of the DFC are identified on the diocesan website. If a list of members and their credentials is not posted, it is not possible to judge whether the diocese is meeting the requirements of Canon 492.

The 2018 review showed that 21 of the 177 dioceses posted their finance council membership with the lay members’ credentials. An additional 79 posted their finance council membership without the lay members’ credentials. The remaining 77 dioceses did not post their membership. This represents some improvement over 2017 when 16 of the 177 dioceses posted their finance council membership with the lay members’ credentials, and an additional 71 posted their finance council membership minus the lay members’ credentials, thereby leaving 90 dioceses, or more than half, that did not post their finance council membership.

Protection of Collections

For the nation’s more than 17,000 Catholic parishes spread among its 177 dioceses, the weekly collections (a significant amount of which comes in the form of cash) are their primary source of income. Due to the manner in which this income is received, i.e., placed into open baskets in the middle of religious services each weekend, it is particularly vulnerable to theft. It must be effectively secured at the first opportunity and kept secure up to and including the point at which it is properly deposited into the parish’s bank account. It is essential to create an environment that prevents any one person from gaining lone, unobserved access to the funds prior to their documentation and deposit.

Two components are of particular importance to a parish’s ability to establish a genuinely secure collection system. Question 10 asks whether detailed Sunday collection procedures are posted by the diocese and whether those procedures require the use of numbered collection containers as well as counting teams composed of three or more persons. By a very wide margin, dioceses scored most poorly on this question.

Of the 177 dioceses, only 90 posted details of their Sunday collection procedures at their website, and only 16 of the 90 require the two components noted above. Of the remaining 74 dioceses that posted their procedures, 33 require neither component and 41 require one

or the other but not both. The absence of either of those two components virtually guarantees that the affected parish's collections are vulnerable to weekly theft.

Under Canon Law (Canon 455), the USCCB could mandate the conference-wide use of genuinely secure collection procedures that would significantly decrease collection thefts. Doing so would require a two-thirds vote of the members of the conference and Vatican approval. This is the approach the bishops used to implement the Dallas Charter for the Protection of Children and Young People that was adopted by the conference in 2002 and most recently revised in 2011.

Conclusions

The results of this report show that, based on diocesan transparency scores, diocesan financial transparency is increasing in the U.S. Positive signs include more dioceses posting audited financial reports and greater openness concerning activities of Diocesan Finance Councils (DFC), of which Santa Rosa is a good example. Approved highlights of their DFC meetings are posted on their website. Such transparency gives the laity a level of confidence that their financial support of the bishop and the good works of the diocese will accomplish their intended goal. It also enhances the sense of lay stewardship and promotes generosity within the diocese.

These improvements are not universal, however. Although many dioceses have made a commitment to transparency, others have lagged behind. They have failed to exercise openness concerning their financial operations. High-performing dioceses serve as an example and demonstrate that significant improvements in transparency can be achieved, but lay involvement is crucial in making openness in financial affairs more widely practiced across the country. Lay Catholics must be vigilant about diocesan finances. We must let our bishops know if we find their financial transparency lacking.

Recommendations

If you are a faithful Catholic who supports your parish and diocese, you should check your diocese's overall score and its question-by-question scores as determined by this review. If your diocese does not post its audited financial statement or, worse, not even an unaudited financial report, your diocesan leadership is being less than forthright about its finances. If your diocese does not mandate safe collection procedures, it is failing in its duty to protect the resources you have provided to them.

Their message to you is that financial reports and financial guidelines are need-to-know information, and that the laity—without whose financial support the hierarchy could not function—do not have a need to know. That can be likened to the officers of a major corporation declaring their stockholders have no need to know how the assets of their company are being used.

If that describes your diocese, don't be afraid to let your bishop know of your concern. If you receive no response and the level of financial transparency does not improve, you might consider this: On the Annual Appeal pledge slip, write the following and place it in the return envelope: *"I cannot in good conscience contribute to the annual appeal until the Diocese publishes its audited financial reports. Sincerely, [your name]."* Remember, it's your Church too!

Remember also that the members of your DFC represent you in ensuring that your donations advance the mission of the Church. The function of the DFC parallels in some ways that of a corporate board of directors. Secrecy of the operation of the council is not mandated by Canon Law, although bishops may require it. The example of the Diocese of Santa Rosa shows that greater openness is a possibility. Check your diocesan website to learn who the members of your DFC are and if there is any indication of their expertise. If DFC members are identified, you might contact your diocesan bishop or Chief Financial Officer to ask if highlights of DFC meetings can be posted to the website. If DFC members are not identified, you might ask why not.

In his August 16, 2018, statement in response to the PA Grand Jury's report and the revelations about Cardinal McCarrick, USCCB President Daniel Cardinal DiNardo stated *"We are faced with a spiritual crisis that requires not only spiritual conversion, but practical changes to avoid repeating the sins and failures of the past that are so evident in the recent report."* For lay Catholics in the U.S., such "practical changes" are essential in rebuilding trust in our bishops. Bishops must adopt reforms that include meaningful involvement of the laity and should empower a lay review board to help guide this new effort.

It seems likely that Pope Francis will ask the national bishops' conferences to take on a larger role in dealing with the current crisis of confidence in the church, since they should understand the local challenges in greater detail. As one "practical change," the USCCB should adopt procedures, parallel to the Dallas Charter, to mandate accountability for bishops and to put measures in place to ensure that covering up crimes of clerical sexual abuse cannot reoccur. Mandating financial transparency will be an important part of such reforms. It is doubtful that the Pope would refuse his approval for them if two-thirds of the conference supported them. It is time for U.S. Catholic bishops to step forward and translate their words into actions.

Appendix A: Methodology

The 2018 review began on June 1, 2018, and concluded on September 7, 2018, to provide every opportunity for dioceses to post their most recent financial reports. Diocesan websites change constantly as information is added or deleted, and the links that existed at the time of the 2018 survey may have changed after the reviews were completed.

In reviewing the diocesan websites, the following 10 questions were asked.

Question 1: Can any financial data be found within a few to several minutes?

Maximum value – 5 points

Reviewers typically withheld credit only when no data could be found no matter how long they searched.

Question 2: Is there a workable internal “search” function?

Maximum value – 5 points

A workable search function allows a visitor to the website to locate hard-to-find information and is key to website transparency.

Question 3: Are audited financial statements posted?

Question 4: If the answer to #3 is “No,” is financial info reported in another format, e.g., booklet form? *Maximum value – 15 points*

If any of the review’s 10 questions can be characterized as representing the heart of the review—financial accountability and transparency—Questions 3 and 4 merit that description. They ask whether the arch/diocese posts its audited financial statement on the website and, if not, whether a less-detailed annual financial report is posted. These reports are essential for showing contributors how their donations support the Church’s administrative structure and fund its many charitable works.

Question 5: Is the Annual Appeal’s purpose explained somewhere on the website, and/or is it reported on the financial statements?

Maximum value – 5 points

Question 6: Is the annual parish assessment (*cathedraticum*) explained somewhere on the website, and/or is it reported on the financial statements?

Maximum value – 10 points

Annual Appeals and parish assessments are key diocesan financial resources. Questions 5 and 6 ask whether the annual appeal and the annual parish assessments, respectively, are explained somewhere on the website and/or are reported on the financial statements.

Question 7: Is contact info for the business office posted? *Maximum value – 5*

Posting contact information for the finance staff makes it easier for website visitors to initiate finance-related inquiries.

Question 8: Is the finance council identified? *Maximum value – 5 points*

Canon Law (specifically Canon 492), requires that every diocese have a Finance Council consisting of “at least three members of the Christian faithful truly expert in Financial affairs and civil law, outstanding in integrity, and appointed by the bishop.” Absent either the list of members or their credentials, it is not possible to judge whether the Canon Law standard is met.

Question 9: Are parish financial guidelines posted? *Maximum value – 5 points*

Question 10: Are detailed collection & counting procedures posted? *Maximum value – 10 points*

Questions 9 and 10 are related because the collection and counting procedures referred to in Question 10 are typically (though not always) found within the guidelines referenced in Question 9. Like Questions 3 and 4, Question 10 is a crucial element in this review. Weekly collections are the primary source of the Church’s revenue, making proper collection and counting procedures essential. Both the use of serially numbered, tamper-evident containers and counting teams of three or more individuals are absolutely essential to establishing and maintaining a genuinely secure weekly collection system.

APPENDIX B: Worksheet for Measuring Transparency

Worksheet to Summarize Financial Transparency & Accountability Criteria Concerning U.S. Dioceses/Archdioceses
Depending upon the specific question, the rating scale is between 0 and 15, with the highest possible total score being 60.

Diocese:	URL address:	Date of Review:			Reviewer's Initials:
Score		Yes	No	Somewhat	Notes
	1. Can any financial data be found within a few to several minutes? <i>Score: 0 or 5</i>				
	2. Is there a workable internal "search" function? Score: 0-5 Note: Deduct 3 points if present but <u>not</u> on homepage. Deduct 1 point if not on the other criteria pages.				
	3. Are audited financial statements posted? <i>Score: 0-15</i> Note: Enter the latest year in "Notes." Deduct 5 points if the latest statement is 1-2 yrs old, 10 points if 3-4 years old and 15 points if 5 or more years old.				
	4. If the answer to #3 is "No," is financial info reported in another format, e.g., booklet form? <i>Score: 0 or 2</i> Note: Score 0 if answer to #3 is "Yes."				
	5. Annual Appeal <i>Score: 0 or 5</i> Is the appeal's purpose explained somewhere on the website, and/or is it reported on the financial statements? Note: Deduct 5 points if neither is true.				
	6. Annual Assessments (<i>cathedraticum</i>) <i>Score: 0 or 5</i> Is the <i>cathedraticum</i> explained somewhere on the website, and/or is it reported on the financial statements? Note: Deduct 5 points if neither is true.				
	7. Is contact info for the business office posted? <i>Score: 0-5</i> Note: Deduct 2 points if only one name is posted and their contact info is shown.				
	8. Is the finance council identified? <i>Score: 0-5</i> Note: Deduct 3 points if there are not 3 lay members. Deduct 1 point if credentials are not posted.				
	9. Are parish financial guidelines posted? <i>Score: 0 or 5</i>				
	10. Are detailed collection & counting procedures posted? <i>Score: 0-10</i> Note: Deduct 4 pts for each "No" answer below. - Are serially numbered containers <u>required</u> ? - Are three (3) or more counters <u>required</u> ?				

TOTAL SCORE: _____ (maximum possible score = 60)

Worksheet to Summarize Financial Transparency & Accountability Criteria Concerning U.S. Dioceses/Archdioceses
Depending upon the specific question, the rating scale is between 0 and 15, with the highest possible total score being 60.

Diocese: **Spokane** URL address <https://www.dioceseofspokane.org/> Date of Review: **9/8/18** Reviewer's Initials:

Score		Yes	No	Somewhat	Notes
0	1. Can any financial data be found within a few to several minutes? Score: 0 or 5		X		
5	2. Is there a workable internal "search" function? Score: 0-5 Note: Deduct 3 points if present but <u>not</u> on homepage. Deduct 1 point if not on the other criteria pages.	X			
0	3. Are audited financial statements posted? Score: 0-15 Note: Enter the latest year in "Notes." Deduct 5 points if the latest statement is 1-2 yrs old, 10 points if 3-4 years old and 15 points if 5 or more years old.		X		
0	4. If the answer to #3 is "No," is financial info reported in another format, e.g., booklet form? Score: 0 or 2 Note: Score 0 if answer to #3 is "Yes."		X		
5	5. Annual Appeal Score: 0 or 5 Is the appeal's purpose explained somewhere on the website, and/or is it reported on the financial statements? Note: Deduct 5 points if neither is true.	X			
5	6. Annual Assessments (cathedraticum) Score: 0 or 5 Is the <i>cathedraticum</i> explained somewhere on the website, and/or is it reported on the financial statements? Note: Deduct 5 points if neither is true.	X			https://dioceseofspokane.org/documents/2015/6/5.01.01.pdf
5	7. Is contact info for the business office posted? Score: 0-5 Note: Deduct 2 points if only one name is posted and their contact info is shown.	X			
4	8. Is the finance council identified? Score: 0-5 Note: Deduct 3 points if there are not 3 lay members. Deduct 1 point if credentials are not posted.	X			https://dioceseofspokane.org/documents/2015/10/5.02.15%20.pdf
5	9. Are parish financial guidelines posted? Score: 0 or 5	X			Included here: https://dioceseofspokane.org/green-book
10	10. Are detailed collection & counting procedures posted? Score: 0-10 Note: Deduct 4 pts for each "No" answer below. - Are serially numbered containers <u>required</u> ? - Are three (3) or more counters <u>required</u> ?	X			https://dioceseofspokane.org/documents/2018/3/5.02.03_032018.pdf
		X			
		X			

TOTAL SCORE: 39 (maximum possible score = 60)

APPENDIX C: 2018/2017 Scores Diocesan Financial Transparency

Alphabetical listing (**archdioceses** in bold)

Maximum score = 60

Diocese	Total Scores		Scores per Question (see Legend for total possible on each)								
	2018	2017	Q 1	Q 2	Qs 3&4*	Q 5	Q 6	Q 7	Q 8	Q 9	Q 10
Albany, NY	40		5	5	15	5	5	5	0	0	0
		20	0	5	0	5	5	5	0	0	0
Alexandria, LA	29		0	5	0	5	5	5	4	5	0
		29	0	5	0	5	5	5	4	5	0
Allentown, PA	27		5	5	2	5	5	5	0	0	0
		15	0	5	0	5	0	5	0	0	0
Altoona-Johnstown	31		0	5	0	5	5	5	4	5	2
		22	0	5	0	5	0	5	0	5	2
Amarillo	49		5	5	15	5	5	5	4	5	0
		47	5	5	15	5	5	3	4	5	0
Anchorage, AK	45		5	5	15	5	5	5	0	5	0
		45	5	5	15	5	5	5	0	5	0
Arlington, VA	44		5	5	15	5	5	5	4	0	0
		44	5	5	15	5	5	5	4	0	0
Atlanta, GA	59		5	5	15	5	5	5	4	5	10
		50	5	0	15	5	5	5	4	5	6
Austin, TX	55		5	5	15	5	5	5	0	5	10
		51	5	5	15	5	5	5	0	5	6
Baker, OR	27		5	0	0	5	5	5	0	5	2
		27	5	0	0	5	5	5	0	5	2
Baltimore	59		5	5	15	5	5	5	4	5	10
		55	5	5	15	5	5	5	0	5	10
Baton Rouge, LA	25		0	5	0	5	0	5	4	0	6
		23	0	5	0	5	0	5	4	0	4
Beaumont, TX	46		5	5	2	5	5	5	4	5	10
		46	5	5	2	5	5	5	4	5	10

