



2023 Report: Measuring Abuse Prevention and Safe Environment Programs as Reported Online in Diocesan Policies and Practices

Executive Summary

During the first meeting of the Synod on Synodality (16th Ordinary General Assembly of the Synod of Bishops), the Pontifical Commission for the Protection of Minors issued a “call to action” for the Roman Catholic Church to increase its commitment and resources for safeguarding children: “We are long overdue in fixing the flaws in procedures that leave victims wounded,” (*Tutela Minorum* Sept. 27, 2023) the letter said.

The Church’s commitment to abuse prevention, the resources it allocates to such measures, and the policies that aim to ensure child protection, can be recognized at several levels: the universal (global) church, national church conferences, dioceses, and local parishes. Using as a foundation the universal (Vatican-issued) and national (bishop conference standards) Church standards along with the child-protection standards developed by abuse-prevention professionals such as those used by the Center for Disease Control, Voice of the Faithful has examined the adherence of dioceses in the United States to the established standards.

This is the second such analysis Voice of the Faithful (VOTF) has conducted. The initial review, conducted in 2022, found that U.S. dioceses together averaged 67 out of a possible 100 points when measured against the accepted standards. The average score increased somewhat in the 2023 review, to 70.5. Individually, no diocese attained the maximum 100 points in either year. For 2023, the most frequently achieved overall score was 73.5 (an increase from the 63.5 most-frequent score in 2022).

Details on the worksheet used for assessment, the overall scores in each category measured, and the individual scores of each diocese comprise the bulk of the following report and appendices. We also include a brief survey of the standards established.

Child Protection and Abuse Prevention Standards

As noted, child protection and abuse prevention standards in the Catholic Church include those issued by the Vatican as well as those established by national Bishops’ Conferences. The standards are to be carried out at the diocesan and the parish levels.

At the **universal, or global, level**, the “norms” (rules) established for the entire Church include the Vatican-issued standards in *Vos estis lux mundi*, which was made permanent Church law in 2023 (White, 2023).

Measuring and Ranking Diocesan Safe Environment Programs: 2023

Unfortunately, the application of those norms in the worldwide church lacks consistency both in implementation and practice. This deficiency is underscored by problems in the procedures and application when considering different cultural and socio-economic scenarios in the worldwide Church. The problems led the Pontifical Commission for the Protection of Minors to issue their call to action:

We urge you to work towards the day when all children are protected by appropriate safety policies and procedures, ones that are known and verified.

We urge you to work towards the day when transparent and accessible systems of redress for wrongdoing by the Church's ministers' function well according to acceptable standards.

We urge you to work towards the day when all in our Church understand and take responsibility for robust safeguarding in dioceses and parishes and schools and hospitals and retreat centers and houses of formation and all the other places where the Church is present and active.

That day is yet to arrive. And for many it seems a long way away.

Also lacking is a universal supervisory authority over enactment of the norms. Fr. Hans Zollner, S.J., Director of Interdisciplinary Studies on Human Dignity at the Gregorian University and a former member of the Pontifical Commission for the Protection of Minors, says the Church currently lacks a mechanism to monitor the implementation of its norms (*La Croix International*, 2024), which leads to shortcomings in “responsibility, compliance, accountability and transparency” (*Crux*, 2023)

At the **national level, in the United States**, the U.S. Conference of Catholic Bishops (USCCB) has publicly stated their commitment to abuse prevention since 2002 when they created their own resources known as the *Charter for the Protection of Children and Young People (Charter)* and the *Essential Norms (Norms)*. These standards provide comprehensive sets of procedures for addressing allegations of sexual abuse of minors by Catholic clergy. The U.S. bishops most recently revised the *Charter* and the *Norms* in June 2018. (Note that the *Charter* is not church (or Canon) law; it is an agreement or promise among bishops.)

As part of its standard-setting, the USCCB also established the National Review Board for the Protection of Children and Young People (NRB) in 2002, to collaborate with bishops in efforts to prevent sexual abuse of minors in the U.S. by persons in service of the Church. The Board has oversight of the *Charter* and engages an audit company to check compliance with the *Charter*. However, these annual diocesan compliance “audits” consist primarily of bishops’ self-reported answers to prepared inquiries. Bishops maintain control of the information going into the audit.

Measuring and Ranking Diocesan Safe Environment Programs: 2023

StoneBridge is the company engaged by the USCCB for the past 11 years to audit diocesan compliance with the 2002 *Charter*. Their 2022 Audit Report (issued July 2023) noted, as it had in previous years, the limitations to their engagement, because participation in the audit itself is not required in the *Charter* (p.13)

Additionally, it is important to note that, like the *Charter*, the *Essential Norms* are not canon law. But they are a particular and binding law for U.S. dioceses. The *Norms* require bishops to report accusations of child abuse to civil authorities as soon as an accusation is made known to the bishop (Cafardi, 2012). Unfortunately, as with the universal Church standards, the USCCB national standards lack a robust authority to require compliance with both the *Charter* and the *Essential Norms* as well as a methodology to monitor compliance.

At **the diocesan level** for child protection and abuse prevention, each bishop should implement policies and procedures that ensure the proper application of the national standards.

These practices, in turn, should be supported and enacted at the parish level—**the local church** where children interact directly with church personnel. Norms and guidelines for Church leadership are not sufficient to keep our children safe from abuse at the local level. Thus, lay Catholics have a responsibility to advocate for the protection of children in our parishes and communities. **Parishioners have key roles that are vital** to keep our children safe—such as working with diocesan and parish safe environment coordinators to bolster safety guidelines and ensure that safety measures are carried out in their communities.

It is at the diocesan level where VOTF focuses its measurement of U.S. dioceses' commitment to promote safeguarding. Individual diocesan efforts can be found on their websites under headings such as Safe Environment, Child Protection, and Abuse Prevention, as well as in diocesan policies. To determine what resources, including policies and procedures, are provided by a diocese to protect children, VOTF assesses the web postings under these various headings, using a worksheet that includes the standards set by the Church and the standards recommended by child-protection professionals and the Centers for Disease Control.

Prior to VOTF's initial website review in 2022, no extensive measurement had been conducted of website-posted diocesan efforts to meet the criteria of the *Charter*, the *Essential Norms*, and *Vos estis lux mundi*.

This report highlights findings from diocesan website reviews and compares those findings to ones from the 2022 Review. We highlight the most egregious deficiencies in prevention

Measuring and Ranking Diocesan Safe Environment Programs: 2023

content. Note that because diocesan website information can change when web staff update the online information, some links where information was found during the review period may have changed after the reviews were completed.

Methodology for Assessing Diocesan Efforts

VOTF's second comprehensive measurement of abuse prevention and safe environment programs as reported online in diocesan policies and practices was undertaken during the summer of 2023, from June 1 through September 10, 2023. Researchers utilized the same specialized Worksheet (See Appendix A) that was used in the 2022 review.

The worksheet lists 33 questions in the following 10 categories (Table 1). The questions were developed by VOTF's Protection of Children (POC) Working Group composed of VOTF officers and members, several of whom have years of experience in child well-being.

To minimize the role of personal opinion in reviews, the POC team emphasized the use of objective questions (yes/no options) in the worksheet. The maximum score achievable was 100 points. (See Appendix A for the worksheet utilized in this review.)

The 2023 review began on June 1, 2023, and concluded on September 10, 2023. All 177 dioceses were notified of the dates of the review and each website was scored on its posted child protection and safeguarding information during that period. Two independent reviewers conducted the analyses, using the 2023 Worksheet. Following the reviews, VOTF reconciled all scores to ensure that each diocese received proper credit. (Appendix B has diocesan scores in alphabetic order and Appendix C shows scores in ranked order.)

Table 1 – Assigned Category Points

Topic	Maximum Score
Policy	10
Codes of Conduct	5
Report Abuse	8
Background Checks	15
Prevention Education & Training	18
Contact Information	6
Audit Reporting	10
Review Boards	18
Publish List of Accused Clergy	5
Victim Assistance	5
TOTAL SCORE POSSIBLE	100

Key Results

The average overall score achieved by the 177 dioceses in the 2023 review was 70.6 of a possible 100 points. This average score is an increase in total average scores from the 2022 Review, which was 67.0 out of a possible 100 points.

No diocese attained the maximum 100 points. The most frequently achieved overall score on the 2023 Review was 73.5.

The overall scores reflect total scores from all 10 categories. However, it is important to note that the individual category scores as reported in Appendices B and C reveal more about a diocese’s adherence to the set standards and guidelines than does the overall score.

The Top-Scoring Dioceses in 2023 Review

The top score achieved was 96.5 by the Diocese of Harrisburg PA, which also achieved the top score of 95.5 in the 2022 Review. The Winona-Rochester MN diocese again scored well in the 2023 Review: 96.0 compared with their 2022 score of 93.5. The remaining five top-scoring dioceses made the “top performer” list for the first time in 2023.

The diocese of Fall River MA posts a model website for organizational clarity. The Richmond VA website contained a comprehensive 30-page child protection policy.

Also of note, three of these top-scoring dioceses had bankruptcy filings: Harrisburg PA (2020); Winona-Rochester NY (2018); and Rochester NY (2019). (See Appendix F.)

Table 2 – Top-Scoring Dioceses

Diocese	Total 2023 Score	Total 2022 Score
Harrisburg PA	96.50	95.50
Winona-Rochester MN	96.00	93.50
Fall River MA	95.00	82.50
Rochester NY	93.50	63.00
Richmond VA	93.00	89.50
Salina KS	91.50	75.50
Boston MA	90.50	82.50

The Lowest-Scoring Dioceses

The 11 lowest-scoring dioceses from the 2023 Review (Table 3) again included Colorado Springs CO; Pueblo CO, Corpus Christi TX, Lubbock TX, San Francisco CA, and Military Services USA.

New on the list from the 2023 review: Birmingham AL with a score of 55.5, down from 60.0 in the 2022 Review; Las Vegas NV with a score of 42.5, down from 57.0 in the 2022 Review; Metuchen NJ and Lafayette LA with scores of 54.7. The scores of these last two dioceses also decreased from the 2022 Review.

Scores obtained by the Archdiocese of Military Services USA in the 2022 and 2023 Reviews were similar.

Also of note, none of the lowest-scoring dioceses had filed for bankruptcy.

Some of the findings from these dioceses:

- ❖ The website for the Pueblo CO diocese scored 8.5 on the 2023 review compared with a score of 44.0 on the review in 2022. Their website contained child protection text but lacked active links to information on their safe environment and abuse prevention programs.
- ❖ No search engine was found on the Lubbock TX website, which contained bad links on multiple web pages.
- ❖ Reviewers could not locate a posted child protection or safe environment policy for Las Vegas NV, which scored 42.5 in the 2023 Review compared to 57.0 in the previous review.
- ❖ On the Metuchen NJ website, reviewers did not find Prevention Education/ Training information.
- ❖ In the Lafayette LA diocese, reviewers noted problematic policy statements, including a guideline posted under “Investigating Allegations of Abuse” against a priest or deacon. The diocese guideline declares that after an allegation is reported to civil authorities and the Vicar General, “At the Bishop’s discretion, the matter may be reported to the Diocesan Review Board.” That statement is contrary to the *Essential Norms*, which states that the determination of gravity of an alleged act is the responsibility of the diocesan bishop with the advice of a qualified review board (*Norms*, Article 13, Note #2).

Table 3 – Lowest-Scoring Dioceses

Diocese	Total 2023 Score	Total 2022 Score
Birmingham AL	55.50	60.00
Colorado Springs CO	55.50	41.50
Saint Thomas VI	55.50	50.00
San Francisco CA	55.50	44.50
Metuchen NJ	54.50	57.50
Lafayette LA	54.50	61.00
Lubbock TX	48.50	23.50
Las Vegas NV	42.50	57.00
Arch. Military Services USA	34.50	38.50
Corpus Christi TX	31.50	27.00
Pueblo CO	8.50	44.0

Detailed Summary—Scoring in Each Category

Scoring information in each of the 10 worksheet categories follows and includes comparison to scores achieved in the 2022 VOTF review of diocesan website information. This analysis provides an indication of compliance with specific mandates of the *Charter*, the *Essential Norms*, and *Vos estis lux mundi*.

Category 1 – Policy (10 Points)

2023 Average score = 9.14; maximum score 10, by 83 dioceses

2022 Average score = 8.89; maximum score 10, by 72 dioceses

Policies ensure that an organization operates consistently with its values and goals. The *Charter* itself includes guidelines for prevention of future acts of abuse and the creation of safe environments for children and young people. VOTF reviewers searched for website postings of such policies under these possible names: abuse prevention, safe environment, child protection, policy. They also scored the total number of required “clicks” needed to locate a posted policy and open it.

