



**Lay Involvement in Governance  
of the Church By and Through the  
Diocesan Finance Council:  
2022 Report**



# Lay Involvement in the Governance of the Church by and Through the Diocesan Finance Council: 2022

---

## **Background**

Under the reforms of the Code of Canon Law of 1983 and 1984, each diocese was required to form a Diocesan Finance Council (DFC), and that council was granted duties of “consent” and “consult” on certain matters. Membership in the council was to consist of individuals who were “competent” in matters of finance, law, real estate, etc. This meant that the council must include lay women and men, since few members of the clergy possess the required expertise.

The objective of this survey by Voice of the Faithful (VOTF) was to determine compliance of each diocese with Canon law as to the canons that relate to the DFC. Our working group developed a list of ten (10) questions that referenced specific canons dealing with the duties and authority of the DFC. The group then assigned a weight of 5 to 15 points for each question.

After developing the questions, in the spring of 2021 VOTF sent a notice of the survey and the worksheet questions to all U.S. dioceses. The survey itself began on October 15, 2021, and it concluded on January 15, 2022. Two independent reviewers examined each diocesan website to gather evidential matter and grade each diocese on the 10 questions. Following the independent reviews, the reviewers reconciled any differences in their grading, then ranked the dioceses in descending and alphabetical order.

This is the inaugural survey of lay involvement in governance of the Church by and through the DFCs.

## **Why Is This Survey Important?**

We need look only as far as Canons 492, 493, 494, 1277 and 1287, the primary Canons concerned with the duties and responsibilities of the DFC, to see that if the dioceses had followed Canon Law with regard to full disclosure of financial information and included the settlement payments to the survivors of clerical sexual abuse and had followed canon law with regard to obtaining consent from their finance councils for such “extraordinary” payments under Canon 1277, the scandal, sin, and sickness of child sex abuse would most probably not have persisted as long as it did.

## Lay Involvement in Governance of the Church By and Through DFCs

Arguably, compliance with Canon Law also would have benefitted bishops since they would not have engaged in secret payments to those who suffered abuse and would therefore have avoided the scandalous public disclosure and lack of credibility that eventually resulted from the cover-ups.

### Findings

In the analysis of DFCs, the overall average grade on the review was 31%. With 60% as a passing grade, only 18 (10%) of the 176 dioceses surveyed achieved the passing grade; 158 dioceses (90%) received a failing grade and their average score was 26%.

The top five (5) dioceses had grades from 95% to 80%:

Memphis TN	95%
Kansas City KS	92%
Scranton PA	83%
Atlanta GA	80%
Cheyenne WY	80%

Fifty-six dioceses (32%) received points only for question #1, which asked if the website had a workable search function. Two dioceses—Altoona-Johnstown and Crookston—failed even this minimum score; they received 0 points because their websites did not contain any DFC information or a search function.

Table 1 (page 3) compares scores of the 18 dioceses that passed the governance survey with the scores they received on VOTF's Diocesan Financial Transparency review. All the dioceses with passing governance grades showed a commitment to financial transparency as well. Overall, the 2021 financial transparency scores in these 18 dioceses exceeded their governance scores by an average of 14%. We note that some of these dioceses scored significantly lower on financial transparency scores when first reviewed in 2017 and have made considerable progress in the last five years.

Three of the 18 dioceses with passing grades on governance scored higher than they did on the financial transparency review: *Memphis*, which scored the highest on governance at 95%, scored 87% on finance transparency. *Cheyenne* scored 80% on governance and 70% on financial transparency, and *Fargo* scored 78% on governance and 75% on financial transparency.

## Lay Involvement in Governance of the Church By and Through DFCs

**Table 1: Comparing Governance Grades with Financial Transparency Scores**  
*Archdioceses in bold*

Diocese	Governance Score 2022	Financial Transparency Scores	
		2021	2017
Memphis TN	95%	87%	78%
<b>Kansas City KS</b>	<b>92%</b>	<b>96%</b>	<b>92%</b>
Scranton PA	83%	100%	72%
<b>Atlanta GA</b>	<b>80%</b>	<b>96%</b>	<b>83%</b>
Cheyenne WY	80%	70%	58%
Fall River MA	78%	92%	37%
Fargo ND	78%	75%	67%
Fort Wayne-South Bend IN	75%	96%	57%
Rochester NY	75%	90%	58%
<b>Baltimore MD</b>	<b>73%</b>	<b>96%</b>	<b>92%</b>
Greensburg PA	68%	92%	52%
San Diego CA	68%	93%	52%
Metuchen NJ	65%	54%	45%
<b>Seattle WA</b>	<b>65%</b>	<b>86%</b>	<b>70%</b>
Trenton NJ	65%	92%	25%
Rapid City SD	63%	72%	43%
Raleigh NC	62%	92%	67%
<b>St. Paul-Minneapolis MN</b>	<b>60%</b>	<b>92%</b>	<b>58%</b>
<b>Average</b>	<b>73.6%</b>	<b>87.3%</b>	<b>61%</b>

*Comparison of Diocesan Financial Transparency scores and Governance scores for the 18 dioceses that had passing grades (60%) on the Governance survey.*

Table 2 (page 4) demonstrates that although all dioceses with passing governance grades have shown a clear commitment to financial transparency, the reverse is not the case. Those dioceses with the highest scores on the Diocesan Financial Transparency review, on average, had governance scores 40% lower. *Kansas City* is the only diocese whose transparency score and governance score are nearly the same. Both scores ranked very high at 96% and 92% respectively. Of the four dioceses that scored 100% on the 2021 finance transparency review, *Scranton* is the only one that received a passing grade of 83% on the governance review.

However, it is interesting to compare the scores in 2017 and 2021 on the Financial Transparency survey for the dioceses listed in Table 1. During the five years of that review, their average score went from 61% in 2017 to 87% in 2021. This represents an impressive 43% improvement over the average 2017 score of 61%. We might hope for a comparable learning curve on the governance assessment.