Diocesan Financial Transparency: 2018/2017 Scores

Alphabetical listing (**archdioceses** in bold)

Maximum score = 60

Diocese	Total Scores		Scores per Question (see Legend for total possible on each)								
	2018	2017	Q 1	Q 2	Qs 3&4*	Q 5	Q 6	Q 7	Q 8	Q 9	Q 10
Belleville, IL	55		5	5	15	5	5	5	4	5	6
		55	5	5	15	5	5	5	4	5	6
Biloxi, MS	20		5	5	0	5	0	5	0	0	0
		10	0	5	0	0	0	5	0	0	0
Birmingham, AL	24		0	5	0	5	5	5	4	0	0
		24	0	5	0	5	5	5	4	0	0
Bismarck, ND	56		5	5	15	5	5	5	5	5	6
		47	5	5	10	5	5	5	5	5	2
Boise ID	40		5	5	15	5	5	5	0	0	0
		40	5	5	15	5	5	5	0	0	0
Boston	53		5	2	15	5	5	5	5	5	6
		46	5	0	15	5	5	5	5	0	6
Bridgeport, CT	56		5	5	15	5	5	5	5	5	6
		55	5	4	15	5	5	5	5	5	6
Brooklyn, NY	35		5	5	10	5	5	5	0	0	0
		35	5	0	15	5	5	5	0	0	0
Brownsville, TX	15		0	5	0	5	0	5	0	0	0
		10	0	5	0	0	0	5	0	0	0
Buffalo, NY	56		5	5	15	5	5	5	5	5	6
		55	5	5	15	5	5	5	4	5	6
Burlington, VT	60		5	5	15	5	5	5	5	5	10
		44	5	5	15	5	5	5	4	0	0
Camden, NJ	25		5	5	0	5	0	5	5	0	0
		10	0	5	0	5	0	0	0	0	0

Diocesan Financial Transparency: 2018/2017 Scores

Alphabetical listing (**archdioceses** in bold)

Maximum score = 60

Diocese	Total Scores		Scores per Question (see Legend for total possible on each)								
	2018	2017	Q 1	Q 2	Qs 3&4*	Q 5	Q 6	Q 7	Q 8	Q 9	Q 10
Charleston, SC	54		5	0	15	5	5	5	4	5	10
		46	5	0	15	5	5	5	4	5	2
Charlotte, NC	51		5	5	15	5	5	5	0	5	6
		51	5	5	15	5	5	5	0	5	6
Cheyenne, WY	30		5	5	5	5	5	5	0	0	0
		35	5	5	10	5	5	5	0	0	0
Chicago, IL	55		5	5	15	5	5	5	0	5	10
		50	5	5	10	5	5	5	0	5	10
Cincinnati, OH	49		5	5	15	5	5	3	0	5	6
		49	5	5	15	5	5	3	0	5	6
Cleveland, OH	55		5	4	15	5	5	5	5	5	6
		56	5	5	15	5	5	5	5	5	6
Colorado Springs	27		5	5	2	5	5	5	0	0	0
		27	5	5	2	5	5	5	0	0	0
Columbus, OH	44		5	5	0	5	5	5	4	5	10
		39	0	5	0	5	5	5	4	5	10
Corpus Christi, TX	52		5	5	15	5	5	5	5	5	2
		47	5	5	15	5	5	5	5	0	2
Covington, KY	40		5	5	0	5	5	5	4	5	6
		35	0	5	0	5	5	5	4	5	6
Crookston, MN	20		5	0	0	5	5	5	0	0	0
		20	0	5	0	5	5	5	0	0	0
Dallas, TX	51		5	5	15	5	5	5	4	5	2
		51	5	5	15	5	5	5	4	5	2

Diocesan Financial Transparency: 2018/2017 Scores

Alphabetical listing (**archdioceses** in bold)

Maximum score = 60

Diocese	Total Scores		Scores per Question (see Legend for total possible on each)								
	2018	2017	Q 1	Q 2	Qs 3&4*	Q 5	Q 6	Q 7	Q 8	Q 9	Q 10
Davenport, IA	52		5	5	15	5	5	5	5	5	2
		47	5	5	15	5	5	5	0	5	2
Denver CO	46		5	5	2	5	5	5	4	5	10
		41	5	4	2	5	5	5	4	5	6
Des Moines, IA	56		5	5	15	5	5	5	5	5	6
		56	5	5	15	5	5	5	5	5	6
Detroit, MI	51		5	5	15	5	5	5	4	5	2
		51	5	5	15	5	5	5	4	5	2
Dodge City, KS	37		5	5	10	5	5	5	0	0	2
		37	5	5	15	5	0	5	0	0	2
Dubuque, IA	47		5	5	10	5	5	5	5	5	2
		47	5	5	10	5	5	5	5	5	2
Duluth, MN	31		5	5	2	5	5	5	4	0	0
		39	5	5	10	5	5	5	4	0	0
El Paso, TX	32		5	5	2	5	5	5	0	5	0
		32	5	5	2	5	5	5	0	5	0
Erie, PA	55		5	5	15	5	5	5	4	5	6
		49	5	5	15	5	5	5	0	5	4
Evansville, IN	44		5	5	15	5	5	5	4	0	0
		35	5	5	10	5	5	5	0	0	0
Fairbanks, AK	27		5	5	2	5	5	5	0	0	0
		20	0	5	0	5	5	5	0	0	0
Fall River, MA	43		5	5	15	5	5	3	5	0	0
		22	0	5	0	5	5	3	4	0	0
Fargo, ND	40		5	5	15	5	5	5	0	0	0
		40	5	5	15	5	5	5	0	0	0

Diocesan Financial Transparency: 2018/2017 Scores

Alphabetical listing (**archdioceses** in bold)

Maximum score = 60

Diocese	Total Scores		Scores per Question (see Legend for total possible on each)								
	2018	2017	Q 1	Q 2	Qs 3&4*	Q 5	Q 6	Q 7	Q 8	Q 9	Q 10
Fort Worth, TX	44		5	5	15	5	5	5	4	0	0
		44	5	5	15	5	5	5	4	0	0
Fresno, CA	24		0	5	0	5	5	5	4	0	0
		15	0	5	0	5	0	5	0	0	0
Ft. Wayne-So. Bend	56		5	5	15	5	5	5	5	5	6
		34	5	5	0	5	5	5	0	5	4
Gallup, NM	25		0	5	0	5	5	5	0	5	0
		25	0	5	0	5	5	5	0	5	0
Galveston-Houston, TX	40		5	5	15	5	5	5	0	0	0
		40	5	5	15	5	5	5	0	0	0
Gary, IN	27		5	0	0	5	5	5	0	5	2
		27	5	5	0	5	0	5	0	5	2
Gaylord, MI	51		5	5	15	5	5	5	0	5	6
		51	5	5	15	5	5	5	0	5	6
Grand Island, NE	13		0	5	0	5	0	3	0	0	0
		13	0	5	0	5	0	3	0	0	0
Grand Rapids, MI	44		5	5	15	5	5	5	4	0	0
		44	5	5	15	5	5	5	4	0	0
Great Falls-Billings, MT	48		5	4	15	5	5	5	4	5	0
		44	5	4	15	5	5	5	0	5	0
Green Bay, WI	47		5	5	15	5	5	5	0	5	2
		47	5	5	15	5	5	5	0	5	2
Greensburg, PA	31		5	5	2	5	5	5	4	0	0
		31	5	5	2	5	5	5	4	0	0
Harrisburg, PA	19		0	5	0	5	0	5	4	0	0
		19	0	5	0	5	0	5	4	0	0

Diocesan Financial Transparency: 2018/2017 Scores

Alphabetical listing (**archdioceses** in bold)

Maximum score = 60

Diocese	Total Scores		Scores per Question (see Legend for total possible on each)								
	2018	2017	Q 1	Q 2	Qs 3&4*	Q 5	Q 6	Q 7	Q 8	Q 9	Q 10
Hartford, CT	22		5	4	0	5	5	3	0	0	0
		17	5	4	0	5	0	3	0	0	0
Helena, MT	29		5	5	0	5	5	5	4	0	0
		29	5	5	0	5	5	5	4	0	0
Honolulu, HI	37		5	5	2	5	5	5	4	0	6
		37	5	5	2	5	5	5	4	0	6
Houma-Thibodaux	44		5	5	15	5	5	5	4	0	0
		44	5	5	15	5	5	5	4	0	0
Indianapolis, IN	51		5	5	15	5	5	5	4	5	2
		<u>51</u>	5	5	15	5	5	5	4	5	2
Jackson, MS	20		5	5	0	5	0	5	0	0	0
		15	0	5	0	5	0	5	0	0	0
Jefferson City, MO	40		5	5	15	5	5	5	0	0	0
		35	5	5	10	5	5	5	0	0	0
Joliet, IL	52		5	5	15	5	5	5	5	5	2
		52	5	5	15	5	5	5	5	5	2
Juneau, AK	38		5	5	2	5	5	5	4	5	2
		41	5	5	10	5	5	5	0	0	6
Kalamazoo, MI	49		5	5	15	5	5	5	4	5	0
		49	5	5	15	5	5	5	4	5	0
Knoxville, TN	15		0	5	0	5	0	5	0	0	0
		15	0	5	0	5	0	5	0	0	0
Kansas City, KS	55		5	5	15	5	5	5	4	5	6
		55	5	5	15	5	5	5	4	5	6
KS City-St. Jos., MO	44		5	5	15	5	5	5	4	0	0
		44	5	5	15	5	5	5	4	0	0

Diocesan Financial Transparency: 2018/2017 Scores

Alphabetical listing (**archdioceses** in bold)

Maximum score = 60

Diocese	Total Scores		Scores per Question (see Legend for total possible on each)								
	2018	2017	Q 1	Q 2	Qs 3&4*	Q 5	Q 6	Q 7	Q 8	Q 9	Q 10
La Crosse, WI	51		5	5	15	5	5	5	0	5	6
		28	0	5	10	5	5	3	0	0	0
Lafayette, IN	44		5	5	15	5	5	5	4	0	0
		44	5	5	15	5	5	5	4	0	0
Lafayette, LA	51		5	5	15	5	5	5	4	5	2
		31	0	5	0	5	5	5	4	5	2
Lake Charles, LA	27		5	5	2	5	5	5	0	0	0
		18	0	5	0	5	5	3	0	0	0
Lansing, MI	44		5	5	15	5	5	5	4	0	0
		44	5	5	15	5	5	5	4	0	0
Laredo, TX	40		5	5	15	5	5	5	0	0	0
		40	5	5	15	5	5	5	0	0	0
Las Cruces, NM	47		5	5	15	5	5	5	0	5	2
		47	5	5	15	5	5	5	0	5	2
Las Vegas, NV	35		5	0	15	5	5	5	0	0	0
		35	5	0	15	5	5	5	0	0	0
Lexington, KY	47		5	0	15	5	5	5	5	5	2
		19	0	0	0	5	5	5	4	0	0
Lincoln, NE	31		5	5	2	5	5	5	4	0	0
		27	5	5	2	5	5	5	0	0	0
Little Rock, AR	44		5	5	15	5	5	5	4	0	0
		44	5	5	15	5	5	5	4	0	0
Los Angeles, CA	47		5	5	15	5	5	5	0	5	2
		45	5	5	15	5	5	5	0	5	0
Louisville, KY	51		5	5	15	5	5	5	0	5	6
		47	5	5	15	5	5	5	0	5	2

Diocesan Financial Transparency: 2018/2017 Scores

Alphabetical listing (**archdioceses** in bold)

Maximum score = 60

Diocese	Total Scores		Scores per Question (see Legend for total possible on each)								
	2018	2017	Q 1	Q 2	Qs 3&4*	Q 5	Q 6	Q 7	Q 8	Q 9	Q 10
Lubbock, TX	15		0	0	0	5	5	5	0	0	0
		20	5	0	0	5	5	5	0	0	0
Madison, WI	47		5	5	15	5	5	5	0	5	2
		27	0	5	0	5	5	5	0	5	2
Manchester, NH	44		5	5	15	5	5	5	4	0	0
		40	5	5	15	0	5	5	5	0	0
Marquette, MI	44		5	5	15	5	0	5	2	5	2
		52	5	5	15	5	5	5	5	5	2
Memphis, TN	47		5	5	15	5	5	5	0	5	2
		47	5	5	15	5	5	5	0	5	2
Metuchen, NJ	33		5	5	2	5	5	5	0	0	6
		27	5	5	2	5	5	5	0	0	0
Miami, FL	32		5	5	2	5	0	5	4	0	6
		37	5	5	2	5	0	5	4	5	6
Milwaukee, WI	56		5	5	15	5	5	5	5	5	6
		56	5	5	15	5	5	5	5	5	6
Mobile, AL	22		5	0	2	5	5	5	0	0	0
		10	0	0	0	5	0	5	0	0	0
Monterey, CA	36		5	5	0	5	5	5	0	5	6
		32	5	5	0	5	5	5	0	5	2
Nashville, TN	40		5	5	15	5	5	5	0	0	0
		40	5	5	15	5	5	5	0	0	0
New Orleans, LA	20		0	5	0	0	5	3	0	5	2
		20	0	5	0	0	5	3	0	5	2
New York, NY	31		5	5	2	5	5	5	4	0	0
		27	5	5	2	5	5	5	0	0	0

Diocesan Financial Transparency: 2018/2017 Scores

Alphabetical listing (**archdioceses** in bold)