In four dioceses, reviewers were unable to locate safe environment and abuse prevention policies: Corpus Christi TX; Lansing MI; Las Vegas NV, and Pueblo CO. The only archdiocese that did not post a policy was the Archdiocese of San Francisco.

Measuring and Ranking Diocesan Safe Environment Programs: 2023

In Corpus Christi TX, the faithful need a private code to access the “Leadership Manual” found (located under the Human Resources webpage). Hiding guidelines behind private access does not enhance child protection. All should know the requirements.

Some dioceses received significantly lower scores on the 2023 Review in Category 1 compared to scores awarded in the 2022 Review. Lansing MI, for example, attained 9 points out of 10 possible points on the 2022 Review but 0 points on the current review. Reviewers did locate explanations of policy in various sections on their website, but they were unable to locate a comprehensive policy document on the site. The average parishioner is not likely to do as thorough a search as our reviewers, so there should be one location where all relevant policies are found.

The Category 1 scores for Lake Charles LA and Rockford IL decreased in the 2023 Review because reviewers had difficulty locating their policies.

Despite these declines, the 2023 scores for many dioceses in this category improved from their scores on the 2022 review: Lubbock TX improved from zero to 10 points; Providence RI from 7 to 10 points; and Rochester NY improved from 2 points to 10 points in the current review.

The length of policies varied from one-page general information postings to detailed 300+-page documents. Researchers again found a wide-range of content within the located policies, which required them to read each policy carefully to score the worksheet questions.

Revised and updated safe environment and child protection policies can be expected on the websites that dioceses use to “speak digitally” to the faithful. However, in some instances dioceses had not eliminated older policies from the website nor indicated whether the newer policy superseded or simply added to the older policy. This lack of internal consistency penalized some dioceses—such as when a diocese’s policies stipulate that all volunteers must undergo training and background checks yet posted standards cite exceptions to the “all” volunteers. *When reviewers found conflicting or contradicting information in posted policies or between policy statements and website information, they could not award credit on that worksheet question.* (They had no way of knowing which statement was applied.)

The diocesan policies for child protection and safe environments are important guidelines for parishes to implement safe environment and child protection measures but are not the only set of standards vital to child safety and abuse prevention. Questions on the VOTF worksheet in the next categories address those topics.

Measuring and Ranking Diocesan Safe Environment Programs: 2023

Category 2 – Code of Conduct (5 Points)

2023 Average Score = 4.83; maximum score 5, by 169 dioceses

2022 Average Score = 4.76; maximum score 5, by 164 dioceses

Reviewers search for postings of Codes of Conduct for several populations: clergy and lay employees, staff, and volunteers. Again, four dioceses did not post any publicly accessible Conduct Codes: Military Services, Camden NJ, Lincoln NE, and Pueblo CO.

Four low-scoring dioceses did not post publicly accessible Conduct Codes for at least one of the populations that should be covered: Corpus Christi TX, Galveston-Houston TX, Las Vegas NV, and Memphis TN.

Reviewers again found that some Codes of Conduct for clergy were only accessible through password-protected links. Concealing this information from public review points to a lack of transparency.

Category 3 – Reporting Abuse (8 Points)

2023 Average Score = 7.61; maximum score 8, by 153 dioceses

2022 Average Score = 7.58; maximum score 8, by 151 dioceses

Average scores improved minimally from the 2022 Review. Four questions comprise this category about diocesan abuse-reporting processes, about mandated reporting to law enforcement, and about where to report complaints about bishops. The latter requires an active link to the Catholic Bishops Abuse Reporting (CBAR) portal, which the U.S. Bishops implemented in response to *Vos estis lux mundi*.

CBAR is an online reporting service that receives reports regarding sexual abuse involving bishops. This service was initiated to eliminate or reduce possible bias in asking one prelate to investigate another. Worksheet Questions 3c and 3d examine the posting of CBAR information as well as whether the diocesan website contains an active link to the online reporting (CBAR) portal. (One shortcoming of the CBAR reporting process is its lack of notification when a bishop is being investigated, but at least there is a reporting option.)

Eighteen dioceses did not post easily accessible CBAR information on their websites and an additional three dioceses did not post an active link to the CBAR portal. For two other dioceses, Arlington VA and Pueblo CO, the reviewers did not find posted information on the mandatory requirement to report abuse allegations to law enforcement or civil authorities. These data suggest the need for a monitoring authority to ensure that dioceses follow the mandates found in *Vos estis lux mundi*. (See Appendix D for comments on CBAR compliance and reporting bishop abuse.)

Measuring and Ranking Diocesan Safe Environment Programs: 2023

Category 4 – Background Checks (15 Points)

2023 Average Score = 11.09; maximum score 15, by 2 dioceses

2022 Average Score = 11.01; maximum score 15, by no dioceses

Screening and training of diocesan staff, clergy, and volunteers are important abuse prevention requirements. Clearly stated public standards for background screening and mandates for abuse prevention training are foundational standards. For standards to be effective, compliance must be monitored in parishes, schools, and diocesan offices. Questions 4 and 5 of the worksheet covered these two issues in detail.

Reviewers scored each diocese on six questions in Category 4. First, they looked for a requirement specifying criminal background checks for various populations and the frequency of those checks. The populations that should be covered include clergy, lay employees, volunteers, members of religious communities, and visiting or temporarily assigned clergy as well as international priests. Reviewers also looked for a description of the process to be followed if criminal information was found during the background check. Finally, they checked for the name of a diocesan office or department that monitors background check compliance.

Two dioceses received full credit in this category: Nashville TN and New York NY. Sixty-four dioceses scored 10 points or less in this Category, and 111 dioceses scored between 11 and 14 points on the Background Checks questions.

One common failure: Many dioceses did not post clearly stated requirements for letters of suitability or a certification of suitability for visiting and international priests to exercise ministry within the diocese. Typically, a priest entering a new diocese will have a letter of suitability from the sending bishop or the religious order's superior indicating that there is no reason the priest should be limited or barred from ministry. Reviewers looked for this requirement for suitability letters or certifications in diocesan policy or in information posted on a Safe Environment web page.

As in the 2022 Review, the reviewers discovered unclear wording for requirements of both background checks and prevention education and training. Clear mandates on these two measures are essential. Obtaining background checks on all clergy, on all existing and potential employees, and on all volunteers within a diocese is a strong abuse prevention measure, according to the guidelines from the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC, 2007). These guidelines also point to the necessity for clear and concise policy statements.

Measuring and Ranking Diocesan Safe Environment Programs: 2023

Category 5 – Prevention Education & Training (18 Points)

2023 Average Score = 13.43; maximum score 18, by no diocese

2022 Average Score = 12.85; maximum score 18, by 6 dioceses

This category has five questions: content on child abuse education and training for adults; mandates for prevention education and training information for clergy; mandates for prevention education for all children in Catholic schools and religious education programs; training mandates for visiting and international priests; training mandates for all volunteers, including those who do not have regular contact with children.

Average score increased in this category, but no diocese received the full credit of 18 points in the 2023 review. Nine dioceses received less than 10 points in this category compared with 43 dioceses in the 2022 review. Sixty dioceses scored 15 to 17 points in this category, and 108 dioceses scored between 10 and 15 points.

Reviewers were not able to access any prevention training information for the dioceses of Pueblo CO and Metuchen NJ. The diocese of Lake Charles LA received no points in the 2022 review but received 10 points this year. Three dioceses received 17 out of 18 points in the 2023 review: Albany NY; Covington KY; and Fall River MA. Twenty-four dioceses were awarded 16 points, and 141 dioceses scored between 10 and 15 points. The Newark NJ diocesan website contained well-organized information on training, especially their Local Safe Environment Coordinator Training Guide – Parish.

Prevention education and training in abuse prevention are key factors in keeping the need for vigilance in the forefront for parishioners. To be effective, this training must be ongoing and inclusive of all populations who work and volunteer in our parishes. Education helps individuals distinguish potentially abusive behaviors from healthy and normal interactions. This ongoing education should be specific to child sexual abuse and inclusive of the organization's child sexual abuse prevention policies and procedures (CDC, 2007).

Category 6 – Contact Information (6 Points)

2023 Average Score = 4.51; maximum score 6, by 95 dioceses

2022 Average Score = 4.42; maximum score 6, by 93 dioceses

Researchers look for contact information about the office or person listed as head of the diocesan Child Protection or Safe Environment office; they also search for a link to a civil authority or agency for filing a child abuse complaint, such as a county Family Services or state Child Welfare agencies.

Measuring and Ranking Diocesan Safe Environment Programs: 2023

Similar to findings from the 2022 review, 95 of the 177 dioceses received maximum credit on the 2023 review. Only 6 dioceses failed to list contact information for the diocesan employee or the abuse reporting agency on their websites: Military Services USA; Covington KY; Des Moines IA; Fargo ND; Knoxville TN; and Steubenville OH. The remaining 76 dioceses failed to list one or the other contact information.

Category 7 – Audit Reporting (10 Points)

2023 Average Score = 3.01; maximum score 10, by 13 dioceses

2022 Average Score = 2.85; maximum score 10, by 9 dioceses

Reviewers searched for information posted about recent USCCB-sponsored audit findings conducted by the outside contracted company StoneBridge. Credit was awarded if the website contained information on whether the audit was conducted onsite or was only a data-review audit. Additional credit was awarded to dioceses that posted their bishop's notification of or response to the audit findings. Because the USCCB audit monitors adherence to the child protection *Charter*, each diocese was expected to report its results in that audit to the faithful.

Thirteen of the 177 diocesan websites received full credit on questions in this category, compared with 9 dioceses who received full credit in the 2022 review. However, 101 dioceses did not post the StoneBridge Auditor letters with information concerning the most recent USCCB audit report findings.

Category 8 – Diocesan Review Boards (DRB) (18 Points)

2023 Average Score = 8.08; maximum score 18, by 31 dioceses

2022 Average Score = 6.58; maximum score 18, by 21 dioceses

Article 2 of the USCCB *Charter* and Article #5 of the *Essential Norms* call for establishment of a Diocesan Review Board in each diocese. DRBs are to evaluate evidence presented by the investigator into allegations of clergy sexual abuse and to function as advisory to the bishop of the diocese in those cases.

This category utilized four worksheet questions: posting of names and credentials of DRB members; information whether lay people constitute a majority of the non-employee DRB members; posting of the name of the DRB chair; and whether the DRB is notified about all abuse allegations against clergy.

The average 2023 review scores in this category improved significantly compared to those in the 2022 review: from 6.58 in 2022 up to 8.08 in the 2023 review. Thirty-one dioceses received full credit in this category; in the overall total scoring, these 31 dioceses scored

Measuring and Ranking Diocesan Safe Environment Programs: 2023

average or above, with total scores of 70.5 or greater. Yet, 21 dioceses failed to post any information about DRBs in the 2023 review compared with 35 diocesan websites that did not receive any credit in this category in the 2022 review.

Category 9 – Publication of Names of Clergy Accused of Abuse (5 Points)

2023 Average Score = 4.39; maximum score 5, by 153 dioceses

2022 Average Score = 4.28; maximum score 5, by 149 dioceses

The vast majority of dioceses again were found to have published lists of clergy who were credibly accused of abuse (153 out of 177 dioceses); only 19 dioceses did not publish those lists. Another five dioceses posted lists of those credibly accused but did not designate whether the accused was living, deceased, or laicized or they failed to include the locations of past ministerial assignments for the accused clergy. (See Appendix E for the dioceses with incomplete listings.)

Disclosures of names of credibly accused clergy are recognized as best practice for abuse prevention and to serve as a deterrent to future abuse. Full disclosures can demonstrate diocesan transparency about issues of clergy sexual abuse and positively inform the needed trust in the institution.

Category 10 – Victim Assistance (VAC) (5 Points)

2023 Average Score = 4.46; maximum score 5, by 83 dioceses

2022 Average Score = 4.13; maximum score 5, by 68 dioceses

Clergy sexual abuse affects more than the immediate victims. So, this category examined not only whether contact information for the VAC was posted on the website but also whether pastoral and counseling services were made available to survivors and families of survivors and affected communities. Eighty-three dioceses obtained full credit (5 points) on the 2023 review compared to 68 on the 2022 review.

Many dioceses did not receive full credit again in this category because reviewers found incomplete website or policy information on the populations who were designated to receive counseling or pastoral services.

Key Issues, Final Comments, and Recommendations

Website Content

Reviewers noted a huge variance in the child safety content posted on diocesan websites. Well-organized websites have been noted in this Review. Content on those websites can serve as templates for use in other dioceses, especially those scoring low in this Review. On well-organized websites, the faithful could easily find critical information to implement in their parishes. We recommend the creation and utilization of best-practice templates for website content on these measures.

Content of diocesan policies may vary by state requirements, but basic safe environment, abuse prevention, and child safety topics following the *Charter* and *Norms* and best-practice guidelines provide the critical foundation for creating a robust policy. A comprehensive policy need not be lengthy. We recommend that a comprehensive policy address every Category analyzed in this report.