## Lay Involvement in Governance of the Church By and Through DFCs

**Table 2: Governance Grades for Top Scorers on Financial Transparency**  
*Archdioceses in bold*

Diocese	Financial Transparency Score	Governance Scores
Bridgeport CT	100%	48%
Charleston SC	100%	43%
Orlando FL	100%	55%
Scranton PA	100%	83%
Belleville IL	98%	48%
Stockton CA	97%	30%
<b>Atlanta GA</b>	<b>96%</b>	<b>80%</b>
<b>Baltimore MD</b>	<b>96%</b>	<b>73%</b>
Biloxi MS	96%	48%
Des Moines IA	96%	53%
Fort Wayne-South Bend IN	96%	75%
<b>Kansas City KS</b>	<b>96%</b>	<b>92%</b>
Lexington KY	96%	58%
Wheeling-Charleston WV	96%	53%
Joliet IL	95%	40%
<b>Milwaukee WI</b>	<b>95%</b>	<b>45%</b>
St. Petersburg FL	95%	53%
Yakima WA	94%	55%
<b>Average</b>	<b>97%</b>	<b>57%</b>

*Compares the governance grades for dioceses with the highest scores on VOTF's Diocesan Financial Transparency review. Only five also had a passing grade in the Governance survey.*

## Conclusion

In our opinion, evidence of compliance with Canon Law by the Diocesan Finance Councils is disappointingly low. The fact that only 18 dioceses achieved a passing grade obviously means there is room for improvement. We feel confident this improvement can take place, because we now have a five-year history with our financial transparency survey and have found a steady improvement in overall scores there. Many dioceses have contacted us with a desire to increase their finance transparency scores, and we hope this happens with the governance scores as well.

Notably, an improvement in diocesan scores on governance is feasible for any dioceses regardless of its size, whether measured by net assets or number of Catholics or number of parishes. The data shown in Table 3 (page 5) illustrates the range of those factors among the highest scoring dioceses in the 2022 report.

## Lay Involvement in Governance of the Church By and Through DFCs

**Table 3: Size and Assets of the Top Five Governance Scoring Dioceses**  
*Archdioceses in bold*

Diocese	Score	Net Assets (\$)	# Catholics	# Parishes
Memphis TN	95%	272,268,910 *	60,740	47
<b>Kansas City KS</b>	<b>92%</b>	<b>90,457,726 **</b>	<b>190,624</b>	<b>110</b>
Scranton PA	83%	9,850,386 **	282,400	117
<b>Atlanta GA</b>	<b>80%</b>	<b>43,089,827 **</b>	<b>1,200,000</b>	<b>90</b>
Cheyenne WY	80%	7,476,998 **	51,701	40

\*The consolidated audit includes financial activities of the parishes, schools, cemeteries, and administrative offices.

\*\* The audit covers the financial activities of the chancery/administrative offices.

### **Detailed Summary—Key Areas of Governance**

**Question 1—Does the website have a workable internet search function? Maximum score 10 points; Average Score 9.0**

- a. Award 4 points if a workable internal search function can be found anywhere on the website.
- b. Add 3 points if it is on the homepage.
- c. Add 3 points if any information on the DFC can be found using the search function.

Almost all dioceses have a workable search engine on their website, which is reflected by the high average score on Question 1. Dioceses recognize that a workable search function makes it easier for members to locate information that the diocese wants to share, e.g., ways to contribute to the annual appeal, where to find a parish, information on the protection of children, and so on. If the reviewers could find only a brief explanation for the DFC responsibilities, they awarded points even if a DFC list could not be found or more detailed documents were not posted.

Sometimes the DFC members are listed in a diocesan directory that is loaded onto the website as a PDF file. The internal content of such a PDF file cannot be found using a website search, making the names much more difficult to find.

**Question 2—Is contact information for the DFC members posted on the website? Maximum score 5 points; Average Score 0.30**

- a. Award 2 points if at least one name is posted and contact information is shown.
- b. Add 3 points if contact information is posted for more than one person, including the Chair of the DFC.

## Lay Involvement in Governance of the Church By and Through DFCs

Only 14 dioceses scored points in this category. Of this number, 8 dioceses also scored 3 points on 2b for having contact information listed for more than one of its members. No points were given if the only contact information for the DFC was a member of staff.

Contact information for the DFC is important because they are the stewards for the secular goods of the church intended for the benefit of the Christian faithful, who should be able to contact their representatives.

### ***Question 3--Availability of current information about DFC members on the website. Maximum score 15 points; Average Score 5.2***

- a. Award 5 points if current DFC members are listed.*
- b. Add 5 points if terms of service are listed for each member.*
- c. Add 5 points if each member's expertise in civil law, finance or other professional experience is listed. (Canon 492)*

VOTF believes that it is essential that the DFC list is up-to-date, because its members are responsible for all the secular goods of the church. The function of the DFC parallels in some ways that of a corporate board of directors. The faithful should have current information on the people serving as their representatives on this key diocesan body.

For this survey, reviewers considered a list of DFC members to be current if it was consistent with the audited financial information VOTF reviewed for its 2021 financial review. Examples of information that was accepted for credit as demonstrating a current DFC membership list for Questions 3 and 5 included:

- Providing a dated roster of DFC members. The date might be for the current year (e.g., January 2022) or for a multi-year period that includes the current year.
- Listing the appointment dates of the individual members so long as each is consistent with the current audit.
- Dating the URL link to the list.

For this question, 88 (50%) dioceses posted a current DFC list, 29 (16%) posted a list that the reviewers could not determine was current, and 59 (34%) did not post a list at all. Many dioceses that posted a DFC list did not indicate the terms of service for the members or list the members' area of expertise.

### ***Question 4-- Terms of Service for DFC Members. Maximum score 10 points; Average Score 1.9***

- a. Award 5 points if members serve at least one term.*
- b. Add 5 points if no elected or appointed members can serve more than two consecutive five-year terms. (USCCB DFM)*

## Lay Involvement in Governance of the Church By and Through DFCs

Fifty (28%) dioceses received a score for this category but only 18 of this number received the full 10 points. Thirty-two of these 50 dioceses did not receive points for 4b, because their DFC members can serve more than two consecutive terms. Some locations listed terms that were three years long and not five years as required in Canon law. These dioceses did not receive any points for 4a or 4b. In addition, 126 (72%) dioceses did not discuss any terms of service at all and did not receive any points.