Maximum score = 60

Diocese	Total Scores		Scores per Question (see Legend for total possible on each)								
	2018	2017	Q 1	Q 2	Qs 3&4*	Q 5	Q 6	Q 7	Q 8	Q 9	Q 10
Newark, NJ	42		5	5	15	5	5	5	0	0	2
		25	5	5	0	5	5	5	0	0	0
New Ulm, MN	22		5	5	2	5	0	5	0	0	0
		15	0	5	0	5	0	5	0	0	0
Norwich, CT	24		5	5	0	5	0	5	4	0	0
		19	0	5	0	5	0	5	4	0	0
Oakland, CA	39		5	5	10	5	5	5	4	0	0
		44	5	5	15	5	5	5	4	0	0
Ogdensburg, NY	40		5	5	15	5	5	5	0	0	0
		40	5	5	15	5	5	5	0	0	0
Oklahoma City, OK	34		5	4	10	5	5	5	0	0	0
		39	5	4	15	5	5	5	0	0	0
Omaha, NE	56		5	5	15	5	5	5	5	5	6
		26	0	5	0	5	0	5	0	5	6
Orange, CA	19		0	5	0	5	0	5	4	0	0
		19	0	5	0	5	0	5	4	0	0
Orlando, FL	60		5	5	15	5	5	5	5	5	10
		26	5	5	2	5	0	5	4	0	0
Owensboro, KY	51		5	5	15	5	5	5	4	5	2
		47	5	5	15	5	5	5	0	5	2
Palm Beach, FL	49		5	0	15	5	5	5	4	0	10
		50	5	5	15	5	5	5	0	0	10
Paterson-Clifton	55		5	5	15	5	5	5	4	5	6
		55	5	5	15	5	5	5	4	5	6
Pensacola-Tal, FL	44		5	5	15	5	5	5	4	0	0
		44	5	5	15	5	5	5	4	0	0

Diocesan Financial Transparency: 2018/2017 Scores

Alphabetical listing (**archdioceses** in bold)

Maximum score = 60

Diocese	Total Scores		Scores per Question (see Legend for total possible on each)								
	2018	2017	Q 1	Q 2	Qs 3&4*	Q 5	Q 6	Q 7	Q 8	Q 9	Q 10
Peoria, IL	34		5	5	2	5	5	5	0	5	2
		34	5	5	2	5	5	5	0	5	2
Philadelphia, PA	40		5	5	15	5	5	5	0	0	0
		40	5	5	15	5	5	5	0	0	0
Phoenix, AZ	25		5	5	0	5	5	5	0	0	0
		25	5	5	0	5	5	5	0	0	0
Pittsburgh, PA	42		5	5	10	5	5	5	0	5	2
		41	5	5	10	5	0	5	4	5	2
Portland, ME	27		5	5	2	5	5	5	0	0	0
		27	5	5	2	5	5	5	0	0	0
Portland, OR	15		0	5	0	5	0	5	0	0	0
		15	0	5	0	5	0	5	0	0	0
Providence, RI	44		5	5	15	5	5	5	4	0	0
		44	5	5	15	5	5	5	4	0	0
Pueblo, CO	28		0	5	0	5	5	5	1	5	2
		31	0	5	0	5	5	5	4	5	2
Raleigh, NC	40		5	5	15	5	5	5	0	0	0
		40	5	5	15	5	5	5	0	0	0
Rapid City, SD	29		5	5	0	5	5	5	4	0	0
		26	0	5	2	5	5	5	4	0	0
Reno, NV	51		5	5	15	5	5	5	4	5	2
		31	5	5	0	5	0	5	4	5	2
Richmond, VA	51		5	5	15	5	5	5	0	5	6
		47	5	5	15	5	5	5	0	5	2
Rochester, NY	42		5	5	15	5	5	3	4	0	0
		35	5	5	15	5	5	0	0	0	0

Diocesan Financial Transparency: 2018/2017 Scores

Alphabetical listing (**archdioceses** in bold)

Maximum score = 60

Diocese	Total Scores		Scores per Question (see Legend for total possible on each)								
	2018	2017	Q 1	Q 2	Qs 3&4*	Q 5	Q 6	Q 7	Q 8	Q 9	Q 10
Rockford, IL	35		0	5	0	5	5	5	4	5	6
		30	0	5	0	5	0	5	4	5	6
Rockville Ctr, NY	25		5	0	5	5	5	5	0	0	0
		35	5	0	10	5	5	5	5	0	0
Sacramento, CA	59		5	5	15	5	5	5	4	5	10
		59	5	4	15	5	5	5	5	5	10
<u>Saginaw, MI</u>	<u>40</u>		<u>5</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>15</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>
		<u>40</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>15</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>
Salina, KS	18		0	4	0	5	0	5	4	0	0
		18	0	4	0	5	0	5	4	0	0
Salt Lake City, UT	47		5	5	15	5	5	5	0	5	2
		52	5	5	15	5	5	5	5	5	2
San Angelo, TX	44		5	5	15	5	5	5	4	0	0
		39	5	5	15	0	5	5	4	0	0
San Antonio, TX	35		5	0	15	5	5	5	0	0	0
		35	5	0	15	5	5	5	0	0	0
San Bernardino, CA	45		5	5	5	5	5	5	4	5	6
		45	5	0	10	5	5	5	4	5	6
San Diego, CA	56		5	5	15	5	5	5	5	5	6
		31	0	5	0	5	5	5	0	5	6
San Francisco, CA	55		5	5	15	5	5	5	4	5	6
		51	5	5	15	5	5	5	0	5	6
San Jose, CA	55		5	5	15	5	5	5	4	5	6
		55	5	5	15	5	5	5	4	5	6
Santa Fe, NM	19		0	5	0	5	0	5	4	0	0
		19	0	5	0	5	0	5	4	0	0

Diocesan Financial Transparency: 2018/2017 Scores

Alphabetical listing (**archdioceses** in bold)

Maximum score = 60

Diocese	Total Scores		Scores per Question (see Legend for total possible on each)								
	2018	2017	Q 1	Q 2	Qs 3&4*	Q 5	Q 6	Q 7	Q 8	Q 9	Q 10
Santa Rosa, CA	50		5	0	15	5	5	5	4	5	6
		36	5	0	10	5	5	5	4	0	2
Savannah, GA	55		5	5	15	5	5	5	0	5	10
		55	5	5	15	5	5	5	0	5	10
Scranton, PA	23		0	5	0	5	5	3	5	0	0
		43	5	5	15	5	5	3	5	0	0
Seattle, WA	42		5	5	2	5	5	5	4	5	6
		42	5	5	2	5	5	5	4	5	6
Shreveport, LA	22		5	0	0	5	5	5	0	0	2
		22	5	0	0	5	5	5	0	0	2
Sioux City, IA	35		0	5	0	5	5	5	4	5	6
		35	0	5	0	5	5	5	4	5	6
Sioux Falls, SD	20		0	5	0	5	5	5	0	0	0
		20	0	5	0	5	5	5	0	0	0
Spokane, WA	39		0	5	0	5	5	5	4	5	10
		27	0	5	0	5	5	5	0	5	2
Springfield, IL	35		0	5	0	5	5	5	4	5	6
		30	0	4	0	5	5	5	4	5	2
Springfield, MA	20		5	5	0	5	0	5	0	0	0
		30	5	5	0	5	5	5	5	0	0
Springfield-C.G., MO	39		5	4	15	5	5	5	0	0	0
		40	5	5	15	5	5	5	0	0	0
St. Augustine, FL	44		5	5	15	5	5	5	4	0	0
		44	5	5	15	5	5	5	4	0	0
St. Cloud, MN	27		5	5	2	5	5	5	0	0	0
		27	5	5	2	5	5	5	0	0	0

Diocesan Financial Transparency: 2018/2017 Scores

Alphabetical listing (**archdioceses** in bold)

Maximum score = 60

Diocese	Total Scores		Scores per Question (see Legend for total possible on each)								
	2018	2017	Q 1	Q 2	Qs 3&4*	Q 5	Q 6	Q 7	Q 8	Q 9	Q 10
St. Louis, MO	55		5	5	15	5	5	5	4	5	6
		51	5	5	15	5	5	5	4	5	2
St. Paul-Minn., MN	27		5	5	2	5	5	5	0	0	0
		35	5	5	10	5	5	5	0	0	0
St. Petersburg, FL	47		5	5	15	5	5	5	0	5	2
		42	5	5	10	5	5	5	0	5	2
St. Thomas, VI	12		0	0	0	5	0	3	4	0	0
		19	0	5	0	5	0	5	4	0	0
Steubenville, OH	24		0	5	0	5	5	5	4	0	0
		24	0	5	0	5	5	5	4	0	0
Stockton, CA	55		5	5	15	5	5	5	0	5	10
		45	5	5	5	5	5	5	0	5	10
Superior, WI	31		5	5	2	5	5	5	4	0	0
		31	0	5	0	5	5	5	4	5	2
Syracuse, NY	55		5	5	15	5	5	5	4	5	6
		55	5	5	15	5	5	5	4	5	6
Toledo, OH	40		5	5	15	5	5	5	0	0	0
		38	5	5	15	5	5	3	0	0	0
Trenton, NJ	40		5	5	10	5	5	5	5	0	0
		15	0	5	0	5	0	5	0	0	0
Tucson, AZ	45		5	4	10	5	5	5	0	5	6
		50	5	4	15	5	5	5	0	5	6
Tulsa, OK	15		5	5	0	5	0	0	0	0	0
		15	5	5	0	5	0	0	0	0	0
Tyler, TX	39		5	4	15	5	5	5	0	0	0
		43	5	4	15	5	5	5	4	0	0

Diocesan Financial Transparency: 2018/2017 Scores

Alphabetical listing (**archdioceses** in bold)

Maximum score = 60

Diocese	Total Scores		Scores per Question (see Legend for total possible on each)								
	2018	2017	Q 1	Q 2	Qs 3&4*	Q 5	Q 6	Q 7	Q 8	Q 9	Q 10
Venice, FL	55		5	5	15	5	5	5	4	5	6
		55	5	5	15	5	5	5	4	5	6
Victoria, TX	29		5	5	0	5	5	5	4	0	0
		24	0	5	0	5	5	5	4	0	0
Washington, DC	44		5	5	15	5	5	5	4	0	0
		44	5	5	15	5	5	5	4	0	0
Wheeling-C'ton, WV	44		5	5	0	5	5	5	4	5	10
		44	5	5	0	5	5	5	4	5	10
Wichita, KS	38		5	5	2	5	5	5	4	5	2
		19	0	5	0	5	0	5	4	0	0
Wilmington, DE	39		5	4	15	5	5	5	0	0	0
		40	5	5	15	5	5	5	0	0	0
Winona-Roch., MN	31		0	5	0	5	5	5	4	5	2
		31	0	5	0	5	5	5	4	5	2
Worcester, MA	51		5	5	15	5	5	5	4	5	2
		51	5	5	15	5	5	5	4	5	2
Yakima, WA	55		5	5	15	5	5	5	4	5	6
		55	5	5	15	5	5	5	4	5	6
Youngstown, OH	51		5	5	15	5	5	5	0	5	6
		49	5	5	15	5	5	3	0	5	6

* Questions 3 and 4 are interrelated and must therefore be considered as one insofar as scoring is concerned.

LEGEND

Question #1: Can any financial data be found within a few to several minutes?

Question #2: Is there a workable internal “search” function? Deduct 3 points if not on homepage, and 1 point if not on the other pages.

Questions 3&4: Are audited financial statements posted? If the answer to #3 is “No,” is financial info reported in another format?

Question #5: Is the appeal's purpose explained somewhere on the website, and/or is it reported on the financial statements?

Question #6: Is the cathedraticum explained somewhere on the website, and/or is it reported on the financial statements?

Question #7: Is contact info for the business office posted? Deduct 2 points if only one name is posted and contact info is shown.

Question #8: Is the finance council identified? Deduct 3 points if less than 3 lay members and 1 point if no credentials are posted.

Question #9: Are parish financial guidelines posted?

Question #10: Are detailed collection & counting procedures posted? Deduct 4 points if procedures do not require numbered containers or 3 counters aren't required.

Question #6: Is the cathedraticum explained somewhere on the website, and/or is it reported on the financial statements?

Question #7: Is contact info for the business office posted? Deduct 2 points if only one name is posted and contact info is shown.

Question #8: Is the finance council identified? Deduct 3 points if less than 3 lay members and 1 point if no credentials are posted.

Question #9: Are parish financial guidelines posted?

Question #10: Are detailed collection & counting procedures posted? Deduct 4 points if the procedures do not require numbered containers or 3 counters aren't required.

Total possible score is 60:

Question	1	2	3 & 4	5	6	7	8	9	10	Total
Max. Score	5	5	15	5	5	5	5	5	10	60

APPENDIX D: Dioceses Ranked by 2018 Financial Transparency Score

Archdioceses in bold

Maximum score = 60

Diocese	Total Scores		Scores per Question (see Legend for total possible on each)								
	2018	2017	Q 1	Q 2	Qs 3&4*	Q 5	Q 6	Q 7	Q 8	Q 9	Q 10
Burlington, VT	60		5	5	15	5	5	5	5	5	10
		44	5	5	15	5	5	5	4	0	0
Orlando, FL	60		5	5	15	5	5	5	5	5	10
		26	5	5	2	5	0	5	4	0	0
Atlanta, GA	59		5	5	15	5	5	5	4	5	10
		50	5	0	15	5	5	5	4	5	6
Baltimore, MD	59		5	5	15	5	5	5	4	5	10
		55	5	5	15	5	5	5	0	5	10
Sacramento, CA	59		5	5	15	5	5	5	4	5	10
		59	5	4	15	5	5	5	5	5	10
Bismarck, ND	56		5	5	15	5	5	5	5	5	6
		47	5	5	10	5	5	5	5	5	2
Bridgeport, CT	56		5	5	15	5	5	5	5	5	6
		55	5	4	15	5	5	5	5	5	6
Buffalo, NY	56		5	5	15	5	5	5	5	5	6
		55	5	5	15	5	5	5	4	5	6
Des Moines, IA	56		5	5	15	5	5	5	5	5	6
		56	5	5	15	5	5	5	5	5	6
Ft. Wayne-So. Bend, IN	56		5	5	15	5	5	5	5	5	6
		34	5	5	0	5	5	5	0	5	4
Milwaukee, WI	56		5	5	15	5	5	5	5	5	6
		56	5	5	15	5	5	5	5	5	6
Omaha, NE	56		5	5	15	5	5	5	5	5	6
		26	0	5	0	5	0	5	0	5	6
San Diego, CA	56		5	5	15	5	5	5	5	5	6
		31	0	5	0	5	5	5	0	5	6