Policy

Diocesan safe environment policies need regular reviews, revisions, and updates, just as the *Charter* is reviewed and updated periodically. In the 2022 Annual Report on the Implementation of the *Charter* (July 2023), StoneBridge auditors identified 12 concerns in their audit findings, including outdated policies, lack of availability of policies or procedures, and items not translated into language used by congregants.

Posted policies and directives should be clearly stated, and the content must agree with information found on website pages. Likewise, policy content and codes of conduct should be available to the public and not password-protected.

Policies should be posted in every major language spoken by diocesan members.

We recommend that older and outdated policies posted on diocesan websites be archived to avoid posting potentially conflicting information and creating confusion about the directives for safe environments and child protection in parishes.

We also recommend regular reviews of entire website content on Safe Environment and Abuse Prevention web pages to ensure that content is in agreement with posted policies. (Reviewers did not distinguish between website content and policy content to score questions on the Worksheet.)

Measuring and Ranking Diocesan Safe Environment Programs: 2023

Policies on child protection should contain clear statements and mandates. They should be readily located on web pages and grouped under intuitive or self-explanatory headings such as Safe Environments, Child Protection, or Abuse Prevention.

Transparency of Protection Procedures: Judicial Task

The processing of child sexual abuse allegations against clergy varies from diocese to diocese. In some dioceses allegations are always sent to the chair of the Diocesan Review Board (DRB). However, because the DRB is an advisory board to the bishop some dioceses avoid that step, and only the bishop makes the determination to proceed. Some dioceses employ outside investigation of allegations, but some dioceses do not. A difficult situation arises when a bishop, who has the role of “father” within his diocese, must reconcile that role with the role of judging an allegation levied against clergy within his diocese.

This issue was mentioned in the Interim Synod Report, Article 12 “The Bishop in Ecclesial Communion” under Part II “All Disciples, All Missionaries” (Synthesis Report, 2023). The Synthesis Report emphasizes consideration of this matter to ensure a culture of respect and transparency for the procedures established for the protection of minors. Further structures dedicated to the prevention of abuse are called for as well, specifically, authoritative structures to address the difficult reconciliation of ostensibly competing episcopal roles: that of father and simultaneously that of judge when abuse allegations are levied.

Separation of those roles is needed, and the creation of another canonically specified body or empowerment of a current structure to serve as judge. A culture of transparency and respect should be ensured for the procedures established for the protection of minors.

Annual Audits

Audits that measure compliance with the bishops’ standards (*Charter* and *Norms*) should include completely independent investigations of diocesan abuse prevention and child protection measures. To ensure credibility, the auditors should be independent of each diocese.

When deficiencies are found by the auditors, such as mandatory participation in the audit process by every diocese, there must be an empowered authority to follow-up on audit findings and an enforced, time-limited period for correcting deficiencies.

Diocesan Review Boards (DRB)

In the 2022 Annual Report (July 2023), StoneBridge auditors again note some dysfunction in Diocesan Review Boards (DRBs). Problems included lack of meetings, inadequate

Measuring and Ranking Diocesan Safe Environment Programs: 2023

composition or membership, not following the Board's own by-laws, failure to rotate membership, and a lack of review of diocesan policies and procedures. DRBs are supposed to ensure that *Charter*-related policies and procedures are not only relevant but also are clearly articulated on diocesan websites and in diocesan policies. We question why dioceses have been found in compliance with an audit when their DRB is noted as dysfunctional.

Disclosure of Names of Credibly Accused Clergy

In the 2022 Annual Report (July 2023), StoneBridge auditors note the absence of a formal plan to monitor the whereabouts or activities of clergy removed from active ministry. Although disclosing names and status of credibly accused clergy is not a requirement of the *Charter*, such disclosures are best practices for abuse prevention. If disclosure of the names and current status of these clergy were made mandatory, child protection and survivor healing would be enhanced in our faith communities. Dioceses would be compelled and held accountable to disclose this critical information if there were a mandate.

Two Strong Prevention Measures

Comprehensive abuse prevention efforts must include criminal background checks of all employees, clergy, and volunteers as well as mandatory abuse prevention education and training for all groups. Clearly stated and publicly accessible mandates on these two measures are strong abuse prevention elements and need to be stated within safe environment policies and on diocesan web pages dedicated to child protection efforts. The 2023 Annual Audit (July 2023) found that some clergy, employees, and volunteers were not trained or their backgrounds not checked, yet they had contact with minors (p. 14).

The 2023 VOTF Review found that average scores in both Category 4 (Background Checks average score = 11 out of a possible 15 points) and Category 5 (Prevention Education & Training average score = 13.4 out of a possible 18 points) suggest that dioceses were not effectively monitoring compliance with their own internal policy requirements for renewal training or for renewal of background checks as noted by the auditors in the 2023 Annual Audit Report (p. 14). We recommend empowering an existing agency within dioceses, such as the DRB, to monitor the internal policy requirements for both training and renewal prevention training, for background checks/renewal checks, and for the enforcement of compliance by parishes.

Overall Recommendations and Ongoing Protection Efforts

The Pontifical Commission for the Protection of Minors met in plenary assembly earlier this year. We look forward to release of their annual report on safeguarding policies and

Measuring and Ranking Diocesan Safe Environment Programs: 2023

procedures in the Church. That document is expected to document how Catholic institutions worldwide are actively combating sexual abuse against minors and how the rules of abuse prevention are being carried out.

Efforts to understand clergy sexual abuse in the Roman Catholic Church have been underway since the revelations exposed in The *Boston Globe Spotlight Team Report* 22 years ago. National efforts to investigate sex abuse in the Church have been undertaken worldwide and, in the United States, in multiple state and local jurisdictions. In the past few years, the Vatican established a Center for Child Protection at the Pontifical Gregorian University, which recently evolved into the university's Safeguarding Institute (IADC) headed by Hans Zollner, S.J.

In comments on the 2022 German Sex Abuse Report, Fr. Zollner stated: "The sexual abuse of children and its cover-up in the Church contain concentrated issues of sex, money, power, leadership, relationships, relationship to the state, to outside experts and to the media." In that interview, he notes that the work of the IADC concerns not only sex abuse, but "it is also about structure, systemic [abuse], accountability, transparency, and much else" (O'Connell, 2022).

Mindful of the need to address all these issues, VOTF adds these recommendations to the ones cited under Key Issues above.

- ❖ Bishops should take responsibility of their diocesan website content on child protection, safe environment, and abuse prevention measures. Bishops must ensure that tenets in child protection **policies are clearly stated and easily accessible to the public** as well as in compliance with the *Charter, Norms*, and *Vos estis lux mundi*. Dioceses should monitor how their website-posted child safety guidelines and mandates are implemented in their parishes.
- ❖ VOTF recommends that **parishioners participate in child protection** efforts by monitoring the comprehensiveness of the posted diocesan guidelines and mandates. The 10 Categories utilized in this Review can be employed as fundamental standards of child safety and abuse prevention. Parishioners can work with diocesan personnel such as the chancellor and diocesan safe environment coordinator / director to ensure that comprehensive measures are in place. Monitoring efforts can ensure the diocesan measures for child safety and abuse prevention are complete, especially with reference to the 10 Categories presented in this Review. Simultaneously, parishioners should be aware of the ongoing need for child protection and safe environment efforts in their parishes and work with the parish safe environment personnel to implement the established diocesan standards.

Measuring and Ranking Diocesan Safe Environment Programs: 2023

- ❖ VOTF recommends that diocesan safe environment coordinators come together as a body and **collaborate on standardizing website content** on child protection, safe environment, and abuse prevention measures.

Reviewers did not differentiate where information was located on web pages or in policy to score the worksheet. We recommend that future reviews make note of where the dioceses post the information.

Ongoing Child Protection Efforts

Results of this Review indicate the need to enhance diocesan child protection policies and safe environment measures. Actions by all are essential to keep children safe in our church communities. Clearly stated, publicly available, and comprehensive diocesan guidelines for safe environments provide measurable standards that can be modeled in parishes and are essential to prevent further child abuse. The USCCB can more frequently update their *Charter and Norms*. The USCCB National Review Board should monitor compliance with the bishops' own standards for child protection by augmenting annual audits. VOTF will continue to monitor diocesan child protection measures on an annual basis.

However, no matter what the bishops do, individually or via the USCCB, children face the greatest dangers at the parish level. **Parishioners must play a key role in ensuring the protection of children in our parishes.**

- ❖ Parishioners should work with diocesan and parish safe environment personnel to bolster safety guidelines at the diocesan level.
- ❖ Parishioners must ensure that safety measures are carried out in their local faith communities.

Alive in the life of Jesus, the entire People of God can transform into a sacramental community where children, youth, and the vulnerable are nurtured and protected in safe environments.

References

2022 Annual Report: Findings and Recommendations. Report on the implementation of the *Charter for the Protection of Children and Young People*, July 2023. Secretariat of Child and Youth Protection; National Review Board; United States Conference of Catholic Bishops.

See link on: <https://www.usccb.org/resources/2022-annual-report-implementation-charter-protection-children-and-young-people>

Cafardi, Nicholas: “We can do better: Responding to sex abuse 10 years later.” *U.S. Catholic, Religion Section Interview*. June 1, 2012. <https://uscatholic.org/articles/201206/we-can-do-better-responding-to-sex-abuse-10-years-later/>

Centers for Disease Control, U.S. Department of Health and Human Services. “Preventing Child Sexual Abuse in Youth-Serving Organizations: Creating Safe, Stable, Nurturing Relationships and Environments,” 2007. See link on:

<https://www.cdc.gov/violenceprevention/childsexualabuse/preventingcsa-in-yso.html>

Christian, Gina. April 3, 2024. “Sacramento Diocese files for bankruptcy due to ‘sickening sin’ of church sex abuse.” *National Catholic Reporter*.

<https://www.ncronline.org/news/sacramento-diocese-files-bankruptcy-due-sickening-sin-church-sex-abuse#:~:text=The%20Diocese%20of%20Sacramento%20announced,an%20April%201%20press%20release>

Crux, April 18, 2023, Issue. “Top anti-abuse expert sets record straight on resignation from Vatican body. <https://cruxnow.com/vatican/2023/04/top-anti-abuse-expert-sets-record-straight-on-resignation-from-vatican-body>

Healy, Suzanne. Chairwoman, USCCB National Review Board for the Protection of Children and Young People. “2021 Progress Report to the Body of Bishops” June 2021.

<https://www.usccb.org/offices/child-and-youth-protection/national-review-board>

La Croix International, Sunday, February 25, 2024 Issue. “Expert says church has strong anti-abuse protocols but they’re not being fully applied.” Hans Zollner, S.J., interview by

Loup Besmond de Senneville, Vatican City. https://international.la-croix.com/news/religion/expert-says-church-has-strong-anti-abuse-protocols-but-theyre-not-being-fully-applied/19231?utm_source=newsletter&utm_medium=email&utm_campaign=Mailjet_23Feb24N1&cmid=8085c825-721d-4998-b615-76c2e42bb055

McElwee, Joshua J. *National Catholic Reporter*. “Vos Estis’ at one year: Some question pope’s process for investigating bishops”. May 27, 2020.

<https://www.ncronline.org/news/vos-estis-one-year-some-question-popes-process-investigating-bishops>

Measuring and Ranking Diocesan Safe Environment Programs: 2023

O’Connell, Gerard. “Fr. Hans Zollner on the German sex abuse report, Pope Benedict and the future of the church.” *America Magazine*, February 4, 2022.

<https://www.americamagazine.org/faith/2022/02/04/zollner-german-report-sex-abuse-pope-benedict-242334>

Quinones, Kate. April 2, 2024. “Sacramento Diocese files for bankruptcy in wake of more than 250 abuse allegations.” *Catholic News Agency*.

<https://www.catholicnewsagency.com/news/257258/sacramento-diocese-files-for-bankruptcy-in-wake-of-more-than-250-abuse-allegations>

Synthesis Report. XVI Ordinary General Assembly of the Synod of Bishops; First Session. 2023 Vatican City. [*2023.10.28-ENG-Synthesis-Report IMP.pdf \(uscgb.org\)](#)

Tutela Minorum, Pontifical Commission for the Protection Minors. “A Call to Action on the Occasion of the Consistory for the Creation of New Cardinals and the 16th Ordinary General Assembly of the Synod of Bishops.” September 27, 2023. <https://www.tutelaminorum.org/a-call-to-action-on-the-occasion-of-the-consistory-for-the-creation-of-new-cardinals-and-the-16th-ordinary-general-assembly-of-the-synod-of-bishops/>

USCCB “Charter for the Protection of Children and Young People: Essential Norms for Diocesan/Eparchial Policies Dealing with Allegations of Sexual Abuse of Minors by Priests or Deacons: A Statement of Episcopal Commitment,” 2018.