### ***Question 5– Nature of DFC membership. Maximum score 15 points; Average Score 6.7***

- a. Award 5 points if the Council has at least three members (Canon 492)
- b. Add 3 points if the Council has at least three lay members. (USCCB DFM)
- c. Add 5 points if the Council has a majority of lay members.
- d. Add 2 points if the Bishop delegates the role of Council Chair to a lay person. (Canon 492)

As with Question #3, the reviewers had to be able to determine if the posted DFC list was current in order to award points. Ninety-one (52%) dioceses scored in this category. On 5b, except for only a very few dioceses, lay members comprised the majority of DFC members. Where the reviewers could determine who the council chair was, the Bishop was the chair in the majority of dioceses. Eighty-five (48%) of the dioceses did not receive any points because they either did not post a list or because the reviewers could not determine if the posted list was current.

### ***Question 6– Are agendas or highlights of DFC meetings posted on the diocesan website? Maximum score 10 points; Average Score 0.5***

The eight dioceses of Baltimore, Belleville, Fall River, Kansas City KS, Memphis, Rochester, Santa Rosa, and Scranton listed either their DFC's meeting agenda or meeting highlights. Posting this information is important because the finance council is not a secret council. Unfortunately, 168 (95%) dioceses did not post any details about their DFC meetings.

### ***Question 7 – Does the posted meeting information indicate that the Bishop (or his representative) attends the meetings? (Canon 492) Maximum score 5 points; Average Score 2.3***

Eighty (45%) dioceses indicated that the bishop or his representative attends the DFC meetings with 96 (55%) dioceses not indicating this information. If the Bishop was listed as a member on a current DFC membership list, then the reviewers assumed he attends the meetings.



## Lay Involvement in Governance of the Church By and Through DFCs

**Question 8 – Is the DFC responsible for the preparation of the diocesan budget as to income and expense for the coming year? (Canon 493) Maximum score 10 points; Average Score 1.7**

Thirty (17%) dioceses indicated that the DFC prepares the budget and were awarded points. Thirty-two (18%) reported that the DFC only advises, approves, or reviews the budget. These dioceses did **not** receive points, because Canon law specifically indicates the DFC is to **prepare** the budget. The remaining 114 (65%) dioceses did not mention this responsibility at all.

**Question 9 – Diocesan financial review at the end of the year. Maximum score 10 points; Average Score 2.2**

- a. Award 5 points if the DFC, at the end of the year, examines an account of revenue and expenses. (Canon 493)
- b. Add 5 points if the Diocesan Bishop presents a Statement of Income & Expenses and a Balance Sheet (Statement of Financial Position) to the DFC for all entities under his jurisdiction after the close of each year. (Canon 1287)

One-third of the dioceses received some credit on this question. However, only 20 (11%) complied with both of these canons (493 and 1287) and received full credit, thus indicating transparency and inclusion of the DFC in making and/or reviewing expenses and revenues of the diocese. If the DFCs are not involved in reviewing revenue and expenses for all the entities under the jurisdiction of the bishop, questions arise around fiscal responsibility, accountability, and transparency.

**Question 10 – Acts of Extraordinary Administration (Canon 1277). Maximum score 10 points; Average Score 1.1**

- a. Award 5 points if the nature and dollar amount of Acts of Extraordinary Administration are defined on the Diocesan website.
- b. Add 5 points if the Bishop obtains DFC approval for such Extraordinary Acts prior to implementation.

Only 9 dioceses (5%) out of 176 received the full 10 points for this category. An additional 10 (6%) indicated their DFC has to give consent and received points for 10b, but they did not elaborate on the nature or dollar value of these acts and thus did not receive points for 10a. No points were given for 10a if only the alienation of property was listed as an act, because this is not the only act of extraordinary administration approved by the USCCB (United States Conference of Catholic Bishops). Points were also not given if the acts were only mentioned in the context of what the USCCB describes about them without listing them. The remaining 157 (89%) dioceses did not score any points in this category, which indicates a lack of oversight on major financial decisions in the dioceses.

# Appendices

***Appendix A: Worksheet for Lay Involvement in Governance***

***Appendix B: Governance Scores, Alphabetical Listing***

***Appendix C: Governance Scores, Ranked by Score***

***Appendix D: Canon Laws Related to DFCs***

## Appendix A: Governance By and Through Diocesan Finance Councils 2022

VOTF Worksheet to Assess DFC Accountability (based on Canon Law): 100 points maximum

Diocese:	URL address:	Date of Review:			Reviewer's Initials:
Score		Yes	No	Other	Notes
[0 to 10]	<p><b>1. Does the website have a workable internet search function?</b></p> <p>a. Award 4 points if a workable internal search function can be found anywhere on the website.</p> <p>b. Add 3 points if it is on the homepage.</p> <p>c. Add 3 points if any information on the Diocesan Finance Council (DFC) can be found using the search function.</p>				
[0 to 5]	<p><b>2. Is contact information for the DFC posted on the website?</b></p> <p>a. Award 2 points if at least one name is posted and contact information is shown.</p> <p>b. Add 3 points if contact information is posted for more than one person, including the DFC Chair.</p>				
[0 to 15]	<p><b>3. Availability of current information about DFC members on the website:</b></p> <p>a. Award 5 points if current DFC members are listed.</p> <p>b. Add 5 points if terms of service are listed for each member.</p> <p>c. Add 5 points if each member's expertise in civil law, finance or other professional experience is listed. (Canon 492)</p>				<i>Note: A list of the Finance Council Members is considered current if it is dated and is consistent with, or more recent than, the most recently ended fiscal year.</i>
[0 to 10]	<p><b>4. Terms of Service for DFC Members:</b></p> <p>a. Award 5 points if members serve at least one 5-year term (Canon 492).</p> <p>b. Add 5 points if no elected or appointed members can serve more than 2 consecutive 5-year terms. (based on USCCB DFM)</p>				<p><i>Note: US Conference of Catholic Bishops Diocesan Financial Issues Manual (DFM). Reference to terms limits on page 88.</i></p> <p><a href="http://www.usccb.org/about/financial-reporting/upload/Diocesan-Financial-Issues-Manual.pdf">http://www.usccb.org/about/financial-reporting/upload/Diocesan-Financial-Issues-Manual.pdf</a></p>
[0 to 15]	<p><b>5. Nature of DFC membership:</b></p> <p>a. Award 5 points if Council has at least 3 members. (Canon 492)</p> <p>b. Add 3 points if Council has at least 3 lay members. (USCCB DFM).</p> <p>c. Add 5 points if the Council has a majority of lay members.</p> <p>d. Add 2 points if the Bishop delegates the role of Council Chair to a lay person. (Canon 492)</p>				