APPENDIX D: Dioceses Ranked by 2018 Financial Transparency Score

Archdioceses in bold

Maximum score = 60

Diocese	Total Scores		Scores per Question (see Legend for total possible on each)								
	2018	2017	Q 1	Q 2	Qs 3&4*	Q 5	Q 6	Q 7	Q 8	Q 9	Q 10
Austin, TX	55		5	5	15	5	5	5	0	5	10
		51	5	5	15	5	5	5	0	5	6
Belleville, IL	55		5	5	15	5	5	5	4	5	6
		55	5	5	15	5	5	5	4	5	6
Chicago, IL	55		5	5	15	5	5	5	0	5	10
		50	5	5	10	5	5	5	0	5	10
Cleveland, OH	55		5	4	15	5	5	5	5	5	6
		56	5	5	15	5	5	5	5	5	6
Erie, PA	55		5	5	15	5	5	5	4	5	6
		49	5	5	15	5	5	5	0	5	4
Kansas City, KS	55		5	5	15	5	5	5	4	5	6
		55	5	5	15	5	5	5	4	5	6
Paterson-Clifton, NJ	55		5	5	15	5	5	5	4	5	6
		55	5	5	15	5	5	5	4	5	6
San Francisco, CA	55		5	5	15	5	5	5	4	5	6
		51	5	5	15	5	5	5	0	5	6
San Jose, CA	55		5	5	15	5	5	5	4	5	6
		55	5	5	15	5	5	5	4	5	6
Savannah, GA	55		5	5	15	5	5	5	0	5	10
		55	5	5	15	5	5	5	0	5	10
St. Louis, MO	55		5	5	15	5	5	5	4	5	6
		51	5	5	15	5	5	5	4	5	2
Stockton, CA	55		5	5	15	5	5	5	0	5	10
		45	5	5	5	5	5	5	0	5	10

APPENDIX D: Dioceses Ranked by 2018 Financial Transparency Score

Archdioceses in bold

Maximum score = 60

Diocese	Total Scores		Scores per Question (see Legend for total possible on each)								
	2018	2017	Q 1	Q 2	Qs 3&4*	Q 5	Q 6	Q 7	Q 8	Q 9	Q 10
Syracuse, NY	55		5	5	15	5	5	5	4	5	6
		55	5	5	15	5	5	5	4	5	6
Venice, FL	55		5	5	15	5	5	5	4	5	6
		55	5	5	15	5	5	5	4	5	6
Yakima, WA	55		5	5	15	5	5	5	4	5	6
		55	5	5	15	5	5	5	4	5	6
Charleston, SC	54		5	0	15	5	5	5	4	5	10
		46	5	0	15	5	5	5	4	5	2
Boston, MA	53		5	2	15	5	5	5	5	5	6
		46	5	0	15	5	5	5	5	0	6
Corpus Christi, TX	52		5	5	15	5	5	5	5	5	2
		47	5	5	15	5	5	5	5	0	2
Davenport, IA	52		5	5	15	5	5	5	5	5	2
		47	5	5	15	5	5	5	0	5	2
Joliet, IL	52		5	5	15	5	5	5	5	5	2
		52	5	5	15	5	5	5	5	5	2
Charlotte, NC	51		5	5	15	5	5	5	0	5	6
		51	5	5	15	5	5	5	0	5	6
Dallas, TX	51		5	5	15	5	5	5	4	5	2
		51	5	5	15	5	5	5	4	5	2
Detroit, MI	51		5	5	15	5	5	5	4	5	2
		51	5	5	15	5	5	5	4	5	2
Gaylord, MI	51		5	5	15	5	5	5	0	5	6
		51	5	5	15	5	5	5	0	5	6

APPENDIX D: Dioceses Ranked by 2018 Financial Transparency Score

Archdioceses in bold

Maximum score = 60

Diocese	Total Scores		Scores per Question (see Legend for total possible on each)								
	2018	2017	Q 1	Q 2	Qs 3&4*	Q 5	Q 6	Q 7	Q 8	Q 9	Q 10
Indianapolis, IN	51		5	5	15	5	5	5	4	5	2
		51	5	5	15	5	5	5	4	5	2
La Crosse, WI	51		5	5	15	5	5	5	0	5	6
		28	0	5	10	5	5	3	0	0	0
Lafayette, LA	51		5	5	15	5	5	5	4	5	2
		31	0	5	0	5	5	5	4	5	2
Louisville, KY	51		5	5	15	5	5	5	0	5	6
		47	5	5	15	5	5	5	0	5	2
Owensboro, KY	51		5	5	15	5	5	5	4	5	2
		47	5	5	15	5	5	5	0	5	2
Reno, NV	51		5	5	15	5	5	5	4	5	2
		31	5	5	0	5	0	5	4	5	2
Richmond, VA	51		5	5	15	5	5	5	0	5	6
		47	5	5	15	5	5	5	0	5	2
Worcester, MA	51		5	5	15	5	5	5	4	5	2
		51	5	5	15	5	5	5	4	5	2
Youngstown, OH	51		5	5	15	5	5	5	0	5	6
		49	5	5	15	5	5	3	0	5	6
Santa Rosa, CA	50		5	0	15	5	5	5	4	5	6
		36	5	0	10	5	5	5	4	0	2
Amarillo, TX	49		5	5	15	5	5	5	4	5	0
		47	5	5	15	5	5	3	4	5	0
Cincinnati, OH	49		5	5	15	5	5	3	0	5	6
		49	5	5	15	5	5	3	0	5	6
Kalamazoo, MI	49		5	5	15	5	5	5	4	5	0
		49	5	5	15	5	5	5	4	5	0

APPENDIX D: Dioceses Ranked by 2018 Financial Transparency Score

Archdioceses in bold

Maximum score = 60

Diocese	Total Scores		Scores per Question (see Legend for total possible on each)								
	2018	2017	Q 1	Q 2	Qs 3&4*	Q 5	Q 6	Q 7	Q 8	Q 9	Q 10
Palm Beach, FL	49		5	0	15	5	5	5	4	0	10
		50	5	5	15	5	5	5	0	0	10
Great Falls-Billings, MT	48		5	4	15	5	5	5	4	5	0
		44	5	4	15	5	5	5	0	5	0
Green Bay, WI	47		5	5	15	5	5	5	0	5	2
		47	5	5	15	5	5	5	0	5	2
Las Cruces, NM	47		5	5	15	5	5	5	0	5	2
		47	5	5	15	5	5	5	0	5	2
Lexington, KY	47		5	0	15	5	5	5	5	5	2
		19	0	0	0	5	5	5	4	0	0
Los Angeles, CA	47		5	5	15	5	5	5	0	5	2
		45	5	5	15	5	5	5	0	5	0
Madison, WI	47		5	5	15	5	5	5	0	5	2
		27	0	5	0	5	5	5	0	5	2
Memphis, TN	47		5	5	15	5	5	5	0	5	2
		47	5	5	15	5	5	5	0	5	2
Salt Lake City, UT	47		5	5	15	5	5	5	0	5	2
		52	5	5	15	5	5	5	5	5	2
St. Petersburg, FL	47		5	5	15	5	5	5	0	5	2
		42	5	5	10	5	5	5	0	5	2
Beaumont, TX	46		5	5	2	5	5	5	4	5	10
		46	5	5	2	5	5	5	4	5	10
Denver CO	46		5	5	2	5	5	5	4	5	10
		41	5	4	2	5	5	5	4	5	6
Dubuque, IA	47		5	5	10	5	5	5	5	5	2
		47	5	5	10	5	5	5	5	5	2

APPENDIX D: Dioceses Ranked by 2018 Financial Transparency Score

Archdioceses in bold

Maximum score = 60

Diocese	Total Scores		Scores per Question (see Legend for total possible on each)								
	2018	2017	Q 1	Q 2	Qs 3&4*	Q 5	Q 6	Q 7	Q 8	Q 9	Q 10
Anchorage, AK	45		5	5	15	5	5	5	0	5	0
		45	5	5	15	5	5	5	0	5	0
San Bernardino, CA	45		5	5	5	5	5	5	4	5	6
		45	5	0	10	5	5	5	4	5	6
Tucson, AZ	45		5	4	10	5	5	5	0	5	6
		50	5	4	15	5	5	5	0	5	6
Arlington, VA	44		5	5	15	5	5	5	4	0	0
		44	5	5	15	5	5	5	4	0	0
Columbus, OH	44		5	5	0	5	5	5	4	5	10
		39	0	5	0	5	5	5	4	5	10
Evansville, IN	44		5	5	15	5	5	5	4	0	0
		35	5	5	10	5	5	5	0	0	0
Fort Worth, TX	44		5	5	15	5	5	5	4	0	0
		44	5	5	15	5	5	5	4	0	0
Grand Rapids, MI	44		5	5	15	5	5	5	4	0	0
		44	5	5	15	5	5	5	4	0	0
Houma-Thibodaux	44		5	5	15	5	5	5	4	0	0
		44	5	5	15	5	5	5	4	0	0
KS City-St. Jos., MO	44		5	5	15	5	5	5	4	0	0
		44	5	5	15	5	5	5	4	0	0
Lafayette, IN	44		5	5	15	5	5	5	4	0	0
		44	5	5	15	5	5	5	4	0	0
Lansing, MI	44		5	5	15	5	5	5	4	0	0
		44	5	5	15	5	5	5	4	0	0
Little Rock, AR	44		5	5	15	5	5	5	4	0	0
		44	5	5	15	5	5	5	4	0	0

APPENDIX D: Dioceses Ranked by 2018 Financial Transparency Score

Archdioceses in bold

Maximum score = 60

Diocese	Total Scores		Scores per Question (see Legend for total possible on each)								
	2018	2017	Q 1	Q 2	Qs 3&4*	Q 5	Q 6	Q 7	Q 8	Q 9	Q 10
Manchester, NH	44		5	5	15	5	5	5	4	0	0
		40	5	5	15	0	5	5	5	0	0
Marquette, MI	44		5	5	15	5	0	5	2	5	2
		52	5	5	15	5	5	5	5	5	2
Pensacola-Tal, FL	44		5	5	15	5	5	5	4	0	0
		44	5	5	15	5	5	5	4	0	0
Providence, RI	44		5	5	15	5	5	5	4	0	0
		44	5	5	15	5	5	5	4	0	0
St. Augustine, FL	44		5	5	15	5	5	5	4	0	0
		44	5	5	15	5	5	5	4	0	0
Washington, DC	44		5	5	15	5	5	5	4	0	0
		44	5	5	15	5	5	5	4	0	0
Wheeling-C'ton, WV	44		5	5	0	5	5	5	4	5	10
		44	5	5	0	5	5	5	4	5	10
Fall River, MA	43		5	5	15	5	5	3	5	0	0
		22	0	5	0	5	5	3	4	0	0
Newark, NJ	42		5	5	15	5	5	5	0	0	2
		25	5	5	0	5	5	5	0	0	0
Pittsburgh, PA	42		5	5	10	5	5	5	0	5	2
		41	5	5	10	5	0	5	4	5	2
Rochester, NY	42		5	5	15	5	5	3	4	0	0
		35	5	5	15	5	5	0	0	0	0
Seattle, WA	42		5	5	2	5	5	5	4	5	6
		42	5	5	2	5	5	5	4	5	6
Albany, NY	40		5	5	15	5	5	5	0	0	0
		20	0	5	0	5	5	5	0	0	0

APPENDIX D: Dioceses Ranked by 2018 Financial Transparency Score

Archdioceses in bold

Maximum score = 60

Diocese	Total Scores		Scores per Question (see Legend for total possible on each)								
	2018	2017	Q 1	Q 2	Qs 3&4*	Q 5	Q 6	Q 7	Q 8	Q 9	Q 10
Boise ID	40		5	5	15	5	5	5	0	0	0
		40	5	5	15	5	5	5	0	0	0
Covington, KY	40		5	5	0	5	5	5	4	5	6
		35	0	5	0	5	5	5	4	5	6
Fargo, ND	40		5	5	15	5	5	5	0	0	0
		40	5	5	15	5	5	5	0	0	0
Galveston-Houston, TX	40		5	5	15	5	5	5	0	0	0
		40	5	5	15	5	5	5	0	0	0
Jefferson City, MO	40		5	5	15	5	5	5	0	0	0
		35	5	5	10	5	5	5	0	0	0
Laredo, TX	40		5	5	15	5	5	5	0	0	0
		40	5	5	15	5	5	5	0	0	0
Nashville, TN	40		5	5	15	5	5	5	0	0	0
		40	5	5	15	5	5	5	0	0	0
Ogdensburg, NY	40		5	5	15	5	5	5	0	0	0
		40	5	5	15	5	5	5	0	0	0
Philadelphia, PA	40		5	5	15	5	5	5	0	0	0
		40	5	5	15	5	5	5	0	0	0
Raleigh, NC	40		5	5	15	5	5	5	0	0	0
		40	5	5	15	5	5	5	0	0	0
Saginaw, MI	40		5	5	15	5	5	5	0	0	0
		40	5	5	15	5	5	5	0	0	0
Toledo, OH	40		5	5	15	5	5	5	0	0	0
		38	5	5	15	5	5	3	0	0	0
Trenton, NJ	40		5	5	10	5	5	5	5	0	0
		15	0	5	0	5	0	5	0	0	0

APPENDIX D: Dioceses Ranked by 2018 Financial Transparency Score

Archdioceses in bold

Maximum score = 60

Diocese	Total Scores		Scores per Question (see Legend for total possible on each)								
	2018	2017	Q 1	Q 2	Qs 3&4*	Q 5	Q 6	Q 7	Q 8	Q 9	Q 10
Oakland, CA	39		5	5	10	5	5	5	4	0	0
		44	5	5	15	5	5	5	4	0	0
San Angelo, TX	44		5	5	15	5	5	5	4	0	0
		39	5	5	15	0	5	5	4	0	0
Spokane, WA	39		0	5	0	5	5	5	4	5	10
		27	0	5	0	5	5	5	0	5	2
Springfield-C.G., MO	39		5	4	15	5	5	5	0	0	0
		40	5	5	15	5	5	5	0	0	0
Tyler, TX	39		5	4	15	5	5	5	0	0	0
		43	5	4	15	5	5	5	4	0	0
Wilmington, DE	39		5	4	15	5	5	5	0	0	0
		40	5	5	15	5	5	5	0	0	0
Juneau, AK	38		5	5	2	5	5	5	4	5	2
		41	5	5	10	5	5	5	0	0	6
Wichita, KS	38		5	5	2	5	5	5	4	5	2
		19	0	5	0	5	0	5	4	0	0
Dodge City, KS	37		5	5	10	5	5	5	0	0	2
		37	5	5	15	5	0	5	0	0	2
Honolulu, HI	37		5	5	2	5	5	5	4	0	6
		37	5	5	2	5	5	5	4	0	6
Monterey, CA	36		5	5	0	5	5	5	0	5	6
		32	5	5	0	5	5	5	0	5	2
Brooklyn, NY	35		5	5	10	5	5	5	0	0	0
		35	5	0	15	5	5	5	0	0	0
Las Vegas, NV	35		5	0	15	5	5	5	0	0	0
		35	5	0	15	5	5	5	0	0	0