<https://www.usccb.org/offices/child-and-youth-protection/charter-protection-children-and-young-people>

USCCB “Diocesan Review Board Resource Booklet,” 2012. See link on

<https://www.usccb.org/offices/child-and-youth-protection/diocesan-resources>

Vos Estis Lux Mundi (You are the Light of the World). Pope Francis Apostolic Letter, Issued *Motu Proprio*. MAY 2019.

https://www.vatican.va/content/francesco/en/motu_proprio/documents/papa-francesco-motu-proprio-20190507_vos-estis-lux-mundi.html

White, Christopher. “Pope Francis makes ‘Vos Estis’ clergy abuse law permanent,” *National Catholic Reporter*, March 23, 2023. [Pope Francis makes 'Vos Estis' clergy abuse law permanent | National Catholic Reporter \(ncronline.org\)](#)

Zollner, S.J., Hans. “The Report on Abuse in the Catholic church in Switzerland.” *La Civiltà Cattolica*. November 15, 2023. <https://www.laciviltacattolica.com/the-report-on-abuse-in-the-catholic-church-in-switzerland/>

Appendices

Appendix A: Worksheet for Measuring Child Protection

Appendix B: Transparency Scores, Alphabetical Listing

Appendix C: Transparency Scores, Ranked by Score

Appendix D: Bishop Abuse Reporting (CBAR Information)

Appendix E: Publication of Lists: Credibly Accused Clergy

Appendix F: Bankruptcy Filings

APPENDIX A: Worksheet for Measuring Diocesan Abuse Prevention and Safe Environment Policies & Practices

Date of search: _____ Diocese Name: _____

Researcher Name: _____ Browser Used: _____

Description	Possible Points	Awarded Points	Scoring Instruction	Researcher's Comment
1. Policy -- 10 points total				
1a Is the Diocesan Child Protection or Safe Environments Policy posted on the Diocesan website?	3	_____		
1b Does the Diocesan website contain information on parish mandatory compliance with the Diocesan Abuse Prevention / Safe Environments Policy?	2	_____	(May be difficult to find.)	
1c How easily recognizable is it to find Child Protection policies on the home Diocesan webpage?	5	_____	Score: 5 if ONE click or on Homepage; 4 if need TWO clicks; 3 for THREE clicks; 2 for FOUR clicks; 1 for more than FOUR clicks.	
2. Code of Conduct -- 5 points total				
2a Is a Diocesan Code of Conduct for all clergy, including bishops, and lay employees posted on the website?	2.5	_____		
2b Is a Diocesan Code of Conduct for volunteers posted on the website?	2.5	_____		
3. Reporting of Abuse -- 8 points total				
3a Does the Diocesan website provide information on the Diocesan process for reporting abuse?	2.5	_____	Having a system is mandated in <i>moto proprio</i> 2019 .	
3b Does that website state that all suspected abuse must be reported to law enforcement or civil authorities?	2.5	_____		
3c Does the website contain information for reporting complaints against bishops for abuse or concerns in dealing with abuse?	2	_____		
3d Does the website contain a link to Catholic Bishops Abuse Reporting (CBAR) portal?	1	_____		

APPENDIX A: Worksheet for Measuring Diocesan Abuse Prevention and Safe Environment Policies & Practices

Description	Possible Points	Awarded Points	Scoring Instruction	Researcher's Comment
4. Background Checks -- 15 points total				
4a Does the website post information on who must undergo Criminal History Record checks?	5	—	Award 1 pts each: Clergy; Employees; Volunteers. Award full 5 points if all 3 populations are required to undergo Criminal History Record checks.	
4b Does the website state that Criminal History Record checks for those who come in contact with children while working or volunteering in the diocese are required annually?	2	—	Score 2 if required annually . Score 1 if required, but not annually.	
4c Does the website name who or what Department in the Diocese is responsible for conducting Criminal History Records checks?	2	—	(may be a special group or simply conducted by the Safe Environment office)	
4d Does the website provide information on what happens when Criminal History Record checks turn up a criminal record?	2	—	Process/Procedure	
4e Is information posted on the Diocesan website that Criminal History Record checks are required of members of religious communities who work or volunteer with children within the diocese?	2	—		
4f Does the website state that Criminal History Record checks and a letter of suitability are required of international and temporarily-assigned parish priests?	2	—	Award 1 point if only required of <u>either</u> foreign-born or temporarily assigned priests; award 2 points if both.	
5. Prevention Education & Training -- 18 points				
5a Does the Diocesan website contain information about the child abuse education and prevention training for adults?	5	—		
5b Does the website contain information about Diocesan requirements for abuse prevention training of all clergy?	5	—		

APPENDIX A: Worksheet for Measuring Diocesan Abuse Prevention and Safe Environment Policies & Practices

Description	Possible Points	Awarded Points	Scoring Instruction	Researcher's Comment
5. Prevention Education & Training (continued)				
5c Does the website contain information about Diocesan requirements for abuse prevention training of temporarily-assigned and visiting international priests ?	2	_____	Assign 1 point if for temporarily-assigned or visiting priests; Assign 2 points if for temporarily assigned and visiting, international priests also included.	
5d Does the website contain information about Diocesan requirements for mandatory abuse prevention training of all volunteers ?	2	_____		
5e Does the Diocesan website state that specific prevention training is required of all children and youth who participate in religious education, Catholic Schools and youth activities of the Diocese?	4	_____	Note the word "required;" and Training for Children should be at minimum a separate item in a Policy.	
6. Contact Information -- 6 points				
6a Is contact information for the Diocesan office of Child Protection or Safe Environments posted on the website?	3	_____		
6b Is there contact information on the Diocesan webpage to a civil authority website for filing a child abuse complaint?	3	_____	May be hard to find	
7. Audit Reporting -- 10 points				
7a Is the Date of and Findings from the most recent USCCB-sponsored Child Protection Audit for this Diocese posted on the Diocesan website?	5	_____		
7b Does the Diocesan website contain information whether the most recent USCCB audit was conducted onsite?	2.5	_____		

APPENDIX A: Worksheet for Measuring Diocesan Abuse Prevention and Safe Environment Policies & Practices

Description	Possible Points	Awarded Points	Scoring Instruction	Researcher's Comment
7. Audit Reporting (continued)				
7c Has the bishop personally addressed and posted on the Diocesan website the results of the most recent USCCB-sponsored Diocesan Audit?	2.5	_____	Letter; Diocesan Article/Interview (may be through a link)	
8. Review Boards -- 18 points				
8a Are the Diocesan Review Board members' names and their credentials posted on website?	5	_____		
8b Are the majority of the Diocesan Review Board members lay and not employed by the Diocese?	4	_____		
8c Is the Chair of the Diocesan Review Board a lay person not employed by the Diocese?	4	_____		
8d Is the Diocesan Review Board notified of all abuse allegations?	5	_____		
9. Publication of Names of Clergy Accused of Abuse -- 5 points				
9a Is a list of credibly accused clergy including bishops living and deceased from that Diocese posted on the Diocesan webpage or is there a statement that no diocesan clergy including bishops have had credible allegations?	2.5	_____	NOTE: There may not be any from this Diocese.	
9b Does the list include credibly accused laicized / dismissed clergy including bishops of the Diocese?	2.5	_____	There may not have been any from the Diocese. If that is stated, then Score 2.5 on Question 9b.	
10. Victim Assistance -- 5 points				
10a Is contact information for the Victim Assistance Coordinator posted on the website?	2.5	_____	If credit given, note where information was found on the website	
10b Are the pastoral and counseling services available to survivors, families of survivors and parishes described on the website?	2.5	_____	Score 1 if Survivors; Add 1 if Families are mentioned; Add 0.05 if parishes / communities are mentioned.	
Total Points		100		

Appendix B: Child Protection-Safe Environment Scores 2023

Alphabetical listing (archdioceses in bold)

NOTE: Maximum score = 100

Diocese	Total Scores		Scores per category: Maximum possible per category									
	2023	2022	C1:10	C2:5	C3:8	C4:15	C5:18	C6:6	C7:10	C8:18	C9:5	C10:5
Albany NY	77.5		9.0	5.0	8.0	10.0	17.0	6.0	2.5	10.0	5.0	5.0
2022 Scores		76.0	9.0	5.0	8.0	12.0	16.0	6.0	7.5	5.0	5.0	2.5
Alexandria VA	69.0		10.0	5.0	5.0	12.0	15.0	3.0	0.0	9.0	5.0	5.0
2022 Scores		63.5	8.0	5.0	5.0	13.0	16.0	3.0	0.0	5.0	5.0	3.5
Allentown PA	73.5		9.0	5.0	8.0	13.0	13.0	3.0	0.0	13.0	5.0	4.5
2022 Scores		83.5	9.0	5.0	8.0	10.0	9.0	6.0	10.0	18.0	5.0	3.5
Altoona-Johnstown PA	77.0		9.0	5.0	8.0	10.0	16.0	6.0	0.0	13.0	5.0	5.0
2022 Scores		64.5	10.0	5.0	8.0	12.0	16.0	6.0	0.0	0.0	5.0	2.5
Amarillo TX	68.5		10.0	5.0	5.0	13.0	14.0	6.0	1.0	5.0	5.0	4.5
2022 Scores		67.0	8.0	5.0	5.0	13.0	15.0	6.0	2.5	5.0	5.0	2.5
Anchorage-Juneau AK	68.5		9.0	5.0	8.0	13.0	13.0	6.0	0.0	5.0	5.0	4.5
2022 Scores		79.5	9.0	5.0	8.0	14.0	14.0	6.0	10.0	5.0	5.0	3.5
Arch.Military Svcs USA	34.5		10.0	0.0	2.5	6.0	11.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	5.0
2022 Scores		38.5	8.0	0.0	5.0	4.0	13.0	0.0	5.0	0.0	0.0	3.5
Arlington VA	73.5		8.0	5.0	5.5	12.0	13.0	6.0	0.0	14.0	5.0	5.0
2022 Scores		79.5	8.0	5.0	8.0	12.0	16.0	3.0	5.0	14.0	5.0	3.5
Atlanta GA	74.5		8.0	5.0	8.0	10.0	15.0	6.0	7.5	5.0	5.0	5.0
2022 Scores		77.5	9.0	5.0	8.0	13.0	14.0	6.0	7.5	5.0	5.0	5.0
Austin TX	67.5		9.0	5.0	8.0	10.0	15.0	6.0	0.0	5.0	5.0	4.5
2022 Scores		58.0	9.0	2.5	8.0	8.0	15.0	6.0	0.0	0.0	5.0	4.5
Baker-Redmond OR	70.5		9.0	5.0	8.0	9.0	15.0	6.0	0.0	14.0	0.0	4.5
2022 Scores		64.5	9.0	5.0	8.0	13.0	16.0	6.0	0.0	5.0	0.0	2.5
Baltimore MD	84.0		9.0	5.0	8.0	13.0	13.0	6.0	2.5	18.0	5.0	4.5
2022 Scores		92.5	9.0	5.0	8.0	13.0	16.0	6.0	7.5	18.0	5.0	5.0
Baton Rouge LA	66.5		10.0	5.0	8.0	8.0	15.0	6.0	0.0	5.0	5.0	4.5
2022 Scores		62.5	10.0	5.0	5.0	8.0	16.0	6.0	0.0	5.0	5.0	2.5

Appendix B: Child Protection-Safe Environment Scores 2023

Alphabetical listing (archdioceses in bold)