[0 or 10]	6. Are agendas or highlights of DFC meetings posted on the Diocesan website? <i>Note:</i> The DFC is <i>not</i> a secret council under Canon Law.				
[0 or 5]	7. Does the posted meeting information indicate that the Bishop (or his representative) attends the meetings? (Canon 492)				
[0 or 10]	8. Is the DFC responsible for the preparation of the diocesan budget as to income and expenses for the coming year? (Canon 493)				
[0 to 10]	9. Diocesan financial review at the end of the year a. Award 5 points if the DFC, at the end of the year, examines an account of revenue and expenses. (Canon 493) b. Add 5 points if the Diocesan Bishop presents a Statement of Income & Expenses and a Balance Sheet (Statement of Financial Position) to the DFC for all entities under his jurisdiction after the close of each year? (Canon 1287)				
[0 to 10]	10. Acts of Extraordinary Administration (Canon 1277) a. Award 5 points if the nature and dollar amount of acts of Extraordinary Administration are defined on the Diocesan website. b. Add 5 points if the Bishop obtains DFC approval for such acts prior to implementation				

TOTAL SCORE: \_\_\_\_\_ (Maximum possible score = 100. All scores are based on information that can be found on the Diocesan website.)

## Appendix B: Governance By and Through Diocesan Finance Councils 2022

Alphabetical listing ( *archdioceses* in bold) NOTE: Maximum score = 100

Diocese	Total Score	Scores per category: Maximum possible per category										
		Q1: 10	Q2: 5	Q3: 15	Q4: 10	Q5: 15	Q6: 10	Q7: 5	Q8: 10	Q9: 10	Q10: 10	
Albany NY	7	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Alexandria LA	53	10	0	10	10	13	0	0	0	5	5	
Allentown PA	33	10	0	5	0	13	0	5	0	0	0	
Altoona-Johnstown PA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Amarillo TX	15	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	0	
<b>Anchor.-Juneau AK</b>	40	10	0	10	5	15	0	0	0	0	0	
Arlington VA	33	10	0	5	0	13	0	5	0	0	0	
<b>Atlanta GA</b>	80	10	0	15	10	15	0	5	10	10	5	
Austin TX	48	10	0	15	0	13	0	5	0	5	0	
Baker-Redmond OR	15	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	0	
<b>Baltimore MD</b>	73	10	5	15	0	13	10	5	0	10	5	
Baton Rouge LA	40	10	0	0	5	0	0	5	10	10	0	
Beaumont TX	37	7	0	10	0	15	0	5	0	0	0	
Belleville IL	48	10	0	10	0	13	10	5	0	0	0	
Biloxi MS	48	10	0	15	5	13	0	5	0	0	0	
Birmingham AL	7	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Bismarck ND	30	7	0	5	0	13	0	5	0	0	0	
Boise ID	25	10	0	0	10	0	0	5	0	0	0	
<b>Boston MA</b>	45	0	0	0	10	0	0	5	10	10	10	
Bridgeport CT	48	10	0	15	5	13	0	5	0	0	0	
Brooklyn NY	7	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Brownsville TX	7	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Buffalo NY	55	10	0	5	10	10	0	5	10	5	0	
Burlington VT	10	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Camden NJ	58	10	0	15	0	13	0	5	10	5	0	
Charleston SC	43	10	0	15	5	13	0	0	0	0	0	

**Appendix B: Governance By and Through Diocesan Finance Councils 2022**

Alphabetical listing ( **archdioceses** in bold) NOTE: Maximum score = 100

Diocese	Total Score	Scores per category: Maximum possible per category									
		Q1: 10	Q2: 5	Q3: 15	Q4: 10	Q5: 15	Q6: 10	Q7: 5	Q8: 10	Q9: 10	Q10: 10
Charlotte NC	48	10	0	15	0	13	0	0	0	10	0
Cheyenne WY	80	10	0	15	5	15	0	5	10	10	10
<b>Chicago IL</b>	25	10	0	0	5	0	0	5	0	5	0
<b>Cincinnati OH</b>	10	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Cleveland OH	35	10	0	5	0	15	0	0	0	5	0
Colorado Springs CO	7	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Columbus OH	45	10	0	0	5	0	0	5	10	10	5
Corpus Christi TX	10	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Covington KY	38	10	0	5	0	13	0	5	0	5	0
Crookston MN	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Dallas TX	20	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Davenport IA	48	10	0	5	0	13	0	5	10	5	0
<b>Denver CO</b>	32	10	0	0	5	2	0	0	0	10	5
Des Moines IA	53	10	0	15	10	13	0	5	0	0	0
<b>Detroit MI</b>	42	10	2	5	5	15	0	5	0	0	0
Dodge City KS	43	10	0	15	0	13	0	5	0	0	0
<b>Dubuque IA</b>	33	10	0	5	0	13	0	5	0	0	0
Duluth MN	25	0	0	0	10	0	0	5	0	5	5
El Paso TX	20	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	0	0
Erie PA	48	10	5	15	0	13	0	5	0	0	0
Evansville IN	28	10	0	5	0	13	0	0	0	0	0
Fairbanks AK	10	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Fall River MA	78	10	5	15	5	13	10	5	0	5	10
Fargo ND	78	10	0	15	10	13	0	5	10	10	5
Ft Wayne-So.Bend IN	75	10	2	15	5	13	0	5	10	10	5
Fort Worth TX	55	10	2	15	0	13	0	5	10	0	0