APPENDIX D: Dioceses Ranked by 2018 Financial Transparency Score

Archdioceses in bold

Maximum score = 60

Diocese	Total Scores		Scores per Question (see Legend for total possible on each)								
	2018	2017	Q 1	Q 2	Qs 3&4*	Q 5	Q 6	Q 7	Q 8	Q 9	Q 10
Oklahoma City, OK	34		5	4	10	5	5	5	0	0	0
		39	5	4	15	5	5	5	0	0	0
Rockford, IL	35		0	5	0	5	5	5	4	5	6
		30	0	5	0	5	0	5	4	5	6
San Antonio, TX	35		5	0	15	5	5	5	0	0	0
		35	5	0	15	5	5	5	0	0	0
Sioux City, IA	35		0	5	0	5	5	5	4	5	6
		35	0	5	0	5	5	5	4	5	6
Springfield, IL	35		0	5	0	5	5	5	4	5	6
		30	0	4	0	5	5	5	4	5	2
Peoria, IL	34		5	5	2	5	5	5	0	5	2
		34	5	5	2	5	5	5	0	5	2
Metuchen, NJ	33		5	5	2	5	5	5	0	0	6
		27	5	5	2	5	5	5	0	0	0
El Paso, TX	32		5	5	2	5	5	5	0	5	0
		32	5	5	2	5	5	5	0	5	0
Miami, FL	32		5	5	2	5	0	5	4	0	6
		37	5	5	2	5	0	5	4	5	6
Altoona-Johnstown, PA	31		0	5	0	5	5	5	4	5	2
		22	0	5	0	5	0	5	0	5	2
Duluth, MN	31		5	5	2	5	5	5	4	0	0
		39	5	5	10	5	5	5	4	0	0
Greensburg, PA	31		5	5	2	5	5	5	4	0	0
		31	5	5	2	5	5	5	4	0	0
Lincoln, NE	31		5	5	2	5	5	5	4	0	0
		27	5	5	2	5	5	5	0	0	0

APPENDIX D: Dioceses Ranked by 2018 Financial Transparency Score

Archdioceses in bold

Maximum score = 60

Diocese	Total Scores		Scores per Question (see Legend for total possible on each)								
	2018	2017	Q 1	Q 2	Qs 3&4*	Q 5	Q 6	Q 7	Q 8	Q 9	Q 10
New York, NY	31		5	5	2	5	5	5	4	0	0
		27	5	5	2	5	5	5	0	0	0
Superior, WI	31		5	5	2	5	5	5	4	0	0
		31	0	5	0	5	5	5	4	5	2
Winona-Roch., MN	31		0	5	0	5	5	5	4	5	2
		31	0	5	0	5	5	5	4	5	2
Cheyenne, WY	30		5	5	5	5	5	5	0	0	0
		35	5	5	10	5	5	5	0	0	0
Alexandria, LA	29		0	5	0	5	5	5	4	5	0
		29	0	5	0	5	5	5	4	5	0
Helena, MT	29		5	5	0	5	5	5	4	0	0
		29	5	5	0	5	5	5	4	0	0
Rapid City, SD	29		5	5	0	5	5	5	4	0	0
		26	0	5	2	5	5	5	4	0	0
Victoria, TX	29		5	5	0	5	5	5	4	0	0
		24	0	5	0	5	5	5	4	0	0
Pueblo, CO	28		0	5	0	5	5	5	1	5	2
		31	0	5	0	5	5	5	4	5	2
Allentown, PA	27		5	5	2	5	5	5	0	0	0
		15	0	5	0	5	0	5	0	0	0
Baker, OR	27		5	0	0	5	5	5	0	5	2
		27	5	0	0	5	5	5	0	5	2
Colorado Springs	27		5	5	2	5	5	5	0	0	0
		27	5	5	2	5	5	5	0	0	0
Fairbanks, AK	27		5	5	2	5	5	5	0	0	0
		20	0	5	0	5	5	5	0	0	0

APPENDIX D: Dioceses Ranked by 2018 Financial Transparency Score

Archdioceses in bold

Maximum score = 60

Diocese	Total Scores		Scores per Question (see Legend for total possible on each)								
	2018	2017	Q 1	Q 2	Qs 3&4*	Q 5	Q 6	Q 7	Q 8	Q 9	Q 10
Gary, IN	27		5	0	0	5	5	5	0	5	2
		27	5	5	0	5	0	5	0	5	2
Lake Charles, LA	27		5	5	2	5	5	5	0	0	0
		18	0	5	0	5	5	3	0	0	0
Portland, ME	27		5	5	2	5	5	5	0	0	0
		27	5	5	2	5	5	5	0	0	0
St. Cloud, MN	27		5	5	2	5	5	5	0	0	0
		27	5	5	2	5	5	5	0	0	0
St. Paul-Minn., MN	27		5	5	2	5	5	5	0	0	0
		35	5	5	10	5	5	5	0	0	0
Baton Rouge, LA	25		0	5	0	5	0	5	4	0	6
		23	0	5	0	5	0	5	4	0	4
Camden, NJ	25		5	5	0	5	0	5	5	0	0
		10	0	5	0	5	0	0	0	0	0
Gallup, NM	25		0	5	0	5	5	5	0	5	0
		25	0	5	0	5	5	5	0	5	0
Phoenix, AZ	25		5	5	0	5	5	5	0	0	0
		25	5	5	0	5	5	5	0	0	0
Rockville Ctr, NY	25		5	0	5	5	5	5	0	0	0
		35	5	0	10	5	5	5	5	0	0
Birmingham, AL	24		0	5	0	5	5	5	4	0	0
		24	0	5	0	5	5	5	4	0	0
Fresno, CA	24		0	5	0	5	5	5	4	0	0
		15	0	5	0	5	0	5	0	0	0
Norwich, CT	24		5	5	0	5	0	5	4	0	0
		19	0	5	0	5	0	5	4	0	0

APPENDIX D: Dioceses Ranked by 2018 Financial Transparency Score

Archdioceses in bold

Maximum score = 60

Diocese	Total Scores		Scores per Question (see Legend for total possible on each)								
	2018	2017	Q 1	Q 2	Qs 3&4*	Q 5	Q 6	Q 7	Q 8	Q 9	Q 10
Steubenville, OH	24		0	5	0	5	5	5	4	0	0
		24	0	5	0	5	5	5	4	0	0
Scranton, PA	23		0	5	0	5	5	3	5	0	0
		43	5	5	15	5	5	3	5	0	0
Hartford, CT	22		5	4	0	5	5	3	0	0	0
		17	5	4	0	5	0	3	0	0	0
Mobile, AL	22		5	0	2	5	5	5	0	0	0
		10	0	0	0	5	0	5	0	0	0
New Ulm, MN	22		5	5	2	5	0	5	0	0	0
		15	0	5	0	5	0	5	0	0	0
Shreveport, LA	22		5	0	0	5	5	5	0	0	2
		22	5	0	0	5	5	5	0	0	2
Biloxi, MS	20		5	5	0	5	0	5	0	0	0
		10	0	5	0	0	0	5	0	0	0
Crookston, MN	20		5	0	0	5	5	5	0	0	0
		20	0	5	0	5	5	5	0	0	0
Jackson, MS	20		5	5	0	5	0	5	0	0	0
		15	0	5	0	5	0	5	0	0	0
New Orleans, LA	20		0	5	0	0	5	3	0	5	2
		20	0	5	0	0	5	3	0	5	2
Sioux Falls, SD	20		0	5	0	5	5	5	0	0	0
		20	0	5	0	5	5	5	0	0	0
Springfield, MA	20		5	5	0	5	0	5	0	0	0
		30	5	5	0	5	5	5	5	0	0
Harrisburg, PA	19		0	5	0	5	0	5	4	0	0
		19	0	5	0	5	0	5	4	0	0

APPENDIX D: Dioceses Ranked by 2018 Financial Transparency Score

Archdioceses in bold

Maximum score = 60

Diocese	Total Scores		Scores per Question (see Legend for total possible on each)								
	2018	2017	Q 1	Q 2	Qs 3&4*	Q 5	Q 6	Q 7	Q 8	Q 9	Q 10
Orange, CA	19		0	5	0	5	0	5	4	0	0
		19	0	5	0	5	0	5	4	0	0
Santa Fe, NM	19		0	5	0	5	0	5	4	0	0
		19	0	5	0	5	0	5	4	0	0
Salina, KS	18		0	4	0	5	0	5	4	0	0
		18	0	4	0	5	0	5	4	0	0
Brownsville, TX	15		0	5	0	5	0	5	0	0	0
		10	0	5	0	0	0	5	0	0	0
Knoxville, TN	15		0	5	0	5	0	5	0	0	0
		15	0	5	0	5	0	5	0	0	0
Lubbock, TX	15		0	0	0	5	5	5	0	0	0
		20	5	0	0	5	5	5	0	0	0
Portland, OR	15		0	5	0	5	0	5	0	0	0
		15	0	5	0	5	0	5	0	0	0
Tulsa, OK	15		5	5	0	5	0	0	0	0	0
		15	5	5	0	5	0	0	0	0	0
Grand Island, NE	13		0	5	0	5	0	3	0	0	0
		13	0	5	0	5	0	3	0	0	0
St. Thomas, VI	12		0	0	0	5	0	3	4	0	0
		19	0	5	0	5	0	5	4	0	0

* Questions 3 and 4 are interrelated and must therefore be considered as one insofar as scoring is concerned.

LEGEND

Question #1: Can any financial data be found within a few to several minutes?

Question #2: Is there a workable internal “search” function? Deduct 3 points if not on homepage, and 1 point if not on the other pages.

APPENDIX D: Dioceses Ranked by 2018 Financial Transparency Score

Archdioceses in bold

LEGEND (continued)

Questions 3&4: Are audited financial statements posted? If the answer to #3 is “No,” is financial info reported in another format?

Question #5: Is the appeal's purpose explained somewhere on the website, and/or is it reported on the financial statements?

Question #6: Is the cathedraticum explained somewhere on the website, and/or is it reported on the financial statements?

Question #7: Is contact info for the business office posted? Deduct 2 points if only one name is posted and contact info is shown.

Question #8: Is the finance council identified? Deduct 3 points if less than 3 lay members and 1 point if no credentials are posted.

Question #9: Are parish financial guidelines posted?

Question #10: Are detailed collection & counting procedures posted? Deduct 4 points if procedures do not require numbered containers or 3 counters aren't required.

Question #6: Is the cathedraticum explained somewhere on the website, and/or is it reported on the financial statements?

Question #7: Is contact info for the business office posted? Deduct 2 points if only one name is posted and contact info is shown.

Question #8: Is the finance council identified? Deduct 3 points if less than 3 lay members and 1 point if no credentials are posted.

Question #9: Are parish financial guidelines posted?

Question #10: Are detailed collection & counting procedures posted? Deduct 4 points if the procedures do not require numbered containers or 3 counters aren't required.

Total possible score is 60:

Question	1	2	3 & 4	5	6	7	8	9	10	Total
Max. Score	5	5	15	5	5	5	5	5	10	60

Appendix E: Data Subsets

Selected snapshots of the findings from the 2018 review of diocesan financial transparency:

- ❖ Top-scoring and lowest-scoring dioceses (E-1)
- ❖ Comparisons of assets and demographics among top and bottom scoring dioceses (E-2)
- ❖ Dioceses with the greatest improvement in scores (E-3)
- ❖ Dioceses where scores regressed in 2018 (E-4)

Table 1 – Highest and Lowest Financial Transparency Scores in 2018
(*archdioceses in bold*)

Top Scores (56 to 60 points)			Bottom Scores (12 to 19 points)		
Diocese	Score	Audited Report?	Diocese	Score	Audited Report?
Orlando FL	60	Yes	Harrisburg PA	19	No
Burlington VT	60	Yes*(Qualified)	Orange CA	19	No
Atlanta GA	59	Yes	Santa Fe NM	19	No
Baltimore MD	59	Yes	Salina KS	18	No
Sacramento CA	59	Yes	Brownsville TX	10	No
Bismarck ND	56	Yes	Knoxville TN	15	No
Bridgeport CT	56	Yes	Lubbock TX	15	No
Buffalo NY	56	Yes	Portland OR	15	No
Des Moines IA	56	Yes	Tulsa OK	15	No
Ft. Wayne-South Bend IN	56	Yes	Grand Island NE	13	No
Milwaukee WI	56	Yes	St. Thomas VI	12	No
Omaha NE	56	Yes			
San Diego CA	56	Yes			

Thirteen dioceses scored 56 or higher in 2018. Eleven dioceses scored 19 or lower. As in the 2017 review, there was no correlation of scores with diocesan assets, size or geographic region.

Appendix E: Data Subsets

Table 2 – Physical Sizes and Assets of Top-Scoring Dioceses in 2018
(archdioceses in bold)

Diocese	2018 Score	Net Assets (\$)	# Catholics	# Parishes
Burlington VT	60	26,327,709	118,000	73 (+20 missions)
Orlando FL	60	65,803,869	418,834	79 (+12 missions)
Atlanta GA	59	219,257,011	1,200,000	103
Baltimore MD	59	73,778,120	500,393	144 (+8 missions)
Sacramento CA	59	104,487,093	1,000,000	102 (+42 missions)
Bismarck ND	56	24,353,553	61,862	97
Bridgeport CT	56	43,013,915	460,000	82
Buffalo NY	56	45,601,864	600,000	163
Des Moines IA	56	11,907,598	97,000	80
Ft. Wayne-S. Bend IN	56	23,961,453	159,825	82
Milwaukee WI	56	61,742,704	544,407	195
Omaha NE	56	72,314,639	230,000	140
San Diego CA	56	41,167,629	1,002,223	98 (+13 missions)

The degree of financial transparency in a diocese does not correlate with its net assets, how many Catholics reside there, the number of parishes, or various other demographic characteristics reported in the Voice of the Faithful diocesan finances database. Nor does its status as an archdiocese.