NOTE: Maximum score = 100

Diocese	Total Scores		Scores per category: Maximum possible per category									
	2023	2022	C1:10	C2:5	C3:8	C4:15	C5:18	C6:6	C7:10	C8:18	C9:5	C10:5
Beaumont TX	73.0		9.0	5.0	8.0	11.0	13.0	3.0	0.0	14.0	5.0	5.0
2022 Scores		73.0	10.0	5.0	5.0	11.0	16.0	3.0	0.0	13.0	5.0	5.0
Belleville IL	71.0		9.0	5.0	8.0	13.0	15.0	6.0	0.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
2022 Scores		68.0	9.0	5.0	8.0	13.0	17.0	6.0	0.0	0.0	5.0	5.0
Biloxi MS	73.0		10.0	5.0	8.0	14.0	15.0	6.0	0.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
2022 Scores		61.0	9.0	5.0	8.0	12.0	9.0	3.0	2.5	5.0	5.0	2.5
Birmingham AL	55.5		10.0	5.0	5.0	10.0	13.0	3.0	0.0	5.0	0.0	4.5
2022 Scores		60.0	8.0	5.0	5.0	10.0	16.0	6.0	0.0	5.0	0.0	5.0
Bismarck ND	70.5		10.0	5.0	8.0	12.0	15.0	6.0	0.0	5.0	5.0	4.5
2022 Scores		62.0	10.0	5.0	8.0	7.0	16.0	6.0	0.0	0.0	5.0	5.0
Boise ID	81.5		10.0	5.0	5.0	13.0	15.0	3.0	2.5	18.0	5.0	5.0
2022 Scores		78.0	9.0	5.0	5.0	13.0	15.0	3.0	2.5	18.0	5.0	2.5
Boston MA	90.5		9.0	5.0	8.0	13.0	14.0	6.0	7.5	18.0	5.0	5.0
2022 Scores		82.5	10.0	5.0	8.0	13.0	9.0	6.0	7.5	14.0	5.0	5.0
Bridgeport CT	88.5		10.0	5.0	8.0	14.0	15.0	3.0	10.0	14.0	5.0	4.5
2022 Scores		72.0	9.0	5.0	8.0	14.0	18.0	6.0	2.5	0.0	5.0	4.5
Brooklyn NY	89.5		10.0	5.0	5.0	14.0	15.0	3.0	10.0	18.0	5.0	4.5
2022 Scores		89.0	9.0	5.0	8.0	12.0	15.0	3.0	10.0	18.0	5.0	4.0
Brownsville TX	66.5		10.0	5.0	8.0	11.0	12.5	6.0	0.0	5.0	5.0	4.0
2022 Scores		58.0	10.0	5.0	8.0	11.0	9.0	6.0	0.0	0.0	5.0	4.0
Buffalo NY	84.5		10.0	5.0	8.0	8.0	16.0	3.0	7.5	18.0	5.0	4.0
2022 Scores		72.0	9.0	5.0	5.0	10.0	11.0	3.0	7.5	14.0	5.0	2.5
Burlington VT	73.0		10.0	5.0	5.0	10.0	13.0	6.0	10.0	5.0	5.0	4.0
2022 Scores		68.5	9.0	5.0	5.0	12.0	9.0	6.0	7.5	5.0	5.0	5.0
Camden NJ	80.5		9.0	0.0	8.0	13.0	14.0	6.0	7.5	14.0	5.0	4.0
2022 Scores		86.5	8.0	5.0	8.0	13.0	16.0	6.0	2.5	18.0	5.0	5.0

Appendix B: Child Protection-Safe Environment Scores 2023

Alphabetical listing (archdioceses in bold)

NOTE: Maximum score = 100

Diocese	Total Scores		Scores per category: Maximum possible per category									
	2023	2022	C1:10	C2:5	C3:8	C4:15	C5:18	C6:6	C7:10	C8:18	C9:5	C10:5
Charleston SC	81.5		10.0	5.0	8.0	14.0	16.0	6.0	7.5	5.0	5.0	5.0
2022 Scores	88.5		9.0	5.0	8.0	14.0	16.0	6.0	7.5	13.0	5.0	5.0
Charlotte NC	76.0		10.0	5.0	8.0	12.0	15.0	6.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
2022 Scores	74.0		9.0	5.0	8.0	14.0	12.0	6.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Cheyenne WY	80.0		10.0	5.0	8.0	11.0	16.0	6.0	0.0	14.0	5.0	5.0
2022 Scores	74.0		8.0	5.0	8.0	8.0	15.0	6.0	0.0	14.0	5.0	5.0
Chicago IL	75.0		8.0	5.0	8.0	14.0	15.0	6.0	0.0	9.0	5.0	5.0
2022 Scores	71.0		6.0	5.0	8.0	14.0	18.0	6.0	0.0	4.0	5.0	5.0
Cincinnati OH	73.5		9.0	5.0	8.0	12.0	14.0	3.0	7.5	5.0	5.0	5.0
2022 Scores	57.0		10.0	0.0	8.0	12.0	14.0	3.0	0.0	0.0	5.0	5.0
Cleveland OH	85.5		10.0	5.0	8.0	9.0	15.0	3.0	7.5	18.0	5.0	5.0
2022 Scores	88.5		10.0	5.0	8.0	13.0	17.0	0.0	7.5	18.0	5.0	5.0
Colorado Springs CO	55.5		10.0	5.0	8.0	8.0	11.0	6.0	0.0	0.0	5.0	2.5
2022 Scores	41.5		8.0	0.0	8.0	7.0	10.0	6.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.5
Columbus OH	63.5		9.0	5.0	8.0	12.0	10.0	6.0	0.0	5.0	5.0	3.5
2022 Scores	57.5		9.0	5.0	8.0	12.0	11.0	3.0	0.0	0.0	5.0	4.5
Corpus Christi TX	31.5		2.0	2.5	2.5	7.0	4.0	6.0	0.0	0.0	5.0	2.5
2022 Scores	27.0		0.0	5.0	2.5	3.0	6.0	3.0	0.0	0.0	5.0	2.5
Covington KY	63.5		9.0	5.0	8.0	11.0	17.0	0.0	0.0	5.0	5.0	3.5
2022 Scores	71.5		10.0	5.0	8.0	14.0	18.0	3.0	0.0	5.0	5.0	3.5
Crookston MN	79.0		10.0	5.0	8.0	13.0	15.0	6.0	7.5	5.0	5.0	4.5
2022 Scores	77.0		10.0	5.0	8.0	12.0	15.0	6.0	7.5	5.0	5.0	3.5
Dallas TX	78.0		10.0	5.0	8.0	13.0	14.0	6.0	7.5	5.0	5.0	4.5
2022 Scores	57.5		10.0	5.0	8.0	12.0	9.0	6.0	0.0	0.0	5.0	2.5

Appendix B: Child Protection-Safe Environment Scores 2023

Alphabetical listing (archdioceses in bold)

NOTE: Maximum score = 100

Diocese	Total Scores		Scores per category: Maximum possible per category									
	2023	2022	C1:10	C2:5	C3:8	C4:15	C5:18	C6:6	C7:10	C8:18	C9:5	C10:5
Davenport IA	74.0		10.0	5.0	8.0	11.0	14.0	6.0	7.5	5.0	2.5	5.0
2022 Scores		71.0	10.0	5.0	8.0	11.0	14.0	3.0	7.5	5.0	2.5	5.0
Denver CO	69.0		9.0	5.0	8.0	13.0	13.0	6.0	0.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
2022 Scores		61.5	9.0	5.0	8.0	10.0	14.0	6.0	0.0	0.0	5.0	4.5
Des Moines IA	70.5		8.0	5.0	8.0	11.0	11.0	0.0	0.0	18.0	5.0	4.5
2022 Scores		73.5	10.0	5.0	8.0	10.0	10.0	3.0	0.0	18.0	5.0	4.5
Detroit MI	81.0		8.0	5.0	8.0	10.0	13.0	3.0	7.5	18.0	5.0	3.5
2022 Scores		87.0	6.0	5.0	8.0	13.0	15.0	6.0	7.5	18.0	5.0	3.5
Dodge City KS	63.0		9.0	5.0	8.0	13.0	13.0	3.0	0.0	5.0	5.0	2.0
2022 Scores		67.5	9.0	5.0	8.0	13.0	14.0	6.0	0.0	5.0	5.0	2.5
Dubuque IA	76.0		10.0	5.0	8.0	9.0	16.0	3.0	10.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
2022 Scores		62.0	10.0	5.0	8.0	11.0	15.0	3.0	0.0	0.0	5.0	5.0
Duluth MN	64.5		10.0	5.0	8.0	10.0	14.0	3.0	0.0	5.0	5.0	4.5
2022 Scores		67.5	10.0	5.0	8.0	13.0	14.0	3.0	0.0	5.0	5.0	4.5
El Paso TX	56.5		9.0	5.0	8.0	9.0	10.0	6.0	0.0	0.0	5.0	4.5
2022 Scores		50.5	9.0	5.0	5.5	9.0	9.0	3.0	0.0	0.0	5.0	5.0
Erie PA	77.5		9.0	5.0	8.0	13.0	14.0	6.0	7.5	5.0	5.0	5.0
2022 Scores		69.5	8.0	5.0	8.0	14.0	11.0	6.0	7.5	0.0	5.0	5.0
Evansville IN	74.0		10.0	5.0	8.0	10.0	13.0	6.0	7.5	5.0	5.0	4.5
2022 Scores		72.0	10.0	5.0	8.0	13.0	15.0	6.0	7.5	0.0	5.0	2.5
Fairbanks AK	77.0		9.0	5.0	8.0	14.0	14.0	6.0	7.5	5.0	5.0	3.5
2022 Scores		66.0	10.0	5.0	8.0	10.0	16.0	3.0	0.0	5.0	5.0	4.0
Fall River MA	95.0		9.0	5.0	8.0	13.0	17.0	6.0	10.0	18.0	5.0	4.0
2022 Scores		82.5	9.0	2.5	8.0	13.0	17.0	6.0	0.0	18.0	5.0	4.0
Fargo ND	57.0		10.0	5.0	8.0	6.0	13.0	0.0	0.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
2022 Scores		61.5	10.0	5.0	8.0	11.0	14.0	0.0	0.0	5.0	5.0	3.5

Appendix B: Child Protection-Safe Environment Scores 2023

Alphabetical listing (archdioceses in bold)

NOTE: Maximum score = 100

Diocese	Total Scores										Scores per category: Maximum possible per category													
	2023	2022	C1:10	C2:5	C3:8	C4:15	C5:18	C6:6	C7:10	C8:18	C9:5	C10:5	2023	2022	C1:10	C2:5	C3:8	C4:15	C5:18	C6:6	C7:10	C8:18	C9:5	C10:5
Fort Wayne-South Bend I	88.0		9.0	5.0	8.0	14.0	15.0	6.0	7.5	14.0	5.0	4.5			9.0	5.0	8.0	14.0	15.0	6.0	7.5	14.0	5.0	4.5
2022 Scores		77.0	7.0	5.0	8.0	13.0	15.0	3.0	7.5	9.0	5.0	4.5												
Fort Worth TX	63.5		9.0	5.0	8.0	8.0	16.0	3.0	0.0	5.0	5.0	4.5			9.0	5.0	8.0	8.0	16.0	3.0	0.0	5.0	5.0	4.5
2022 Scores		60.0	10.0	5.0	8.0	10.0	14.0	3.0	0.0	0.0	5.0	5.0												
Fresno CA	74.0		9.0	5.0	8.0	8.0	13.0	3.0	0.0	18.0	5.0	5.0			9.0	5.0	8.0	13.0	3.0	0.0	0.0	18.0	5.0	5.0
2022 Scores		57.5	8.0	2.5	8.0	6.0	15.0	3.0	5.0	5.0	0.0	5.0												
Gallup NM	70.5		10.0	5.0	7.0	14.0	15.0	6.0	0.0	5.0	5.0	3.5			10.0	5.0	7.0	14.0	15.0	6.0	0.0	5.0	5.0	3.5
2022 Scores		64.0	10.0	5.0	7.0	14.0	11.0	6.0	0.0	5.0	2.5	3.5												
Galveston-Houston TX	57.5		9.0	2.5	8.0	8.0	13.5	3.0	0.0	5.0	5.0	3.5			9.0	2.5	8.0	8.0	13.5	3.0	0.0	5.0	5.0	3.5
2022 Scores		65.0	10.0	2.5	8.0	7.0	17.0	6.0	0.0	5.0	5.0	4.5												
Gary IN	76.0		10.0	5.0	8.0	12.0	14.0	3.0	0.0	14.0	5.0	5.0			10.0	5.0	8.0	12.0	14.0	3.0	0.0	14.0	5.0	5.0
2022 Scores		63.5	9.0	2.5	8.0	10.0	14.0	0.0	0.0	10.0	5.0	5.0												
Gaylord MI	86.5		10.0	5.0	8.0	8.0	14.0	6.0	7.5	18.0	5.0	5.0			10.0	5.0	8.0	14.0	14.0	6.0	7.5	18.0	5.0	5.0
2022 Scores		71.5	7.0	5.0	8.0	8.0	14.0	3.0	7.5	9.0	5.0	5.0												
Grand Island NE	71.0		9.0	5.0	8.0	13.0	14.0	3.0	0.0	14.0	0.0	5.0			9.0	5.0	8.0	13.0	14.0	3.0	0.0	14.0	0.0	5.0
2022 Scores		74.0	9.0	5.0	8.0	12.0	9.0	6.0	7.5	14.0	0.0	3.5												
Grand Rapids ME	72.0		10.0	5.0	8.0	10.0	16.0	3.0	10.0	5.0	0.0	5.0			10.0	5.0	8.0	10.0	16.0	3.0	10.0	5.0	0.0	5.0
2022 Scores		58.0	7.0	5.0	8.0	10.0	9.0	3.0	7.5	5.0	0.0	3.5												
Great Falls-Billings MT	76.5		9.0	5.0	8.0	13.0	13.0	3.0	0.0	18.0	2.5	5.0			9.0	5.0	8.0	13.0	13.0	3.0	0.0	18.0	2.5	5.0
2022 Scores		54.5	9.0	5.0	5.5	13.0	9.0	0.0	0.0	8.0	2.5	2.5												
Green Bay WI	71.0		10.0	5.0	8.0	9.0	13.0	3.0	0.0	13.0	5.0	5.0			10.0	5.0	8.0	9.0	13.0	3.0	0.0	13.0	5.0	5.0
2022 Scores		78.5	10.0	5.0	8.0	6.0	14.0	6.0	7.5	13.0	5.0	4.0												
Greensburg PA	68.0		10.0	5.0	8.0	12.0	12.0	6.0	0.0	5.0	5.0	5.0			10.0	5.0	8.0	12.0	12.0	6.0	0.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
2022 Scores		64.0	10.0	5.0	8.0	8.0	12.0	6.0	0.0	5.0	5.0	5.0												
Harrisburg PA	96.5		10.0	5.0	8.0	14.0	16.0	6.0	10.0	18.0	5.0	4.5			10.0	5.0	8.0	14.0	16.0	6.0	10.0	18.0	5.0	4.5
2022 Scores		95.5	10.0	5.0	8.0	14.0	16.0	6.0	10.0	18.0	5.0	3.5												