## Appendix B: Governance By and Through Diocesan Finance Councils 2022

Alphabetical listing ( **archdioceses** in bold) NOTE: Maximum score = 100

Diocese	Total Score	Scores per category: Maximum possible per category									
		Q1: 10	Q2: 5	Q3: 15	Q4: 10	Q5: 15	Q6: 10	Q7: 5	Q8: 10	Q9: 10	Q10: 10
Fresno CA	20	10	0	0	5	0	0	5	0	0	0
Gallup NM	7	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>Galves.-Hous. TX</b>	7	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Gary IN	7	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Gaylord MI	22	7	0	0	5	0	0	0	0	10	0
Grand Island NE	7	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Grand Rapids MI	7	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Grt. Falls-Billings MT	32	10	0	0	5	2	0	5	0	5	5
Green Bay WI	7	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Greensburg PA	68	10	0	15	5	13	0	5	10	5	5
Harrisburg PA	10	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>Hartford CT</b>	7	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Helena MT	7	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Honolulu HI	45	10	0	5	10	15	0	5	0	0	0
Houma-Thibodeaux LA	25	7	0	5	0	13	0	0	0	0	0
<b>Indianapolis IN</b>	35	10	0	5	0	15	0	5	0	0	0
Jackson MS	45	10	0	15	5	15	0	0	0	0	0
Jefferson City MO	38	10	0	10	0	13	0	5	0	0	0
Joliet IL	40	10	0	10	0	15	0	5	0	0	0
Kalamazoo MI	25	7	0	5	0	8	0	5	0	0	0
<b>Kansas City KS</b>	92	10	2	15	10	15	10	5	10	5	10
KC-St. Joseph MO	38	10	0	5	0	13	0	5	0	5	0
Knoxville TN	10	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
La Crosse WI	7	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

## Appendix B: Governance By and Through Diocesan Finance Councils 2022

Alphabetical listing ( *archdioceses* in *b* NOTE: Maximum score = 100

Diocese	Total Score	Scores per category: Maximum possible per category									
		Q1: 10	Q2: 5	Q3: 15	Q4: 10	Q5: 15	Q6: 10	Q7: 5	Q8: 10	Q9: 10	Q10: 10
Lafayette IN	38	10	0	10	0	13	0	5	0	0	0
Lafayette LA	43	10	0	15	0	13	0	5	0	0	0
Lake Charles LA	7	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Lansing MI	7	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Laredo TX	7	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Las Cruces NM	7	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Las Vegas NV	7	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Lexington KY	58	10	0	15	10	13	0	5	0	5	0
Lincoln NE	33	10	0	5	0	13	0	5	0	0	0
Little Rock AR	10	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>Los Angeles CA</b>	52	7	0	10	5	15	0	5	0	10	0
<b>Louisville KY</b>	7	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Lubbock TX	15	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	0
Madison WI	7	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Manchester NH	50	10	0	10	0	15	0	5	10	0	0
Marquette MI	48	10	5	15	0	13	0	5	0	0	0
Memphis TN	95	10	5	15	5	15	10	5	10	10	10
Metuchen NJ	65	10	0	15	5	15	0	5	10	5	0
<b>Miami FL</b>	30	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	10
<b>Milwaukee WI</b>	45	10	0	15	0	15	0	5	0	0	0
<b>Mobile AL</b>	10	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Monterey CA	27	7	0	5	0	15	0	0	0	0	0
Nashville TN	7	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>New Orleans LA</b>	10	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
New Ulm MN	7	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>New York NY</b>	35	7	0	5	0	13	0	0	0	10	0



**Appendix B: Governance By and Through Diocesan Finance Councils 2022**

Alphabetical listing ( **archdioceses** in bold) NOTE: Maximum score = 100

Diocese	Total Score	Scores per category: Maximum possible per category									
		Q1: 10	Q2: 5	Q3: 15	Q4: 10	Q5: 15	Q6: 10	Q7: 5	Q8: 10	Q9: 10	Q10: 10
<b>Newark NJ</b>	33	10	0	10	0	13	0	0	0	0	0
Norwich CT	10	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Oakland CA	10	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Ogdensburg NY	38	10	0	10	5	8	0	5	0	0	0
<b>Oklahoma City OK</b>	10	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>Omaha NE</b>	38	10	0	10	0	13	0	5	0	0	0
Orange CA	15	10	0	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0
Orlando FL	55	10	0	15	0	10	0	5	10	5	0
Owensboro KY	25	7	0	5	0	13	0	0	0	0	0
Palm Beach FL	10	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Paterson NJ	35	10	0	0	10	0	0	0	10	5	0
Pensac.-Tallahas. FL	33	10	0	5	0	13	0	5	0	0	0
Peoria IL	10	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>Philadelphia PA</b>	45	10	0	15	0	15	0	5	0	0	0
Phoenix AZ	20	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	0
Pittsburgh PA	48	10	0	10	10	13	0	5	0	0	0
Portland ME	25	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5	0
<b>Portland OR</b>	32	7	0	5	0	15	0	5	0	0	0
Providence RI	48	10	5	10	5	8	0	5	0	5	0
Pueblo CO	10	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Raleigh NC	62	10	2	15	10	15	0	0	0	5	5
Rapid City SD	63	10	0	5	5	13	0	5	10	10	5
Reno NV	35	10	0	0	5	0	0	5	10	5	0
Richmond VA	40	10	0	15	0	15	0	0	0	0	0
Rochester NY	75	10	0	15	10	15	10	5	0	0	10
Rockford IL	10	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