Table 2 – Physical Sizes and Assets of Lowest-Scoring Dioceses in 2018
(archdioceses in bold)

Diocese	2018 Score	Net Assets (\$)	# Catholics	# Parishes
Harrisburg PA	19	26,327,709	233,910	88 (+7 missions)
Orange CA	19	110,716,850	1,547,000	62
Santa Fe NM	19	??	314,100	93 (+226 missions)
Salina KS	18	??	46,671	84
Brownsville TX	10	??	1,147,634	71 (+44 missions)
Knoxville TN	15	[did report revenue]	66,000	50 (+2 missions)
Lubbock TX	15	[last report was 2013]	138,772	63
Portland OR	15	??	455,080	124 (+23 missions)
Tulsa OK	15	??	60,795	78
Grand Island NE	13	??	56,993	69
St. Thomas VI	12	??	30,000	7

As with highest-scoring dioceses, those with the lowest scores do not demonstrate a correlation on net assets, number of Catholics, number of parishes, or other demographic characteristics.


Appendix E: Data Subsets

Figure 1 – Most Improved from 2017 to 2018



Appendix E: Data Subsets

Figure 2 – Regressing from 2017 to 2018



Appendix F: Raw Data

VOTF 2018 FINANCIAL TRANSPARENCY SCORES FOR ARCHDIOCESES - 2018 SCORING ORDER

<u>ARCHDIOCESE</u>	<u>YEAR</u>	<u>Ques. 1</u>	<u>Ques. 2</u>	<u>Qs. 3&4*</u>	<u>Ques. 5</u>	<u>Ques. 6</u>	<u>Ques. 7</u>	<u>Ques. 8</u>	<u>Ques. 9</u>	<u>Ques. 10</u>	<u>TOTAL</u>	<u>PERCENT</u>	<u>RANK</u>	<u>Opinion</u>
Atlanta	2018	5	5	15	5	5	5	4	5	10	59	98%	1T	U
Atlanta	2017	5	0	15	5	5	5	4	5	6	50	83%	8T	
Baltimore	2018	5	5	15	5	5	5	4	5	10	59	98%	1T	U
Baltimore	2017	5	5	15	5	5	5	0	5	10	55	92%	2T	
Milwaukee	2018	5	5	15	5	5	5	5	5	6	56	93%	3T	U
Milwaukee	2017	5	5	15	5	5	5	5	5	6	56	93%	1	
Omaha	2018	5	5	15	5	5	5	5	5	6	56	93%	3T	U
Omaha	2017	0	5	0	5	0	5	0	5	6	26	43%	26	
Chicago	2018	5	5	15	5	5	5	0	5	10	55	92%	5T	U
Chicago	2017	5	5	10	5	5	5	0	5	10	50	83%	8T	
Kansas City	2018	5	5	15	5	5	5	4	5	6	55	92%	5T	U
Kansas City	2017	5	5	15	5	5	5	4	5	6	55	92%	2T	
San Francisco	2018	5	5	15	5	5	5	4	5	6	55	92%	5T	U
San Francisco	2017	5	5	15	5	5	5	0	5	6	51	85%	4T	
St. Louis	2018	5	5	15	5	5	5	4	5	6	55	92%	5T	U
St. Louis	2017	5	5	15	5	5	5	4	5	2	51	85%	4T	
Boston	2018	5	2	15	5	5	5	5	5	6	53	88%	9	U
Boston	2017	5	0	15	5	5	5	5	0	6	46	77%	13	
Detroit	2018	5	5	15	5	5	5	4	5	2	51	85%	10T	U
Detroit	2017	5	5	15	5	5	5	4	5	2	51	85%	4T	
Indianapolis	2018	5	5	15	5	5	5	4	5	2	51	85%	10T	U
Indianapolis	2017	5	5	15	5	5	5	4	5	2	51	85%	4T	
Louisville	2018	5	5	15	5	5	5	0	5	6	51	85%	10T	U
Louisville	2017	5	5	15	5	5	5	0	5	2	47	78%	11T	
Cincinnati	2018	5	5	15	5	5	3	0	5	6	49	82%	13	U
Cincinnati	2017	5	5	15	5	5	3	0	5	6	49	82%	10	
Dubuque	2018	5	5	10	5	5	5	5	5	2	47	78%	14T	U
Dubuque	2017	5	5	10	5	5	5	5	5	2	47	78%	11T	
Los Angeles	2018	5	5	15	5	5	5	0	5	2	47	78%	14T	U
Los Angeles	2017	5	5	15	5	5	5	0	5	0	45	75%	14T	

ARCHDIOCESE	YEAR	Ques. 1	Ques. 2	Qs. 3&4*	Ques. 5	Ques. 6	Ques. 7	Ques. 8	Ques. 9	Ques. 10	TOTAL	Pct. Total	RANK	Opinion
Denver	2018	5	5	2	5	5	5	4	5	10	46	77%	16	
Denver	2017	5	4	2	5	5	5	4	5	6	41	68%	18	
Anchorage	2018	5	5	15	5	5	5	0	5	0	45	75%	17	U
Anchorage	2017	5	5	15	5	5	5	0	5	0	45	75%	14T	
Washington, DC	2018	5	5	15	5	5	5	4	0	0	44	73%	18	U
Washington, DC	2017	5	5	15	5	5	5	4	0	0	44	73%	16	
Newark	2018	5	5	15	5	5	5	0	0	2	42	70%	19T	U
Newark	2017	5	5	0	5	5	5	0	0	0	25	42%	27	
Seattle	2018	5	5	2	5	5	5	4	5	6	42	70%	19T	
Seattle	2017	5	5	2	5	5	5	4	5	6	42	70%	17	
Galveston-Houston	2018	5	5	15	5	5	5	0	0	0	40	67%	21T	U
Galveston-Houston	2017	5	5	15	5	5	5	0	0	0	40	67%	19T	
Philadelphia	2018	5	5	15	5	5	5	0	0	0	40	67%	21T	U
Philadelphia	2017	5	5	15	5	5	5	0	0	0	40	67%	19T	
San Antonio	2018	5	0	15	5	5	5	0	0	0	35	58%	23	U
San Antonio	2017	5	0	15	5	5	5	0	0	0	35	58%	23T	
Oklahoma City	2018	5	4	10	5	5	5	0	0	0	34	57%	24	U
Oklahoma City	2017	5	4	15	5	5	5	0	0	0	39	65%	21	
Miami	2018	5	5	2	5	0	5	4	0	6	32	53%	25	
Miami	2017	5	5	2	5	0	5	4	5	6	37	62%	22	
New York	2018	5	5	2	5	5	5	4	0	0	31	52%	26	
New York	2017	5	5	2	5	5	5	0	0	0	27	45%	25	
St. Paul-Mpls.	2018	5	5	2	5	5	5	0	0	0	27	45%	27	
St. Paul-Mpls.	2017	5	5	10	5	5	5	0	0	0	35	58%	23T	
Hartford	2018	5	4	0	5	5	3	0	0	0	22	37%	28T	
Hartford	2017	5	4	0	5	0	3	0	0	0	17	28%	30	
Mobile	2018	5	0	2	5	5	5	0	0	0	22	37%	28T	
Mobile	2017	0	0	0	5	0	5	0	0	0	10	17%	32	

ARCHDIOCESE	YEAR	Ques. 1	Ques. 2	Qs. 3&4*	Ques. 5	Ques. 6	Ques. 7	Ques. 8	Ques. 9	Ques. 10	TOTAL	Pct. Total	RANK	Opinion
New Orleans	2018	0	5	0	0	5	3	0	5	2	20	33%	30	
New Orleans	2017	0	5	0	0	5	3	0	5	2	20	33%	28	
Santa Fe	2018	0	5	0	5	0	5	4	0	0	19	32%	31	
Santa Fe	2017	0	5	0	5	0	5	4	0	0	19	32%	29	
Portland, OR	2018	0	5	0	5	0	5	0	0	0	15	25%	32	
Portland, OR	2017	0	5	0	5	0	5	0	0	0	15	25%	31	
TOTAL POINTS	2018	145	145	332	155	145	154	72	95	112	1355	71%		
TOTAL POINTS	2017	135	137	308	155	130	154	55	95	92	1261	66%		
DIFFERENCE		10	8	24	0	15	0	17	0	20	94			
PERCENT CHANGE		7%	6%	8%	0%	12%	0%	31%	0%	22%	7%			
QUESTION VALUE		5	5	15	5	5	5	5	5	10	60			
AVERAGE SCORE	2018	4.5	4.5	10.4	4.8	4.5	4.8	2.3	3.0	3.5	42.3			
AVERAGE SCORE	2017	4.2	4.3	9.6	4.8	4.1	4.8	1.7	3.0	2.9	39.4			
PERCENT SCORE	2018	91%	91%	69%	97%	91%	96%	45%	59%	35%	71%			
PERCENT SCORE	2017	84%	86%	64%	97%	81%	96%	34%	59%	29%	66%			

* Questions 3 and 4 are interrelated and must therefore be considered as one insofar as scoring is concerned.

LEGEND

Question #1: Can any financial data be found within a few to several minutes?

Question #2: Is there a workable internal "search" function? Deduct 3 points if not on homepage, and 1 point if not on the other pages.

Questions 3&4: Are audited financial statements posted? If the answer to #3 is "No," is financial info reported in another format?

Question #5: Is the appeal's purpose explained somewhere on the website, and/or is it reported on the financial statements?

Question #6: Is the cathedraticum explained somewhere on the website, and/or is it reported on the financial statements?

Question #7: Is contact info for the business office posted? Deduct 2 points if only one name is posted and their contact info is shown.

Question #8: Is the finance council identified? Deduct 3 points if less than 3 lay members and 1 point if no credentials are posted.

Question #9: Are parish financial guidelines posted?

Question #10: Are detailed collection & counting procedures posted? Deduct 4 points ea. if numbered containers or 3 counters aren't required.

Appendix F: Raw Data

VOTF 2018 FINANCIAL TRANSPARENCY SCORES FOR DIOCESES - 2018 SCORING ORDER

<u>DIOCESE</u>	<u>YEAR</u>	<u>Ques. 1</u>	<u>Ques. 2</u>	<u>Qs. 3&4*</u>	<u>Ques. 5</u>	<u>Ques. 6</u>	<u>Ques. 7</u>	<u>Ques. 8</u>	<u>Ques. 9</u>	<u>Ques. 10</u>	<u>TOTAL</u>	<u>PERCENT</u>	<u>RANK</u>	<u>Opinion</u>
Burlington, VT	2018	5	5	15	5	5	5	5	5	10	60	100%	1T	Q-2
Burlington, VT	2017	5	5	15	5	5	5	4	0	0	44	73%	39T	
Orlando, FL	2018	5	5	15	5	5	5	5	5	10	60	100%	1T	U
Orlando, FL	2017	5	5	2	5	0	5	4	0	0	26	43%	111T	
Sacramento, CA	2018	5	5	15	5	5	5	4	5	10	59	98%	3	U
Sacramento, CA	2017	5	4	15	5	5	5	5	5	10	59	98%	1	
Bismarck, ND	2018	5	5	15	5	5	5	5	5	6	56	93%	4T	U
Bismarck, ND	2017	5	5	10	5	5	5	5	5	2	47	78%	26T	
Bridgeport, CT	2018	5	5	15	5	5	5	5	5	6	56	93%	4T	U
Bridgeport, CT	2017	5	4	15	5	5	5	5	5	6	55	92%	4T	
Buffalo, NY	2018	5	5	15	5	5	5	5	5	6	56	93%	4T	U
Buffalo, NY	2017	5	5	15	5	5	5	4	5	6	55	92%	4T	
Des Moines, IA	2018	5	5	15	5	5	5	5	5	6	56	93%	4T	U
Des Moines, IA	2017	5	5	15	5	5	5	5	5	6	56	93%	2T	
Ft. Wayne-So. Bend	2018	5	5	15	5	5	5	5	5	6	56	93%	4T	U
Ft. Wayne-So. Bend	2017	5	5	0	5	5	5	0	5	4	34	57%	85T	
San Diego, CA	2018	5	5	15	5	5	5	5	5	6	56	93%	4T	U
San Diego, CA	2017	0	5	0	5	5	5	0	5	6	31	52%	89T	
Austin, TX	2018	5	5	15	5	5	5	0	5	10	55	92%	10T	U
Austin, TX	2017	5	5	15	5	5	5	0	5	6	51	85%	16T	
Belleville, IL	2018	5	5	15	5	5	5	4	5	6	55	92%	10T	U
Belleville, IL	2017	5	5	15	5	5	5	4	5	6	55	92%	4T	
Cleveland, OH	2018	5	4	15	5	5	5	5	5	6	55	92%	10T	U
Cleveland, OH	2017	5	5	15	5	5	5	5	5	6	56	93%	2T	
Erie, PA	2018	5	5	15	5	5	5	4	5	6	55	92%	10T	U
Erie, PA	2017	5	5	15	5	5	5	0	5	4	49	82%	23T	
Paterson-Clifton	2018	5	5	15	5	5	5	4	5	6	55	92%	10T	U
Paterson-Clifton	2017	5	5	15	5	5	5	4	5	6	55	92%	4T	