Appendix B: Child Protection-Safe Environment Scores 2023

Alphabetical listing (archdioceses in bold)

NOTE: Maximum score = 100

Diocese	Total Scores										Scores per category: Maximum possible per category													
	2023	2022	C1:10	C2:5	C3:8	C4:15	C5:18	C6:6	C7:10	C8:18	C9:5	C10:5	2023	2022	C1:10	C2:5	C3:8	C4:15	C5:18	C6:6	C7:10	C8:18	C9:5	C10:5
Hartford CT	67.0		10.0	5.0	8.0	14.0	13.0	3.0	0.0	5.0	5.0	4.0			10.0	5.0	8.0	14.0	13.0	3.0	0.0	5.0	5.0	4.0
2022 Scores	68.5		9.0	2.5	8.0	13.0	14.0	3.0	0.0	9.0	5.0	5.0			9.0	2.5	8.0	13.0	14.0	3.0	0.0	9.0	5.0	5.0
Helena MT	74.0		10.0	5.0	8.0	11.0	14.0	3.0	0.0	13.0	5.0	5.0			10.0	5.0	8.0	11.0	14.0	3.0	0.0	13.0	5.0	5.0
2022 Scores	75.5		10.0	5.0	8.0	9.0	15.0	3.0	2.5	13.0	5.0	5.0			10.0	5.0	8.0	9.0	15.0	3.0	2.5	13.0	5.0	5.0
Honolulu HI	64.0		9.0	5.0	8.0	12.0	13.0	6.0	7.5	0.0	0.0	3.5			9.0	5.0	8.0	12.0	13.0	6.0	7.5	0.0	0.0	3.5
2022 Scores	63.5		9.0	5.0	8.0	13.0	14.0	6.0	0.0	5.0	0.0	3.5			9.0	5.0	8.0	13.0	14.0	6.0	0.0	5.0	0.0	3.5
Houma-Thibodaux LA	68.5		9.0	5.0	8.0	10.0	16.0	3.0	0.0	9.0	5.0	3.5			9.0	5.0	8.0	10.0	16.0	3.0	0.0	9.0	5.0	3.5
2022 Scores	69.0		9.0	5.0	8.0	10.0	14.0	3.0	2.5	9.0	5.0	3.5			9.0	5.0	8.0	10.0	14.0	3.0	2.5	9.0	5.0	3.5
Indianapolis IN	65.0		10.0	5.0	8.0	10.0	14.0	3.0	0.0	5.0	5.0	5.0			10.0	5.0	8.0	10.0	14.0	3.0	0.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
2022 Scores	68.0		10.0	5.0	8.0	9.0	18.0	3.0	0.0	5.0	5.0	5.0			10.0	5.0	8.0	9.0	18.0	3.0	0.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Jackson MS	68.5		10.0	5.0	8.0	5.0	12.0	6.0	7.5	5.0	5.0	5.0			10.0	5.0	8.0	5.0	12.0	6.0	7.5	5.0	5.0	5.0
2022 Scores	77.5		10.0	5.0	8.0	12.0	14.0	6.0	7.5	5.0	5.0	5.0			10.0	5.0	8.0	12.0	14.0	6.0	7.5	5.0	5.0	5.0
Jefferson City MO	73.0		8.0	5.0	8.0	12.0	14.0	6.0	7.5	5.0	5.0	2.5			8.0	5.0	8.0	12.0	14.0	6.0	7.5	5.0	5.0	2.5
2022 Scores	71.0		10.0	5.0	8.0	12.0	15.0	6.0	7.5	0.0	5.0	2.5			10.0	5.0	8.0	12.0	15.0	6.0	7.5	0.0	5.0	2.5
Joliet IL	67.5		9.0	5.0	8.0	9.0	11.5	6.0	0.0	9.0	5.0	5.0			9.0	5.0	8.0	9.0	11.5	6.0	0.0	9.0	5.0	5.0
2022 Scores	67.5		9.0	5.0	8.0	12.0	9.0	6.0	0.0	9.0	5.0	4.5			9.0	5.0	8.0	12.0	9.0	6.0	0.0	9.0	5.0	4.5
Kalamazoo MI	60.0		9.0	5.0	8.0	11.0	14.0	3.0	0.0	5.0	0.0	5.0			9.0	5.0	8.0	11.0	14.0	3.0	0.0	5.0	0.0	5.0
2022 Scores	43.5		8.0	5.0	8.0	5.0	10.0	3.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	4.5			8.0	5.0	8.0	5.0	10.0	3.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	4.5
Kansas City KS	67.0		9.0	5.0	8.0	10.0	14.0	6.0	0.0	5.0	5.0	5.0			9.0	5.0	8.0	10.0	14.0	6.0	0.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
2022 Scores	64.5		9.0	5.0	8.0	8.0	16.0	6.0	0.0	5.0	5.0	2.5			9.0	5.0	8.0	8.0	16.0	6.0	0.0	5.0	5.0	2.5
Kansas City-Saint Joseph	81.5		9.0	5.0	8.0	12.0	13.0	3.0	7.5	14.0	5.0	5.0			9.0	5.0	8.0	12.0	13.0	3.0	7.5	14.0	5.0	5.0
2022 Scores	82.0		9.0	5.0	8.0	12.0	14.0	3.0	7.5	14.0	5.0	4.5			9.0	5.0	8.0	12.0	14.0	3.0	7.5	14.0	5.0	4.5
Knoxville TN	66.5		10.0	5.0	8.0	11.0	10.0	0.0	7.5	5.0	5.0	5.0			10.0	5.0	8.0	10.0	10.0	0.0	7.5	5.0	5.0	5.0
2022 Scores	77.5		10.0	5.0	8.0	10.0	14.0	0.0	7.5	13.0	5.0	5.0			10.0	5.0	8.0	10.0	14.0	0.0	7.5	13.0	5.0	5.0
La Crosse WI	85.0		9.0	5.0	8.0	11.0	14.0	3.0	7.5	18.0	5.0	4.5			9.0	5.0	8.0	11.0	14.0	3.0	7.5	18.0	5.0	4.5
2022 Scores	77.5		10.0	5.0	8.0	10.0	14.0	0.0	7.5	13.0	5.0	5.0			10.0	5.0	8.0	10.0	14.0	0.0	7.5	13.0	5.0	5.0

Appendix B: Child Protection-Safe Environment Scores 2023

Alphabetical listing (archdioceses in bold)

NOTE: Maximum score = 100

Diocese	Total Scores										Scores per category: Maximum possible per category													
	2023	2022	C1:10	C2:5	C3:8	C4:15	C5:18	C6:6	C7:10	C8:18	C9:5	C10:5	2023	2022	C1:10	C2:5	C3:8	C4:15	C5:18	C6:6	C7:10	C8:18	C9:5	C10:5
Lafayette IN	66.5		9.0	5.0	8.0	13.0	14.0	3.0	0.0	5.0	5.0	4.5			9.0	5.0	8.0	13.0	14.0	3.0	0.0	5.0	5.0	4.5
2022 Scores		59.0	10.0	5.0	8.0	12.0	11.0	3.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	5.0			10.0	5.0	8.0	11.0	11.0	3.0	0.0	0.0	5.0	5.0
Lafayette LA	54.5		8.0	5.0	7.0	7.0	14.0	6.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.5			8.0	5.0	7.0	7.0	14.0	6.0	0.0	0.0	5.0	2.5
2022 Scores		61.0	10.0	5.0	5.0	11.0	14.0	6.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	5.0			10.0	5.0	5.0	11.0	14.0	6.0	0.0	0.0	5.0	5.0
Lake Charles LA	57.0		6.0	5.0	5.0	8.0	10.0	6.0	7.5	0.0	5.0	4.5			6.0	5.0	5.0	8.0	10.0	6.0	7.5	0.0	5.0	4.5
2022 Scores		49.0	10.0	5.0	5.0	6.0	0.0	6.0	7.5	0.0	5.0	4.5			10.0	5.0	5.0	6.0	0.0	6.0	7.5	0.0	5.0	4.5
Lansing MI	71.5		0.0	5.0	8.0	10.0	14.0	3.0	7.5	14.0	5.0	5.0			0.0	5.0	8.0	10.0	14.0	3.0	7.5	14.0	5.0	5.0
2022 Scores		63.5	9.0	5.0	8.0	9.0	11.0	3.0	0.0	10.0	5.0	3.5			9.0	5.0	8.0	9.0	11.0	3.0	0.0	10.0	5.0	3.5
Laredo TX	68.0		10.0	5.0	8.0	11.0	13.0	6.0	0.0	5.0	5.0	5.0			10.0	5.0	8.0	11.0	13.0	6.0	0.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
2022 Scores		54.0	10.0	5.0	8.0	11.0	9.0	6.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	5.0			10.0	5.0	8.0	11.0	9.0	6.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	5.0
Las Cruces NM	61.0		10.0	5.0	8.0	11.0	14.0	3.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	5.0			10.0	5.0	8.0	11.0	14.0	3.0	0.0	0.0	5.0	5.0
2022 Scores		58.0	9.0	2.5	5.5	14.0	17.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	5.0			9.0	2.5	5.5	14.0	17.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	5.0	5.0
Las Vegas NV	42.5		2.0	2.5	8.0	5.0	8.5	3.0	0.0	4.0	5.0	4.5			2.0	2.5	8.0	5.0	8.5	3.0	0.0	4.0	5.0	4.5
2022 Scores		57.0	2.0	5.0	8.0	5.0	11.0	6.0	7.5	4.0	5.0	3.5			2.0	5.0	8.0	5.0	11.0	6.0	7.5	4.0	5.0	3.5
Lexington KY	71.0		10.0	5.0	5.0	10.0	13.0	3.0	7.5	14.0	0.0	3.5			10.0	5.0	5.0	10.0	13.0	3.0	7.5	14.0	0.0	3.5
2022 Scores		77.0	9.0	5.0	8.0	12.0	18.0	6.0	0.0	9.0	5.0	5.0			9.0	5.0	8.0	12.0	18.0	6.0	0.0	9.0	5.0	5.0
Lincoln NE	70.0		9.0	0.0	5.0	14.0	15.0	3.0	0.0	14.0	5.0	5.0			9.0	0.0	5.0	14.0	15.0	3.0	0.0	14.0	5.0	5.0
2022 Scores		76.0	9.0	5.0	5.0	13.0	17.0	3.0	0.0	14.0	5.0	5.0			9.0	5.0	5.0	13.0	17.0	3.0	0.0	14.0	5.0	5.0
Little Rock AR	63.0		10.0	5.0	8.0	6.0	6.0	6.0	7.5	5.0	5.0	4.5			10.0	5.0	8.0	6.0	6.0	6.0	7.5	5.0	5.0	4.5
2022 Scores		68.0	10.0	5.0	8.0	9.0	9.0	6.0	7.5	5.0	5.0	3.5			10.0	5.0	8.0	9.0	9.0	6.0	7.5	5.0	5.0	3.5
Los Angeles CA	76.0		9.0	5.0	8.0	11.0	15.0	6.0	7.5	5.0	5.0	4.5			9.0	5.0	8.0	11.0	15.0	6.0	7.5	5.0	5.0	4.5
2022 Scores		67.0	10.0	5.0	8.0	13.0	10.0	6.0	0.0	5.0	5.0	5.0			10.0	5.0	8.0	13.0	10.0	6.0	0.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Louisville KY	79.0		10.0	5.0	8.0	10.0	10.0	6.0	2.5	18.0	5.0	4.5			10.0	5.0	8.0	10.0	10.0	6.0	2.5	18.0	5.0	4.5
2022 Scores		73.5	10.0	5.0	8.0	11.0	9.0	3.0	0.0	18.0	5.0	4.5			10.0	5.0	8.0	11.0	9.0	3.0	0.0	18.0	5.0	4.5
Lubbock TX	48.5		10.0	5.0	8.0	5.0	5.0	6.0	0.0	0.0	5.0	4.5			10.0	5.0	8.0	5.0	5.0	6.0	0.0	0.0	5.0	4.5
2022 Scores		23.5	0.0	0.0	8.0	0.0	5.0	3.0	0.0	0.0	5.0	2.5			0.0	0.0	8.0	0.0	5.0	3.0	0.0	0.0	5.0	2.5