**Appendix B: Governance By and Through Diocesan Finance Councils 2022**

Alphabetical listing ( *archdioceses* in bold, NOTE: Maximum score = 100

Diocese	Total Score	Scores per category: Maximum possible per category										
		Q1: 10	Q2: 5	Q3: 15	Q4: 10	Q5: 15	Q6: 10	Q7: 5	Q8: 10	Q9: 10	Q10: 10	
Rockville Centre NY	10	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Sacramento CA	27	7	0	5	0	15	0	0	0	0	0	0
Saginaw MI	12	10	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0
Saint Augustine FL	50	10	0	10	0	15	0	5	0	5	5	5
Saint Cloud MN	7	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>Saint Louis MO</b>	33	10	0	5	0	13	0	5	0	0	0	0
<b>St.Paul -Minneap. MN</b>	60	10	0	15	0	15	0	5	10	5	5	0
Saint Petersburg FL	53	10	0	10	0	13	0	5	10	5	5	0
Saint Thomas VI	7	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Salina KS	15	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	0	0
Salt Lake City UT	20	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	0	0	0
San Angelo TX	55	10	0	15	0	15	0	0	0	10	5	5
<b>San Antonio TX</b>	7	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
San Bernardino CA	10	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
San Diego CA	68	10	5	10	5	13	0	5	10	5	5	5
<b>San Francisco CA</b>	40	10	2	10	0	13	0	5	0	0	0	0
San Jose CA	53	10	0	10	0	13	0	5	0	5	10	10
<b>Santa Fe NM</b>	30	7	0	5	0	13	0	5	0	0	0	0
Santa Rosa CA	43	10	0	5	0	13	10	5	0	0	0	0
Savannah GA	10	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Scranton PA	83	10	0	15	5	13	10	5	10	10	10	5
<b>Seattle WA</b>	65	10	0	15	10	15	0	0	0	10	5	5
Shreveport LA	7	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Sioux City IA	15	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	0	0
Sioux Falls SD	10	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Spokane WA	43	10	0	5	10	13	0	5	0	0	0	0

**Appendix B: Governance By and Through Diocesan Finance Councils 2022**

Alphabetical listing ( **archdioceses** in bold) NOTE: Maximum score = 100

Diocese	Total Score	Scores per category: Maximum possible per category									
		Q1: 10	Q2: 5	Q3: 15	Q4: 10	Q5: 15	Q6: 10	Q7: 5	Q8: 10	Q9: 10	Q10: 10
Springfield IL	22	7	0	0	5	0	0	5	0	5	0
Springfield MA	7	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Spring.-Cape Gir. MO	7	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Steubenville OH	20	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	0	0
Stockton CA	30	10	0	5	0	15	0	0	0	0	0
Superior WI	10	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Syracuse NY	10	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Toledo OH	35	10	0	5	0	15	0	0	0	5	0
Trenton NJ	65	10	0	15	5	15	0	5	10	5	0
Tucson AZ	10	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Tulsa OK	10	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Tyler TX	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5	0
Venice FL	10	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Victoria TX	33	10	0	5	0	13	0	5	0	0	0
<b>Washington DC</b>	28	10	0	5	0	13	0	0	0	0	0
Wheel.-Charlest. WV	53	10	5	15	5	13	0	5	0	0	0
Wichita KS	10	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Wilmington DE	25	10	0	0	10	0	0	5	0	0	0
Winona-Rochest. MN	38	10	0	15	0	8	0	5	0	0	0
Worcester MA	30	10	0	0	5	0	0	5	0	5	5
Yakima WA	55	10	0	10	5	15	0	5	0	5	5
Youngstown OH	7	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

—

## Appendix C: Governance By and Through Diocesan Finance Councils 2022

Listed by scores ( **archdioceses** in bold) NOTE: Maximum score = 100

Diocese	Total Score	Scores per category: Maximum possible per category									
		Q1: 10	Q2: 5	Q3: 15	Q4: 10	Q5: 15	Q6: 10	Q7: 5	Q8: 10	Q9: 10	Q10: 10
Memphis TN	95	10	5	15	5	15	10	5	10	10	10
<b>Kansas City KS</b>	92	10	2	15	10	15	10	5	10	5	10
Scranton PA	83	10	0	15	5	13	10	5	10	10	5
<b>Atlanta GA</b>	80	10	0	15	10	15	0	5	10	10	5
Cheyenne WY	80	10	0	15	5	15	0	5	10	10	10
Fall River MA	78	10	5	15	5	13	10	5	0	5	10
Fargo ND	78	10	0	15	10	13	0	5	10	10	5
Ft Wayne-So.Bend IN	75	10	2	15	5	13	0	5	10	10	5
Rochester NY	75	10	0	15	10	15	10	5	0	0	10
<b>Baltimore MD</b>	73	10	5	15	0	13	10	5	0	10	5
Greensburg PA	68	10	0	15	5	13	0	5	10	5	5
San Diego CA	68	10	5	10	5	13	0	5	10	5	5
Metuchen NJ	65	10	0	15	5	15	0	5	10	5	0
<b>Seattle WA</b>	65	10	0	15	10	15	0	0	0	10	5
Trenton NJ	65	10	0	15	5	15	0	5	10	5	0
Rapid City SD	63	10	0	5	5	13	0	5	10	10	5
Raleigh NC	62	10	2	15	10	15	0	0	0	5	5
<b>St.Paul -Minneap. MN</b>	60	10	0	15	0	15	0	5	10	5	0
Camden NJ	58	10	0	15	0	13	0	5	10	5	0
Lexington KY	58	10	0	15	10	13	0	5	0	5	0
Buffalo NY	55	10	0	5	10	10	0	5	10	5	0
Fort Worth TX	55	10	2	15	0	13	0	5	10	0	0
Orlando FL	55	10	0	15	0	10	0	5	10	5	0
San Angelo TX	55	10	0	15	0	15	0	0	0	10	5
Yakima WA	55	10	0	10	5	15	0	5	0	5	5
Alexandria LA	53	10	0	10	10	13	0	0	0	5	5