DIOCESE	YEAR	Ques. 1	Ques. 2	Qs. 3&4*	Ques. 5	Ques. 6	Ques. 7	Ques. 8	Ques. 9	Ques. 10	TOTAL	PERCENT	RANK	Opinion
San Jose, CA	2018	5	5	15	5	5	5	4	5	6	55	92%	10T	U
San Jose, CA	2017	5	5	15	5	5	5	4	5	6	55	92%	4T	
Savannah, GA	2018	5	5	15	5	5	5	0	5	10	55	92%	10T	U
Savannah, GA	2017	5	5	15	5	5	5	0	5	10	55	92%	4T	
Stockton, CA	2018	5	5	15	5	5	5	0	5	10	55	92%	10T	U
Stockton, CA	2017	5	5	5	5	5	5	0	5	10	45	75%	37T	
Syracuse, NY	2018	5	5	15	5	5	5	4	5	6	55	92%	10T	U
Syracuse, NY	2017	5	5	15	5	5	5	4	5	6	55	92%	4T	
Venice, FL	2018	5	5	15	5	5	5	4	5	6	55	92%	10T	Q-?
Venice, FL	2017	5	5	15	5	5	5	4	5	6	55	92%	4T	
Yakima, WA	2018	5	5	15	5	5	5	4	5	6	55	92%	10T	U
Yakima, WA	2017	5	5	15	5	5	5	4	5	6	55	92%	4T	
Charleston, SC	2018	5	0	15	5	5	5	4	5	10	54	90%	21	U
Charleston, SC	2017	5	0	15	5	5	5	4	5	2	46	77%	35T	
Corpus Christi, TX	2018	5	5	15	5	5	5	5	5	2	52	87%	22T	U
Corpus Christi, TX	2017	5	5	15	5	5	5	5	0	2	47	78%	26T	
Davenport, IA	2018	5	5	15	5	5	5	5	5	2	52	87%	22T	U
Davenport, IA	2017	5	5	15	5	5	5	0	5	2	47	78%	26T	
Joliet, IL	2018	5	5	15	5	5	5	5	5	2	52	87%	22T	U
Joliet, IL	2017	5	5	15	5	5	5	5	5	2	52	87%	13T	
Charlotte, NC	2018	5	5	15	5	5	5	0	5	6	51	85%	25T	U
Charlotte, NC	2017	5	5	15	5	5	5	0	5	6	51	85%	16T	
Dallas, TX	2018	5	5	15	5	5	5	4	5	2	51	85%	25T	U
Dallas, TX	2017	5	5	15	5	5	5	4	5	2	51	85%	16T	
Gaylord, MI	2018	5	5	15	5	5	5	0	5	6	51	85%	25T	U
Gaylord, MI	2017	5	5	15	5	5	5	0	5	6	51	85%	16T	
La Crosse, WI	2018	5	5	15	5	5	5	0	5	6	51	85%	25T	Q
La Crosse, WI	2017	0	5	10	5	5	3	0	0	0	28	47%	101	
Lafayette, LA	2018	5	5	15	5	5	5	4	5	2	51	85%	25T	U
Lafayette, LA	2017	0	5	0	5	5	5	4	5	2	31	52%	89T	

DIOCESE	YEAR	Ques. 1	Ques. 2	Qs. 3&4*	Ques. 5	Ques. 6	Ques. 7	Ques. 8	Ques. 9	Ques. 10	TOTAL	PERCENT	RANK	Opinion
Owensboro, KY	2018	5	5	15	5	5	5	4	5	2	51	85%	25T	U
Owensboro, KY	2017	5	5	15	5	5	5	0	5	2	47	78%	26T	
Reno, NV	2018	5	5	15	5	5	5	4	5	2	51	85%	25T	U
Reno, NV	2017	5	5	0	5	0	5	4	5	2	31	52%	89T	
Richmond, VA	2018	5	5	15	5	5	5	0	5	6	51	85%	25T	U
Richmond, VA	2017	5	5	15	5	5	5	0	5	2	47	78%	26T	
Worcester, MA	2018	5	5	15	5	5	5	4	5	2	51	85%	25T	U
Worcester, MA	2017	5	5	15	5	5	5	4	5	2	51	85%	16T	
Youngstown, OH	2018	5	5	15	5	5	5	0	5	6	51	85%	25T	U
Youngstown, OH	2017	5	5	15	5	5	3	0	5	6	49	82%	23T	
Santa Rosa, CA	2018	5	0	15	5	5	5	4	5	6	50	83%	35T	U
Santa Rosa, CA	2017	5	0	10	5	5	5	4	0	2	36	60%	75	
Amarillo	2018	5	5	15	5	5	5	4	5	0	49	82%	35T	Q-2
Amarillo	2017	5	5	15	5	5	3	4	5	0	47	78%	26T	
Kalamazoo, MI	2018	5	5	15	5	5	5	4	5	0	49	82%	35T	U
Kalamazoo, MI	2017	5	5	15	5	5	5	4	5	0	49	82%	23T	
Palm Beach, FL	2018	5	0	15	5	5	5	4	0	10	49	82%	35T	U
Palm Beach, FL	2017	5	5	15	5	5	5	0	0	10	50	83%	21T	
Great Falls-Billings	2018	5	4	15	5	5	5	4	5	0	48	80%	39	U
Great Falls-Billings	2017	5	4	15	5	5	5	0	5	0	44	73%	39T	
Green Bay, WI	2018	5	5	15	5	5	5	0	5	2	47	78%	40T	U
Green Bay, WI	2017	5	5	15	5	5	5	0	5	2	47	78%	26T	
Las Cruces, NM	2018	5	5	15	5	5	5	0	5	2	47	78%	40T	Q
Las Cruces, NM	2017	5	5	15	5	5	5	0	5	2	47	78%	26T	
Lexington, KY	2018	5	0	15	5	5	5	5	5	2	47	78%	40T	U
Lexington, KY	2017	0	0	0	5	5	5	4	0	0	19	32%	127T	
Madison, WI	2018	5	5	15	5	5	5	0	5	2	47	78%	40T	U
Madison, WI	2017	0	5	0	5	5	5	0	5	2	27	45%	102T	
Memphis, TN	2018	5	5	15	5	5	5	0	5	2	47	78%	40T	Q
Memphis, TN	2017	5	5	15	5	5	5	0	5	2	47	78%	26T	

DIOCESE	YEAR	Ques. 1	Ques. 2	Qs. 3&4*	Ques. 5	Ques. 6	Ques. 7	Ques. 8	Ques. 9	Ques. 10	TOTAL	PERCENT	RANK	Opinion
Salt Lake City, UT	2018	5	5	15	5	5	5	0	5	2	47	78%	40T	U
Salt Lake City, UT	2017	5	5	15	5	5	5	5	5	2	52	87%	13T	
St. Petersburg, FL	2018	5	5	15	5	5	5	0	5	2	47	78%	40T	U
St. Petersburg, FL	2017	5	5	10	5	5	5	0	5	2	42	70%	56	
Beaumont, TX	2018	5	5	2	5	5	5	4	5	10	46	77%	47	
Beaumont, TX	2017	5	5	2	5	5	5	4	5	10	46	77%	35T	
San Bernardino, CA	2018	5	5	5	5	5	5	4	5	6	45	75%	48T	U
San Bernardino, CA	2017	5	0	10	5	5	5	4	5	6	45	75%	37T	
Tucson, AZ	2018	5	4	10	5	5	5	0	5	6	45	75%	48T	U
Tucson, AZ	2017	5	4	15	5	5	5	0	5	6	50	83%	21T	
Arlington, VA	2018	5	5	15	5	5	5	4	0	0	44	73%	50T	U
Arlington, VA	2017	5	5	15	5	5	5	4	0	0	44	73%	39T	
Columbus, OH	2018	5	5	0	5	5	5	4	5	10	44	73%	50T	
Columbus, OH	2017	0	5	0	5	5	5	4	5	10	39	65%	69T	
Evansville, IN	2018	5	5	15	5	5	5	4	0	0	44	73%	50T	Q
Evansville, IN	2017	5	5	10	5	5	5	0	0	0	35	58%	76T	
Fort Worth, TX	2018	5	5	15	5	5	5	4	0	0	44	73%	50T	U
Fort Worth, TX	2017	5	5	15	5	5	5	4	0	0	44	73%	39T	
Grand Rapids, MI	2018	5	5	15	5	5	5	4	0	0	44	73%	50T	U
Grand Rapids, MI	2017	5	5	15	5	5	5	4	0	0	44	73%	39T	
Houma-Thibodaux	2018	5	5	15	5	5	5	4	0	0	44	73%	50T	U
Houma-Thibodaux	2017	5	5	15	5	5	5	4	0	0	44	73%	39T	
KS City-St. Jos., MO	2018	5	5	15	5	5	5	4	0	0	44	73%	50T	U
KS City-St. Jos., MO	2017	5	5	15	5	5	5	4	0	0	44	73%	39T	
Lafayette, IN	2018	5	5	15	5	5	5	4	0	0	44	73%	50T	U
Lafayette, IN	2017	5	5	15	5	5	5	4	0	0	44	73%	39T	
Lansing, MI	2018	5	5	15	5	5	5	4	0	0	44	73%	50T	U
Lansing, MI	2017	5	5	15	5	5	5	4	0	0	44	73%	39T	
Little Rock, AR	2018	5	5	15	5	5	5	4	0	0	44	73%	50T	U
Little Rock, AR	2017	5	5	15	5	5	5	4	0	0	44	73%	39T	

DIOCESE	YEAR	Ques. 1	Ques. 2	Qs. 3&4*	Ques. 5	Ques. 6	Ques. 7	Ques. 8	Ques. 9	Ques. 10	TOTAL	PERCENT	RANK	Opinion
Manchester, NH	2018	5	5	15	5	5	5	4	0	0	44	73%	50T	U
Manchester, NH	2017	5	5	15	0	5	5	5	0	0	40	67%	59T	
Marquette, MI	2018	5	5	15	5	0	5	2	5	2	44	73%	50T	U
Marquette, MI	2017	5	5	15	5	5	5	5	5	2	52	87%	13T	
Pensacola-Tal, FL	2018	5	5	15	5	5	5	4	0	0	44	73%	50T	U
Pensacola-Tal, FL	2017	5	5	15	5	5	5	4	0	0	44	73%	39T	
Providence, RI	2018	5	5	15	5	5	5	4	0	0	44	73%	50T	U
Providence, RI	2017	5	5	15	5	5	5	4	0	0	44	73%	39T	
San Angelo, TX	2018	5	5	15	5	5	5	4	0	0	44	73%	50T	U
San Angelo, TX	2017	5	5	15	0	5	5	4	0	0	39	65%	69T	
St. Augustine, FL	2018	5	5	15	5	5	5	4	0	0	44	73%	50T	U
St. Augustine, FL	2017	5	5	15	5	5	5	4	0	0	44	73%	39T	
Wheeling-C'ton, WV	2018	5	5	0	5	5	5	4	5	10	44	73%	50T	
Wheeling-C'ton, WV	2017	5	5	0	5	5	5	4	5	10	44	73%	39T	
Fall River, MA	2018	5	5	15	5	5	3	5	0	0	43	72%	67	U
Fall River, MA	2017	0	5	0	5	5	3	4	0	0	22	37%	119T	
Pittsburgh, PA	2018	5	5	10	5	5	5	0	5	2	42	70%	68T	U
Pittsburgh, PA	2017	5	5	10	5	0	5	4	5	2	41	68%	57T	
Rochester, NY	2018	5	5	15	5	5	3	4	0	0	42	70%	68T	U
Rochester, NY	2017	5	5	15	5	5	0	0	0	0	35	58%	76T	
Albany, NY	2018	5	5	15	5	5	5	0	0	0	40	67%	70T	U
Albany, NY	2017	0	5	0	5	5	5	0	0	0	20	33%	122T	
Boise ID	2018	5	5	15	5	5	5	0	0	0	40	67%	70T	U
Boise ID	2017	5	5	15	5	5	5	0	0	0	40	67%	59T	
Covington, KY	2018	5	5	0	5	5	5	4	5	6	40	67%	70T	
Covington, KY	2017	0	5	0	5	5	5	4	5	6	35	58%	76T	
Fargo, ND	2018	5	5	15	5	5	5	0	0	0	40	67%	70T	Q
Fargo, ND	2017	5	5	15	5	5	5	0	0	0	40	67%	59T	
Jefferson City, MO	2018	5	5	15	5	5	5	0	0	0	40	67%	70T	U
Jefferson City, MO	2017	5	5	10	5	5	5	0	0	0	35	58%	76T	

DIOCESE	YEAR	Ques. 1	Ques. 2	Qs. 3&4*	Ques. 5	Ques. 6	Ques. 7	Ques. 8	Ques. 9	Ques. 10	TOTAL	PERCENT	RANK	Opinion
Laredo, TX	2018	5	5	15	5	5	5	0	0	0	40	67%	70T	U
Laredo, TX	2017	5	5	15	5	5	5	0	0	0	40	67%	59T	
Nashville, TN	2018	5	5	15	5	5	5	0	0	0	40	67%	70T	U
Nashville, TN	2017	5	5	15	5	5	5	0	0	0	40	67%	59T	
Ogdensburg, NY	2018	5	5	15	5	5	5	0	0	0	40	67%	70T	U
Ogdensburg, NY	2017	5	5	15	5	5	5	0	0	0	40	67%	59T	
Raleigh, NC	2018	5	5	15	5	5	5	0	0	0	40	67%	70T	U
Raleigh, NC	2017	5	5	15	5	5	5	0	0	0	40	67%	59T	
Saginaw, MI	2018	5	5	15	5	5	5	0	0	0	40	67%	70T	Q-5
Saginaw, MI	2017	5	5	15	5	5	5	0	0	0	40	67%	59T	
Toledo, OH	2018	5	5	15	5	5	5	0	0	0	40	67%	70T	U
Toledo, OH	2017	5	5	15	5	5	3	0	0	0	38	63%	72	
Trenton, NJ	2018	5	5	10	5	5	5	5	0	0	40	67%	70T	U
Trenton, NJ	2017	0	5	0	5	0	5	0	0	0	15	25%	135T	
Oakland, CA	2018	5	5	10	5	5	5	4	0	0	39	65%	82T	U
Oakland, CA	2017	5	5	15	5	5	5	4	0	0	44	73%	39T	
Spokane, WA	2018	0	5	0	5	5	5	4	5	10	39	65%	82T	
Spokane, WA	2017	0	5	0	5	5	5	0	5	2	27	45%	102T	
Springfield-C.G., MO	2018	5	4	15	5	5	5	0	0	0	39	65%	82T	U
Springfield-C.G., MO	2017	5	5	15	5	5	5	0	0	0	40	67%	59T	
Tyler, TX	2018	5	4	15	5	5	5	0	0	0	39	65%	82T	U
Tyler, TX	2017	5	4	15	5	5	5	4	0	0	43	72%	54T	
Wilmington, DE	2018	5	4	15	5	5	5	0	0	0	39	65%	82T	U
Wilmington, DE	2017	5	5	15	5	5	5	0	0	0	40	67%	59T	
Juneau, AK	2018	5	5	2	5	5	5	4	5	2	38	63%	87T	
Juneau, AK	2017	5	5	10	5	5	5	0	0	6	41	68%	57T	
Wichita, KS	2018	5	5	2	5	5	5	4	5	2	38	63%	87T	
Wichita, KS	2017	0	5	0	5	0	5	4	0	0	19	32%	127T	
Dodge City, KS	2018	5	5	10	5	5	5	0	0	2	37	62%	89T	U
Dodge City, KS	2017	5	5	15	5	0	5	0	0	2	37	62%	73T	