Appendix B: Child Protection-Safe Environment Scores 2023

Alphabetical listing (archdioceses in bold)

NOTE: Maximum score = 100

Diocese	Total Scores										Scores per category: Maximum possible per category														
	2023	2022	C1:10	C2:5	C3:8	C4:15	C5:18	C6:6	C7:10	C8:18	C9:5	C10:5	2023	2022	C1:10	C2:5	C3:8	C4:15	C5:18	C6:6	C7:10	C8:18	C9:5	C10:5	
Madison WI	69.5		9.0	5.0	8.0	8.0	16.0	6.0	2.5	5.0	5.0	5.0													
2022 Scores		61.0	9.0	5.0	8.0	8.0	10.0	6.0	0.0	5.0	5.0	4.0													
Manchester NH	69.5		9.0	5.0	8.0	13.0	14.0	3.0	7.5	0.0	0.0	5.0													
2022 Scores		69.5	10.0	5.0	8.0	11.0	15.0	3.0	7.5	0.0	5.0	5.0													
Marquette MI	68.0		10.0	5.0	8.0	12.0	13.0	6.0	0.0	5.0	5.0	4.0													
2022 Scores		67.0	10.0	5.0	8.0	10.0	14.0	6.0	0.0	5.0	5.0	4.0													
Memphis TN	77.5		10.0	2.5	8.0	13.0	13.0	3.0	0.0	18.0	5.0	5.0													
2022 Scores		65.5	10.0	2.5	8.0	11.0	5.0	6.0	0.0	13.0	5.0	5.0													
Metuchen NJ	54.5		9.0	5.0	8.0	12.0	0.0	6.0	0.0	5.0	5.0	4.5													
2022 Scores		57.5	8.0	5.0	8.0	12.0	5.0	6.0	0.0	5.0	5.0	3.5													
Miami FL	59.0		10.0	5.0	8.0	13.0	11.0	3.0	0.0	5.0	0.0	4.0													
2022 Scores		65.0	10.0	5.0	8.0	14.0	15.0	3.0	0.0	5.0	0.0	5.0													
Milwaukee WI	70.5		9.0	5.0	8.0	10.0	13.0	6.0	0.0	10.0	5.0	4.5													
2022 Scores		63.5	9.0	5.0	8.0	8.0	14.0	6.0	0.0	5.0	5.0	3.5													
Mobile AL	73.5		9.0	5.0	8.0	13.0	13.0	3.0	7.5	5.0	5.0	5.0													
2022 Scores		63.5	9.0	5.0	8.0	12.0	14.0	3.0	7.5	0.0	5.0	5.0													
Monterey CA	63.0		10.0	5.0	8.0	13.0	9.0	3.0	0.0	5.0	5.0	5.0													
2022 Scores		56.0	10.0	5.0	8.0	11.0	9.0	3.0	0.0	0.0	5.0	5.0													
Nashville TN	73.5		10.0	5.0	8.0	15.0	15.0	6.0	0.0	5.0	5.0	4.5													
2022 Scores		79.0	10.0	5.0	8.0	12.0	16.0	6.0	7.5	5.0	5.0	4.5													
New Orleans LA	59.5		9.0	5.0	8.0	8.0	14.0	6.0	0.0	0.0	5.0	4.5													
2022 Scores		65.5	9.0	5.0	8.0	13.0	16.0	6.0	0.0	0.0	5.0	3.5													
New Ulm MN	64.5		9.0	5.0	8.0	13.0	10.0	6.0	0.0	5.0	5.0	3.5													
2022 Scores		65.5	9.0	5.0	8.0	9.0	15.0	6.0	0.0	5.0	5.0	3.5													
New York NY	73.5		9.0	5.0	8.0	15.0	15.0	6.0	1.0	5.0	5.0	4.5													
2022 Scores		67.0	9.0	5.0	8.0	12.0	14.0	3.0	2.5	5.0	5.0	3.5													

Appendix B: Child Protection-Safe Environment Scores 2023

Alphabetical listing (*archdioceses in bold*)

NOTE: Maximum score = 100

Diocese	Total Scores		Scores per category: Maximum possible per category									
	2023	2022	C1:10	C2:5	C3:8	C4:15	C5:18	C6:6	C7:10	C8:18	C9:5	C10:5
Newark NJ	72.0		10.0	5.0	8.0	10.0	13.0	3.0	0.0	14.0	5.0	4.0
2022 Scores	69.5		9.0	5.0	8.0	11.0	10.0	3.0	0.0	14.0	5.0	4.5
Norwich CT	67.5		9.0	5.0	8.0	14.0	16.0	3.0	0.0	5.0	5.0	2.5
2022 Scores	68.0		9.0	5.0	8.0	14.0	16.0	6.0	0.0	5.0	5.0	0.0
Oakland CA	76.5		10.0	5.0	8.0	11.0	16.0	3.0	0.0	14.0	5.0	4.5
2022 Scores	66.5		8.0	5.0	8.0	12.0	11.0	3.0	0.0	10.0	5.0	4.5
Ogdensburg NY	89.5		10.0	5.0	8.0	14.0	13.5	6.0	7.5	18.0	2.5	5.0
2022 Scores	78.0		10.0	5.0	8.0	13.0	14.0	3.0	10.0	10.0	0.0	5.0
Oklahoma City OK	83.0		8.0	5.0	8.0	11.0	14.0	3.0	7.5	18.0	5.0	3.5
2022 Scores	72.5		9.0	5.0	8.0	11.0	15.0	3.0	0.0	13.0	5.0	3.5
Omaha NE	74.5		10.0	5.0	8.0	12.0	10.0	3.0	2.5	14.0	5.0	5.0
2022 Scores	84.5		10.0	5.0	8.0	13.0	14.0	3.0	7.5	14.0	5.0	5.0
Orange CA	72.0		9.0	5.0	8.0	6.0	13.0	3.0	0.0	18.0	5.0	5.0
2022 Scores	77.5		9.0	5.0	8.0	8.0	14.0	6.0	0.0	18.0	5.0	4.5
Orlando FL	78.5		10.0	5.0	8.0	14.0	16.0	6.0	7.5	5.0	2.5	4.5
2022 Scores	81.0		10.0	5.0	8.0	14.0	16.0	6.0	7.5	5.0	5.0	4.5
Owensboro KY	74.0		9.0	5.0	8.0	11.0	13.0	6.0	7.5	5.0	5.0	4.5
2022 Scores	76.0		9.0	5.0	8.0	12.0	14.0	6.0	7.5	5.0	5.0	4.5
Palm Beach FL	65.0		9.0	5.0	8.0	13.0	13.0	6.0	2.5	5.0	0.0	3.5
2022 Scores	61.5		9.0	5.0	8.0	14.0	16.0	6.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.5
Paterson NJ	77.0		9.0	5.0	5.0	12.0	16.0	6.0	0.0	14.0	5.0	5.0
2022 Scores	75.5		9.0	5.0	5.0	13.0	14.0	6.0	0.0	14.0	5.0	4.5
Pensacola-Tallahassee FL	67.5		9.0	5.0	8.0	12.0	13.0	6.0	0.0	5.0	5.0	4.5
2022 Scores	63.5		9.0	5.0	8.0	12.0	14.0	6.0	0.0	0.0	5.0	4.5
Peoria IL	62.0		10.0	5.0	8.0	8.0	13.0	3.0	0.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
2022 Scores	41.5		9.0	5.0	5.0	0.0	9.0	0.0	0.0	5.0	5.0	3.5

Appendix B: Child Protection-Safe Environment Scores 2023

Alphabetical listing (archdioceses in bold)

NOTE: Maximum score = 100

Diocese	Total Scores										Scores per category: Maximum possible per category													
	2023	2022	C1:10	C2:5	C3:8	C4:15	C5:18	C6:6	C7:10	C8:18	C9:5	C10:5	2023	2022	C1:10	C2:5	C3:8	C4:15	C5:18	C6:6	C7:10	C8:18	C9:5	C10:5
Philadelphia PA	84.0		10.0	5.0	8.0	13.0	14.0	6.0	0.0	18.0	5.0	5.0	76.0	76.0	10.0	5.0	8.0	14.0	9.0	6.0	0.0	14.0	5.0	5.0
2022 Scores																								
Phoenix AZ	65.5		10.0	5.0	8.0	8.0	16.0	6.0	0.0	5.0	5.0	2.5	69.0	69.0	10.0	5.0	8.0	13.0	17.0	6.0	0.0	0.0	5.0	5.0
2022 Scores																								
Pittsburgh PA	65.0		9.0	5.0	5.0	12.0	13.0	6.0	0.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	64.5	64.5	9.0	5.0	8.0	14.0	6.0	0.0	0.0	5.0	5.0	4.5
2022 Scores																								
Portland ME	66.0		10.0	5.0	8.0	10.0	10.0	3.0	10.0	5.0	0.0	5.0	74.0	74.0	10.0	5.0	8.0	15.0	3.0	10.0	10.0	5.0	0.0	5.0
2022 Scores																								
Portland OR	62.0		10.0	5.0	7.0	14.0	15.0	6.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	5.0	60.0	60.0	10.0	5.0	8.0	14.0	6.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	5.0
2022 Scores																								
Providence RI	67.5		10.0	5.0	8.0	5.0	10.0	3.0	7.5	9.0	5.0	5.0	69.5	69.5	7.0	5.0	6.0	14.0	3.0	7.5	9.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
2022 Scores																								
Pueblo CO	8.5		0.0	0.0	5.5	0.0	0.0	3.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	44.0	44.0	9.0	5.0	8.0	9.0	3.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
2022 Scores																								
Raleigh NC	64.0		9.0	5.0	8.0	9.0	12.0	6.0	0.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	63.0	63.0	8.0	5.0	8.0	9.0	6.0	0.0	0.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
2022 Scores																								
Rapid City SD	67.0		9.0	5.0	8.0	12.0	15.0	3.0	0.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	61.0	61.0	9.0	5.0	8.0	9.0	3.0	0.0	0.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
2022 Scores																								
Reno NV	72.0		9.0	5.0	8.0	10.0	15.0	3.0	7.5	5.0	4.5	4.5	54.5	54.5	10.0	5.0	8.0	9.0	3.0	0.0	0.0	5.0	5.0	4.5
2022 Scores																								
Richmond VA	93.0		9.0	5.0	8.0	14.0	13.0	6.0	10.0	18.0	5.0	5.0	89.5	89.5	9.0	5.0	8.0	14.0	6.0	7.5	18.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
2022 Scores																								
Rochester NY	93.5		10.0	5.0	8.0	14.0	15.5	6.0	7.5	18.0	4.5	4.5	63.0	63.0	2.0	5.0	8.0	10.0	3.0	7.5	9.0	5.0	5.0	4.5
2022 Scores																								
Rockford IL	62.0		6.0	5.0	8.0	9.0	13.0	6.0	0.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	63.5	63.5	10.0	5.0	8.0	11.0	6.0	0.0	0.0	5.0	5.0	4.5
2022 Scores																								

Appendix B: Child Protection-Safe Environment Scores 2023

Alphabetical listing (archdioceses in bold)