## Appendix C: Governance By and Through Diocesan Finance Councils 2022

Listed by scores (*archdioceses* in bold) NOTE: Maximum score = 100

Diocese	Total Score	Scores per category: Maximum possible per category									
		Q1: 10	Q2: 5	Q3: 15	Q4: 10	Q5: 15	Q6: 10	Q7: 5	Q8: 10	Q9: 10	Q10: 10
Des Moines IA	53	10	0	15	10	13	0	5	0	0	0
Saint Petersburg FL	53	10	0	10	0	13	0	5	10	5	0
San Jose CA	53	10	0	10	0	13	0	5	0	5	10
Wheel.-Charlest. WV	53	10	5	15	5	13	0	5	0	0	0
<b>Los Angeles CA</b>	52	7	0	10	5	15	0	5	0	10	0
Manchester NH	50	10	0	10	0	15	0	5	10	0	0
Saint Augustine FL	50	10	0	10	0	15	0	5	0	5	5
Austin TX	48	10	0	15	0	13	0	5	0	5	0
Belleville IL	48	10	0	10	0	13	10	5	0	0	0
Biloxi MS	48	10	0	15	5	13	0	5	0	0	0
Bridgeport CT	48	10	0	15	5	13	0	5	0	0	0
Charlotte NC	48	10	0	15	0	13	0	0	0	10	0
Davenport IA	48	10	0	5	0	13	0	5	10	5	0
Erie PA	48	10	5	15	0	13	0	5	0	0	0
Marquette MI	48	10	5	15	0	13	0	5	0	0	0
Pittsburgh PA	48	10	0	10	10	13	0	5	0	0	0
Providence RI	48	10	5	10	5	8	0	5	0	5	0
<b>Boston MA</b>	45	0	0	0	10	0	0	5	10	10	10
Columbus OH	45	10	0	0	5	0	0	5	10	10	5
Honolulu HI	45	10	0	5	10	15	0	5	0	0	0
Jackson MS	45	10	0	15	5	15	0	0	0	0	0
<b>Milwaukee WI</b>	45	10	0	15	0	15	0	5	0	0	0
<b>Philadelphia PA</b>	45	10	0	15	0	15	0	5	0	0	0
Charleston SC	43	10	0	15	5	13	0	0	0	0	0
Dodge City KS	43	10	0	15	0	13	0	5	0	0	0
Lafayette LA	43	10	0	15	0	13	0	5	0	0	0

## Appendix C: Governance By and Through Diocesan Finance Councils 2022

Listed by scores ( **archdioceses** in bold) NOTE: Maximum score = 100

Diocese	Total Score	Scores per category: Maximum possible per category									
		Q1: 10	Q2: 5	Q3: 15	Q4: 10	Q5: 15	Q6: 10	Q7: 5	Q8: 10	Q9: 10	Q10: 10
Santa Rosa CA	43	10	0	5	0	13	10	5	0	0	0
Spokane WA	43	10	0	5	10	13	0	5	0	0	0
<b>Detroit MI</b>	42	10	2	5	5	15	0	5	0	0	0
<b>Anchor.-Juneau AK</b>	40	10	0	10	5	15	0	0	0	0	0
Baton Rouge LA	40	10	0	0	5	0	0	5	10	10	0
Joliet IL	40	10	0	10	0	15	0	5	0	0	0
Richmond VA	40	10	0	15	0	15	0	0	0	0	0
<b>San Francisco CA</b>	40	10	2	10	0	13	0	5	0	0	0
Covington KY	38	10	0	5	0	13	0	5	0	5	0
Jefferson City MO	38	10	0	10	0	13	0	5	0	0	0
KC-St. Joseph MO	38	10	0	5	0	13	0	5	0	5	0
Lafayette IN	38	10	0	10	0	13	0	5	0	0	0
Ogdensburg NY	38	10	0	10	5	8	0	5	0	0	0
<b>Omaha NE</b>	38	10	0	10	0	13	0	5	0	0	0
Winona-Rochest. MN	38	10	0	15	0	8	0	5	0	0	0
Beaumont TX	37	7	0	10	0	15	0	5	0	0	0
Cleveland OH	35	10	0	5	0	15	0	0	0	5	0
<b>Indianapolis IN</b>	35	10	0	5	0	15	0	5	0	0	0
<b>New York NY</b>	35	7	0	5	0	13	0	0	0	10	0
Paterson NJ	35	10	0	0	10	0	0	0	10	5	0
Reno NV	35	10	0	0	5	0	0	5	10	5	0
Toledo OH	35	10	0	5	0	15	0	0	0	5	0
Allentown PA	33	10	0	5	0	13	0	5	0	0	0
Arlington VA	33	10	0	5	0	13	0	5	0	0	0

## Appendix C: Governance By and Through Diocesan Finance Councils 2022

Listed by scores ( *archdioceses* in *bold*) NOTE: Maximum score = 100

Diocese	Total Score	Scores per category: Maximum possible per category									
		Q1: 10	Q2: 5	Q3: 15	Q4: 10	Q5: 15	Q6: 10	Q7: 5	Q8: 10	Q9: 10	Q10: 10
<b>Dubuque IA</b>	33	10	0	5	0	13	0	5	0	0	0
Lincoln NE	33	10	0	5	0	13	0	5	0	0	0
<b>Newark NJ</b>	33	10	0	10	0	13	0	0	0	0	0
Pensc.-Tallahas. FL	33	10	0	5	0	13	0	5	0	0	0
<b>Saint Louis MO</b>	33	10	0	5	0	13	0	5	0	0	0
Victoria TX	33	10	0	5	0	13	0	5	0	0	0
<b>Denver CO</b>	32	10	0	0	5	2	0	0	0	10	5
Grt. Falls-Billgs MT	32	10	0	0	5	2	0	5	0	5	5
<b>Portland OR</b>	32	7	0	5	0	15	0	5	0	0	0
Bismarck ND	30	7	0	5	0	13	0	5	0	0	0
<b>Miami FL</b>	30	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	10
<b>Santa Fe NM</b>	30	7	0	5	0	13	0	5	0	0	0
Stockton CA	30	10	0	5	0	15	0	0	0	0	0
Worcester MA	30	10	0	0	5	0	0	5	0	5	5
Evansville IN	28	10	0	5	0	13	0	0	0	0	0
<b>Washington DC</b>	28	10	0	5	0	13	0	0	0	0	0
Monterey CA	27	7	0	5	0	15	0	0	0	0	0
Sacramento CA	27	7	0	5	0	15	0	0	0	0	0
Boise ID	25	10	0	0	10	0	0	5	0	0	0
<b>Chicago IL</b>	25	10	0	0	5	0	0	5	0	5	0
Duluth MN	25	0	0	0	10	0	0	5	0	5	5
Houma-Thibodeaux	25	7	0	5	0	13	0	0	0	0	0
Kalamazoo MI	25	7	0	5	0	8	0	5	0	0	0
Owensboro KY	25	7	0	5	0	13	0	0	0	0	0
Portland ME	25	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5	0
Wilmington DE	25	10	0	0	10	0	0	5	0	0	0