<u>DIOCESE</u>	<u>YEAR</u>	<u>Ques. 1</u>	<u>Ques. 2</u>	<u>Qs. 3&4*</u>	<u>Ques. 5</u>	<u>Ques. 6</u>	<u>Ques. 7</u>	<u>Ques. 8</u>	<u>Ques. 9</u>	<u>Ques. 10</u>	<u>TOTAL</u>	<u>PERCENT</u>	<u>RANK</u>	<u>Opinion</u>
Honolulu, HI	2018	5	5	2	5	5	5	4	0	6	37	62%	89T	
Honolulu, HI	2017	5	5	2	5	5	5	4	0	6	37	62%	73T	
Monterey, CA	2018	5	5	0	5	5	5	0	5	6	36	60%	91	
Monterey, CA	2017	5	5	0	5	5	5	0	5	2	32	53%	87T	
Brooklyn, NY	2018	5	5	10	5	5	5	0	0	0	35	58%	92T	U
Brooklyn, NY	2017	5	5	10	5	5	5	0	0	0	35	58%	76T	
Las Vegas, NV	2018	5	0	15	5	5	5	0	0	0	35	58%	92T	U
Las Vegas, NV	2017	5	0	15	5	5	5	0	0	0	35	58%	76T	
Rockford, IL	2018	0	5	0	5	5	5	4	5	6	35	58%	92T	
Rockford, IL	2017	0	5	0	5	0	5	4	5	6	30	50%	96T	
Sioux City, IA	2018	0	5	0	5	5	5	4	5	6	35	58%	92T	
Sioux City, IA	2017	0	5	0	5	5	5	4	5	6	35	58%	76T	
Springfield, IL	2018	0	5	0	5	5	5	4	5	6	35	58%	92T	
Springfield, IL	2017	0	4	0	5	5	5	4	5	2	30	50%	96T	
Peoria, IL	2018	5	5	2	5	5	5	0	5	2	34	57%	97	
Peoria, IL	2017	5	5	2	5	5	5	0	5	2	34	57%	85T	
Metuchen, NJ	2018	5	5	2	5	5	5	0	0	6	33	55%	98	
Metuchen, NJ	2017	5	5	2	5	5	5	0	0	0	27	45%	102T	
El Paso, TX	2018	5	5	2	5	5	5	0	5	0	32	53%	99	
El Paso, TX	2017	5	5	2	5	5	5	0	5	0	32	53%	87T	
Altoona-Johnstown	2018	0	5	0	5	5	5	4	5	2	31	52%	100T	
Altoona-Johnstown	2017	0	5	0	5	0	5	0	5	2	22	37%	119T	
Duluth, MN	2018	5	5	2	5	5	5	4	0	0	31	52%	100T	
Duluth, MN	2017	5	5	10	5	5	5	4	0	0	39	65%	69T	
Greensburg, PA	2018	5	5	2	5	5	5	4	0	0	31	52%	100T	
Greensburg, PA	2017	5	5	2	5	5	5	4	0	0	31	52%	89T	
Lincoln, NE	2018	5	5	2	5	5	5	4	0	0	31	52%	100T	
Lincoln, NE	2017	5	5	2	5	5	5	0	0	0	27	45%	102T	
Superior, WI	2018	5	5	2	5	5	5	4	0	0	31	52%	100T	
Superior, WI	2017	0	5	0	5	5	5	4	5	2	31	52%	89T	

<u>DIOCESE</u>	<u>YEAR</u>	<u>Ques. 1</u>	<u>Ques. 2</u>	<u>Qs. 3&4*</u>	<u>Ques. 5</u>	<u>Ques. 6</u>	<u>Ques. 7</u>	<u>Ques. 8</u>	<u>Ques. 9</u>	<u>Ques. 10</u>	<u>TOTAL</u>	<u>PERCENT</u>	<u>RANK</u>	<u>Opinion</u>
Winona-Roch., MN	2018	0	5	0	5	5	5	4	5	2	31	52%	100T	
Winona-Roch., MN	2017	0	5	0	5	5	5	4	5	2	31	52%	89T	
Cheyenne, WY	2018	5	5	5	5	5	5	0	0	0	30	50%	106	U
Cheyenne, WY	2017	5	5	10	5	5	5	0	0	0	35	58%	76T	
Alexandria, LA	2018	0	5	0	5	5	5	4	5	0	29	48%	107T	
Alexandria, LA	2017	0	5	0	5	5	5	4	5	0	29	48%	99T	
Helena, MT	2018	5	5	0	5	5	5	4	0	0	29	48%	107T	
Helena, MT	2017	5	5	0	5	5	5	4	0	0	29	48%	99T	
Rapid City, SD	2018	5	5	0	5	5	5	4	0	0	29	48%	107T	
Rapid City, SD	2017	0	5	2	5	5	5	4	0	0	26	43%	111T	
Victoria, TX	2018	5	5	0	5	5	5	4	0	0	29	48%	107T	
Victoria, TX	2017	0	5	0	5	5	5	4	0	0	24	40%	115T	
Pueblo, CO	2018	0	5	0	5	5	5	1	5	2	28	47%	111	
Pueblo, CO	2017	0	5	0	5	5	5	4	5	2	31	52%	89T	
Allentown, PA	2018	5	5	2	5	5	5	0	0	0	27	45%	112T	
Allentown, PA	2017	0	5	0	5	0	5	0	0	0	15	25%	135T	
Baker, OR	2018	5	0	0	5	5	5	0	5	2	27	45%	112T	
Baker, OR	2017	5	0	0	5	5	5	0	5	2	27	45%	102T	
Colorado Springs	2018	5	5	2	5	5	5	0	0	0	27	45%	112T	
Colorado Springs	2017	5	5	2	5	5	5	0	0	0	27	45%	102T	
Fairbanks, AK	2018	5	5	2	5	5	5	0	0	0	27	45%	112T	no Notes
Fairbanks, AK	2017	0	5	0	5	5	5	0	0	0	20	33%	122T	
Gary, IN	2018	5	0	0	5	5	5	0	5	2	27	45%	112T	
Gary, IN	2017	5	5	0	5	0	5	0	5	2	27	45%	102T	
Lake Charles, LA	2018	5	5	2	5	5	5	0	0	0	27	45%	112T	
Lake Charles, LA	2017	0	5	0	5	5	3	0	0	0	18	30%	133T	
Portland, ME	2018	5	5	2	5	5	5	0	0	0	27	45%	112T	
Portland, ME	2017	5	5	2	5	5	5	0	0	0	27	45%	102T	
St. Cloud, MN	2018	5	5	2	5	5	5	0	0	0	27	45%	112T	
St. Cloud, MN	2017	5	5	2	5	5	5	0	0	0	27	45%	102T	

<u>DIOCESE</u>	<u>YEAR</u>	<u>Ques. 1</u>	<u>Ques. 2</u>	<u>Qs. 3&4*</u>	<u>Ques. 5</u>	<u>Ques. 6</u>	<u>Ques. 7</u>	<u>Ques. 8</u>	<u>Ques. 9</u>	<u>Ques. 10</u>	<u>TOTAL</u>	<u>PERCENT</u>	<u>RANK</u>	<u>Opinion</u>
Baton Rouge, LA	2018	0	5	0	5	0	5	4	0	6	25	42%	120T	
Baton Rouge, LA	2017	0	5	0	5	0	5	4	0	4	23	38%	118	
Camden, NJ	2018	5	5	0	5	0	5	5	0	0	25	42%	120T	
Camden, NJ	2017	0	5	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	10	17%	143T	
Gallup, NM	2018	0	5	0	5	5	5	0	5	0	25	42%	120T	
Gallup, NM	2017	0	5	0	5	5	5	0	5	0	25	42%	113T	
Phoenix, AZ	2018	5	5	0	5	5	5	0	0	0	25	42%	120T	
Phoenix, AZ	2017	5	5	0	5	5	5	0	0	0	25	42%	113T	
Rockville Ctr, NY	2018	5	0	5	5	5	5	0	0	0	25	42%	120T	U
Rockville Ctr, NY	2017	5	0	10	5	5	5	5	0	0	35	58%	76T	
Birmingham, AL	2018	0	5	0	5	5	5	4	0	0	24	40%	125T	
Birmingham, AL	2017	0	5	0	5	5	5	4	0	0	24	40%	115T	
Fresno, CA	2018	0	5	0	5	5	5	4	0	0	24	40%	125T	
Fresno, CA	2017	0	5	0	5	0	5	0	0	0	15	25%	135T	
Norwich, CT	2018	5	5	0	5	0	5	4	0	0	24	40%	125T	
Norwich, CT	2017	0	5	0	5	0	5	4	0	0	19	32%	127T	
Steubenville, OH	2018	0	5	0	5	5	5	4	0	0	24	40%	125T	
Steubenville, OH	2017	0	5	0	5	5	5	4	0	0	24	40%	115T	
Scranton, PA	2018	0	5	0	5	5	3	5	0	0	23	38%	129	
Scranton, PA	2017	5	5	15	5	5	3	5	0	0	43	72%	54T	
New Ulm, MN	2018	5	5	2	5	0	5	0	0	0	22	37%	130T	
New Ulm, MN	2017	0	5	0	5	0	5	0	0	0	15	25%	135T	
Shreveport, LA	2018	5	0	0	5	5	5	0	0	2	22	37%	130T	
Shreveport, LA	2017	5	0	0	5	5	5	0	0	2	22	37%	119T	
Biloxi, MS	2018	5	5	0	5	0	5	0	0	0	20	33%	132T	
Biloxi, MS	2017	0	5	0	0	0	5	0	0	0	10	17%	143T	
Crookston, MN	2018	5	0	0	5	5	5	0	0	0	20	33%	132T	
Crookston, MN	2017	0	5	0	5	5	5	0	0	0	20	33%	122T	
Jackson, MS	2018	5	5	0	5	0	5	0	0	0	20	33%	132T	
Jackson, MS	2017	0	5	0	5	0	5	0	0	0	15	25%	135T	

<u>DIOCESE</u>	<u>YEAR</u>	<u>Ques. 1</u>	<u>Ques. 2</u>	<u>Qs. 3&4*</u>	<u>Ques. 5</u>	<u>Ques. 6</u>	<u>Ques. 7</u>	<u>Ques. 8</u>	<u>Ques. 9</u>	<u>Ques. 10</u>	<u>TOTAL</u>	<u>PERCENT</u>	<u>RANK</u>	<u>Opinion</u>
Sioux Falls, SD	2018	0	5	0	5	5	5	0	0	0	20	33%	132T	
Sioux Falls, SD	2017	0	5	0	5	5	5	0	0	0	20	33%	122T	
Springfield, MA	2018	5	5	0	5	0	5	0	0	0	20	33%	132T	
Springfield, MA	2017	5	5	0	5	5	5	5	0	0	30	50%	96T	
Harrisburg, PA	2018	0	5	0	5	0	5	4	0	0	19	32%	137T	
Harrisburg, PA	2017	0	5	0	5	0	5	4	0	0	19	32%	127T	
Orange, CA	2018	0	5	0	5	0	5	4	0	0	19	32%	137T	
Orange, CA	2017	0	5	0	5	0	5	4	0	0	19	32%	127T	
Salina, KS	2018	0	4	0	5	0	5	4	0	0	18	30%	139	
Salina, KS	2017	0	4	0	5	0	5	4	0	0	18	30%	133T	
Brownsville, TX	2018	0	5	0	5	0	5	0	0	0	15	25%	140T	
Brownsville, TX	2017	0	5	0	0	0	5	0	0	0	10	17%	143T	
Knoxville, TN	2018	0	5	0	5	0	5	0	0	0	15	25%	140T	
Knoxville, TN	2017	0	5	0	5	0	5	0	0	0	15	25%	135T	
Lubbock, TX	2018	0	0	0	5	5	5	0	0	0	15	25%	140T	
Lubbock, TX	2017	5	0	0	5	5	5	0	0	0	20	33%	122T	
Tulsa, OK	2018	5	5	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	15	25%	140T	
Tulsa, OK	2017	5	5	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	15	25%	135T	
Grand Island, NE	2018	0	5	0	5	0	3	0	0	0	13	22%	144	
Grand Island, NE	2017	0	5	0	5	0	3	0	0	0	13	22%	142	
St. Thomas, VI	2018	0	0	0	5	0	3	4	0	0	12	20%	145	
St. Thomas, VI	2017	0	5	0	5	0	5	4	0	0	19	32%	127T	
TOTAL POINTS	2018	610	658	1266	725	645	710	352	345	354	5665			
TOTAL POINTS	2017	505	673	1134	705	600	694	309	310	278	5208			
DIFFERENCE		105	-15	132	20	45	16	43	35	76	457			
PERCENT CHANGE		21%	-2%	12%	3%	8%	2%	14%	11%	27%	9%			
QUESTION VALUE		5	5	15	5	5	5	5	5	10	60			
AVERAGE SCORE	2018	4.2	4.5	8.7	5.0	4.4	4.9	2.4	2.4	2.4	39.1			
AVERAGE SCORE	2017	3.5	4.6	7.8	4.9	4.1	4.8	2.1	2.1	1.9	35.9			
PERCENT SCORE	2018	84%	91%	58%	100%	89%	98%	49%	48%	24%	65%			
PERCENT SCORE	2017	70%	93%	52%	97%	83%	96%	43%	43%	19%	60%			

* Questions 3 and 4 are interrelated and must therefore be considered as one insofar as scoring is concerned.

LEGEND

Question #1: Can any financial data be found within a few to several minutes?

Question #2: Is there a workable internal “search” function? Deduct 3 points if not on homepage, and 1 point if not on the other pages.

Questions 3&4: Are audited financial statements posted? If the answer to #3 is “No,” is financial info reported in another format?

Question #5: Is the appeal's purpose explained somewhere on the website, and/or is it reported on the financial statements?

Question #6: Is the cathedraticum explained somewhere on the website, and/or is it reported on the financial statements?

Question #7: Is contact info for the business office posted? Deduct 2 points if only one name is posted and their contact info is shown.

Question #8: Is the finance council identified? Deduct 3 points if less than 3 lay members and 1 point if no credentials are posted.

Question #9: Are parish financial guidelines posted?

Question #10: Are detailed collection & counting procedures posted? Deduct 4 points if numbered containers or 3 counters aren't required.