**Appendix C: Governance By and Through Diocesan Finance Councils 2022**

Listed by scores ( **archdioceses** in bold) NOTE: Maximum score = 100

Diocese	Total Score	Scores per category: Maximum possible per category									
		Q1: 10	Q2: 5	Q3: 15	Q4: 10	Q5: 15	Q6: 10	Q7: 5	Q8: 10	Q9: 10	Q10: 10
Gaylord MI	22	7	0	0	5	0	0	0	0	10	0
Springfield IL	22	7	0	0	5	0	0	5	0	5	0
Dallas TX	20	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
El Paso TX	20	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	0	0
Fresno CA	20	10	0	0	5	0	0	5	0	0	0
Phoenix AZ	20	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	0
Salt Lake City UT	20	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	0	0
Steubenville OH	20	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	0	0
Amarillo TX	15	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	0
Baker-Redmond OR	15	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	0
Lubbock TX	15	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	0
Orange CA	15	10	0	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0
Salina KS	15	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	0
Sioux City IA	15	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	0
Tyler TX	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5	0
Saginaw MI	12	10	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0
Burlington VT	10	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>Cincinnati OH</b>	10	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Corpus Christi TX	10	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Fairbanks AK	10	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Harrisburg PA	10	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Knoxville TN	10	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Little Rock AR	10	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>Mobile AL</b>	10	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>New Orleans LA</b>	10	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0



**Appendix C: Governance By and Through Diocesan Finance Councils 2022**

Listed by scores (*archdioceses* in bold) NOTE: Maximum score = 100

Diocese	Total Score	Scores per category: Maximum possible per category										
		Q1: 10	Q2: 5	Q3: 15	Q4: 10	Q5: 15	Q6: 10	Q7: 5	Q8: 10	Q9: 10	Q10: 10	
Norwich CT	10	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Oakland CA	10	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>Oklahoma City OK</b>	10	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Palm Beach FL	10	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Peoria IL	10	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Pueblo CO	10	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Rockford IL	10	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Rockville Centre NY	10	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
San Bernardino CA	10	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Savannah GA	10	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Sioux Falls SD	10	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Superior WI	10	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Syracuse NY	10	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Tucson AZ	10	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Tulsa OK	10	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Venice FL	10	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Wichita KS	10	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Albany NY	7	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Birmingham AL	7	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Brooklyn NY	7	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Brownsville TX	7	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Colorado Springs CO	7	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Gallup NM	7	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>Galves.-Hous. TX</b>	7	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Gary IN	7	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Grand Island NE	7	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

**Appendix C: Governance By and Through Diocesan Finance Councils 2022**

Listed by scores (*archdioceses* in bold) NOTE: Maximum score = 100

Diocese	Total Score	Scores per category: Maximum possible per category										
		Q1: 10	Q2: 5	Q3: 15	Q4: 10	Q5: 15	Q6: 10	Q7: 5	Q8: 10	Q9: 10	Q10: 10	
Grand Rapids MI	7	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Green Bay WI	7	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>Hartford CT</b>	7	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Helena MT	7	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
La Crosse WI	7	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Lake Charles LA	7	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Lansing MI	7	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Laredo TX	7	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Las Cruces NM	7	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Las Vegas NV	7	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>Louisville KY</b>	7	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Madison WI	7	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Nashville TN	7	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
New Ulm MN	7	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Saint Cloud MN	7	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Saint Thomas VI	7	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>San Antonio TX</b>	7	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Shreveport LA	7	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Springfield MA	7	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Spring.-Cape Gir. MO	7	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Youngstown OH	7	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Altoona-Johnstown PA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Crookston MN	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

## Appendix D: Canon Laws Related to DFCs

Canon 492 §1. In every diocese a Finance Council is to be established, over which the diocesan bishop himself or his delegate presides, and which consists 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.

§2. Members of the Finance Council are to be appointed for Five years, but at the end of this period they can be appointed for other Five-year terms.

§3. Persons who are related to the bishop up to the fourth degree of consanguinity or affinity are excluded from the Finance council.

Canon 493. In addition to the functions entrusted to it in Book V, The Temporal Goods of the Church, the Finance Council prepares each year, according to the directions of the diocesan bishop, a budget of the income and expenditures which are foreseen for the entire governance of the diocese in the coming year, and at the end of the year examines an account of the revenues and expenses.

Canon 494 §1. In every diocese, after having heard the college of consultors and the Finance council, the bishop is to appoint a Finance officer who is truly expert in Financial affairs and absolutely distinguished for honesty.

§2. The Finance officer is to be appointed for a five-year term but can be appointed for other five-year terms at the end of this period. The finance officer is not to be removed while in this function except for a grave cause to be assessed by the bishop after he has heard the college of consultors and the Finance council.

§3. It is for the Finance officer to administer the goods of the diocese under the authority of the bishop in accord with the budget determined by the Finance council and, from the income of the diocese, to meet expenses which the bishop or others designated by him have legitimately authorized.

§4. At the end of the year, the Finance officer must render an account of receipts and expenditures to the Finance council.

Canon 1277. The diocesan bishop must hear the Finance Council and college of consultors to place acts of administration which are more important in light of the economic condition of the diocese. In addition to the cases specially expressed in universal law or the charter of a foundation, however, he needs the consent of the Finance Council and of the college

## **Appendix D: Canon Laws Related to DFCs**

of consultors to place acts of extraordinary administration. It is for the conference of bishops to define which acts are to be considered of extraordinary administration.

Canon 1287. §1. Both clerical and lay administrators of any ecclesiastical goods whatever which have not been legitimately exempted from the power of governance of the diocesan bishop are bound by their office to present an annual report to the local ordinary who is to present it for examination by the Finance Council; any contrary custom is reprobated.

§2. According to norms to be determined by particular law, administrators are to render an account to the faithful concerning the goods offered by the faithful to the Church.