NOTE: Maximum score = 100

Diocese	Total Scores		Scores per category: Maximum possible per category									
	2023	2022	C1:10	C2:5	C3:8	C4:15	C5:18	C6:6	C7:10	C8:18	C9:5	C10:5
Rockville Centre NY	58.5		9.0	5.0	5.0	13.0	16.0	3.0	0.0	5.0	0.0	2.5
2022 Scores	63.0		9.0	5.0	5.0	14.0	17.0	3.0	2.5	5.0	0.0	2.5
Sacramento CA	71.0		9.0	5.0	8.0	12.0	13.0	3.0	7.5	4.0	5.0	4.5
2022 Scores	62.0		8.0	5.0	8.0	13.0	9.0	3.0	2.5	4.0	5.0	4.5
Saginaw MI	76.5		10.0	5.0	8.0	13.0	15.0	3.0	7.5	5.0	5.0	5.0
2022 Scores	76.5		10.0	5.0	8.0	14.0	14.0	3.0	7.5	5.0	5.0	5.0
Saint Augustine FL	66.5		9.0	5.0	8.0	14.0	16.0	6.0	0.0	5.0	0.0	3.5
2022 Scores	70.0		8.0	5.0	8.0	13.0	17.0	3.0	0.0	9.0	2.5	4.5
Saint Cloud MN	59.0		10.0	5.0	8.0	10.0	13.0	3.0	0.0	0.0	5.0	5.0
2022 Scores	59.0		10.0	5.0	8.0	10.0	9.0	3.0	0.0	4.0	5.0	5.0
Saint Louis MO	65.5		8.0	5.0	8.0	14.0	14.0	3.0	0.0	5.0	5.0	3.5
2022 Scores	62.5		9.0	5.0	8.0	14.0	9.0	3.0	0.0	5.0	5.0	4.5
St.Paul-Minneapolis MN	72.5		9.0	5.0	8.0	14.0	16.0	6.0	0.0	5.0	5.0	4.5
2022 Scores	70.0		9.0	5.0	8.0	12.0	15.0	6.0	0.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Saint Petersburg FL	70.5		10.0	5.0	8.0	13.0	15.0	6.0	7.5	0.0	2.5	3.5
2022 Scores	72.0		10.0	5.0	8.0	13.0	10.0	6.0	7.5	4.0	5.0	3.5
Saint Thomas VI	55.5		10.0	5.0	5.0	8.0	12.0	6.0	0.0	5.0	0.0	4.5
2022 Scores	50.0		8.0	5.0	7.0	10.0	10.0	3.0	0.0	5.0	0.0	2.0
Salina KS	91.5		9.0	5.0	8.0	14.0	15.0	3.0	10.0	18.0	5.0	4.5
2022 Scores	75.5		8.0	5.0	8.0	11.0	10.0	6.0	0.0	18.0	5.0	4.5
Salt Lake City UT	63.5		9.0	5.0	5.0	11.0	13.0	6.0	0.0	5.0	5.0	4.5
2022 Scores	56.5		8.0	5.0	5.0	11.0	14.0	6.0	0.0	0.0	5.0	2.5
San Angelo TX	67.5		10.0	5.0	8.0	11.0	13.0	6.0	0.0	5.0	5.0	4.5
2022 Scores	75.0		10.0	5.0	8.0	11.0	10.0	6.0	10.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
San Antonio TX	69.5		10.0	5.0	6.0	13.0	16.0	6.0	0.0	5.0	5.0	3.5
2022 Scores	68.5		10.0	5.0	8.0	12.0	14.0	6.0	0.0	5.0	5.0	3.5

Appendix B: Child Protection-Safe Environment Scores 2023

Alphabetical listing (archdioceses in bold)

NOTE: Maximum score = 100

Diocese	Total Scores										Scores per category: Maximum possible per category													
	2023	2022	C1:10	C2:5	C3:8	C4:15	C5:18	C6:6	C7:10	C8:18	C9:5	C10:5	2023	2022	C1:10	C2:5	C3:8	C4:15	C5:18	C6:6	C7:10	C8:18	C9:5	C10:5
San Bernardino CA 2022 Scores	65.5	66.5	9.0	5.0	8.0	10.0	14.0	6.0	0.0	5.0	5.0	3.5	66.5	10.0	5.0	8.0	9.0	14.0	6.0	0.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	4.5
San Diego CA 2022 Scores	87.0	74.0	9.0	5.0	8.0	13.0	16.0	6.0	7.5	13.0	5.0	4.5	74.0	9.0	2.5	8.0	12.0	10.0	6.0	7.5	9.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
San Francisco CA 2022 Scores	55.5	44.5	2.0	5.0	8.0	11.0	9.0	3.0	0.0	14.0	0.0	3.5	44.5	0.0	5.0	8.0	6.0	9.0	3.0	0.0	10.0	0.0	0.0	3.5
San Jose CA 2022 Scores	81.0	67.5	9.0	5.0	8.0	11.0	14.0	6.0	0.0	18.0	5.0	5.0	67.5	9.0	5.0	8.0	11.0	14.0	6.0	0.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	4.5
Santa Fe NM 2022 Scores	72.5	67.5	10.0	5.0	8.0	10.0	16.0	6.0	2.5	5.0	5.0	5.0	67.5	9.0	5.0	5.0	12.0	16.0	3.0	2.5	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Santa Rosa CA 2022 Scores	74.5	72.5	10.0	5.0	8.0	12.0	13.0	3.0	0.0	14.0	5.0	4.5	72.5	10.0	5.0	8.0	10.0	9.0	3.0	0.0	18.0	5.0	5.0	4.5
Savannah GA 2022 Scores	58.5	58.5	9.0	5.0	8.0	8.0	13.0	3.0	0.0	5.0	5.0	2.5	58.5	10.0	5.0	8.0	11.0	14.0	3.0	0.0	0.0	5.0	5.0	2.5
Scranton PA 2022 Scores	72.5	75.0	10.0	5.0	8.0	12.0	11.5	6.0	10.0	0.0	5.0	5.0	75.0	10.0	5.0	8.0	12.0	14.0	6.0	10.0	0.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Seattle WA 2022 Scores	69.5	73.5	9.0	5.0	8.0	8.0	13.0	3.0	0.0	14.0	5.0	4.5	73.5	9.0	5.0	8.0	11.0	15.0	3.0	0.0	14.0	5.0	5.0	3.5
Shreveport LA 2022 Scores	62.5	22.5	10.0	5.0	8.0	3.0	13.0	6.0	7.5	5.0	0.0	5.0	22.5	0.0	5.0	8.0	0.0	4.0	3.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.5
Sioux City IA 2022 Scores	60.5	57.5	9.0	5.0	8.0	14.0	6.5	3.0	0.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	57.5	8.0	5.0	8.0	11.0	9.0	3.0	0.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	3.5
Sioux Falls SD 2022 Scores	68.0	70.5	9.0	5.0	8.0	11.0	14.0	6.0	0.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	70.5	9.0	5.0	8.0	13.0	15.0	6.0	0.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	4.5
Spokane WA 2022 Scores	67.5	70.5	7.0	5.0	8.0	13.0	14.0	3.0	7.5	0.0	5.0	5.0	70.5	9.0	5.0	8.0	13.0	15.0	3.0	7.5	0.0	5.0	5.0	5.0

Appendix B: Child Protection-Safe Environment Scores 2023

Alphabetical listing (archdioceses in bold)

NOTE: Maximum score = 100

Diocese	Total Scores										Scores per category: Maximum possible per category													
	2023	2022	C1:10	C2:5	C3:8	C4:15	C5:18	C6:6	C7:10	C8:18	C9:5	C10:5	2023	2022	C1:10	C2:5	C3:8	C4:15	C5:18	C6:6	C7:10	C8:18	C9:5	C10:5
Springfield IL	72.0		9.0	5.0	8.0	12.0	15.0	3.0	7.5	5.0	5.0	2.5	87.0	87.0	10.0	5.0	8.0	14.0	18.0	3.0	7.5	14.0	5.0	2.5
Springfield MA	64.0		8.0	5.0	8.0	12.0	13.0	3.0	0.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	62.0	62.0	10.0	5.0	8.0	5.0	14.0	6.0	0.0	4.0	5.0	5.0
Sprfld-Cape Girard. MO	74.5		10.0	5.0	8.0	11.0	15.0	6.0	10.0	0.0	5.0	4.5	68.0	68.0	9.0	5.0	8.0	12.0	14.0	3.0	7.5	0.0	5.0	4.5
Steubenville OH	61.0		10.0	5.0	8.0	14.0	14.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	5.0	5.0	62.0	62.0	10.0	5.0	8.0	11.0	9.0	0.0	0.0	9.0	5.0	5.0
Stockton CA	65.0		7.0	5.0	5.0	10.0	13.0	3.0	7.5	5.0	4.5	58.5	58.5	9.0	5.0	5.0	10.0	9.0	3.0	7.5	0.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Superior WI	67.0		10.0	5.0	8.0	13.0	13.0	3.0	0.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	69.0	69.0	8.0	5.0	8.0	11.0	17.0	6.0	7.5	4.0	0.0	2.5
Syracuse NY	83.5		10.0	5.0	8.0	13.0	14.0	3.0	2.5	18.0	5.0	5.0	88.5	88.5	10.0	5.0	8.0	13.0	14.0	3.0	7.5	18.0	5.0	5.0
Toledo OH	66.0		10.0	5.0	8.0	11.0	14.0	3.0	0.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	72.0	72.0	9.0	5.0	8.0	13.0	10.0	3.0	5.0	9.0	5.0	5.0
Trenton NJ	57.5		9.0	5.0	5.0	8.0	14.0	3.0	0.0	5.0	3.5	43.5	43.5	7.0	5.0	5.0	6.0	9.0	3.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	5.0	3.5
Tucson AZ	86.0		10.0	5.0	8.0	11.0	13.5	3.0	7.5	18.0	5.0	5.0	56.5	56.5	9.0	5.0	8.0	10.0	9.0	3.0	0.0	5.0	5.0	2.5
Tulsa OK	71.5		10.0	5.0	8.0	12.0	11.5	3.0	7.5	5.0	4.5	72.0	72.0	10.0	5.0	8.0	12.0	14.0	3.0	7.5	5.0	5.0	2.5	
Tyler TX	63.0		10.0	5.0	8.0	9.0	15.0	6.0	0.0	0.0	5.0	5.0	56.5	56.5	10.0	5.0	8.0	9.0	9.0	6.0	0.0	0.0	5.0	4.5
Venice FL	84.0		10.0	5.0	8.0	12.0	13.0	6.0	2.5	18.0	4.5	92.5	92.5	10.0	5.0	8.0	12.0	14.0	6.0	6.0	10.0	18.0	5.0	4.5

Appendix B: Child Protection-Safe Environment Scores 2023

Alphabetical listing (archdioceses in bold)

NOTE: Maximum score = 100

Diocese	Total Scores		Scores per category: Maximum possible per category									
	2023	2022	C1:10	C2:5	C3:8	C4:15	C5:18	C6:6	C7:10	C8:18	C9:5	C10:5
Victoria TX	68.5		9.0	5.0	8.0	12.0	14.0	6.0	0.0	5.0	5.0	4.5
2022 Scores	65.0		10.0	5.0	8.0	12.0	9.0	6.0	0.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Washington DC	83.0		10.0	5.0	8.0	14.0	15.0	3.0	0.0	18.0	5.0	5.0
2022 Scores	60.0		10.0	5.0	8.0	11.0	9.0	3.0	0.0	4.0	5.0	5.0
Wheeling-Charlest.WV	83.0		9.0	5.0	8.0	12.0	15.0	6.0	0.0	18.0	5.0	5.0
2022 Scores	81.0		9.0	5.0	8.0	14.0	11.0	6.0	0.0	18.0	5.0	5.0
Wichita KS	73.5		9.0	5.0	8.0	10.0	13.0	6.0	7.5	5.0	5.0	5.0
2022 Scores	64.5		7.0	5.0	8.0	10.0	14.0	6.0	0.0	5.0	5.0	4.5
Wilmington DE	62.0		10.0	5.0	8.0	10.0	14.0	3.0	2.5	0.0	5.0	4.5
2022 Scores	64.0		10.0	5.0	8.0	12.0	9.0	3.0	7.5	0.0	5.0	4.5
Winona-Rochester MN	96.0		9.0	5.0	8.0	14.0	16.0	6.0	10.0	18.0	5.0	5.0
2022 Scores	93.5		9.0	5.0	8.0	14.0	16.0	6.0	7.5	18.0	5.0	5.0
Worcester MA	84.0		9.0	5.0	8.0	13.0	16.0	3.0	7.5	18.0	0.0	4.5
2022 Scores	88.0		9.0	5.0	8.0	13.0	17.0	6.0	7.5	18.0	0.0	4.5
Yakima WA	70.0		10.0	5.0	8.0	10.0	16.0	6.0	0.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
2022 Scores	60.5		10.0	5.0	8.0	10.0	9.0	6.0	0.0	5.0	5.0	2.5
Youngstown OH	77.5		10.0	5.0	8.0	13.0	13.0	6.0	7.5	5.0	5.0	5.0
2022 Scores	75.0		10.0	5.0	8.0	13.0	14.0	6.0	7.5	5.0	2.5	4.0

Appendix C: Ranked Listing Child Protection-Safe Environment Scores 2023

NOTE: Maximum score = 100

Diocese	Scores per category: Maximum possible per category										
	C1:10	C2:5	C3:8	C4:15	C5:18	C6:6	C7:10	C8:18	C9:5	C10:5	
Harrisburg PA	96.5	10.0	5.0	8.0	14.0	16.0	6.0	10.0	18.0	5.0	4.5
Winona-Rochester MN	96.0	9.0	5.0	8.0	14.0	16.0	6.0	10.0	18.0	5.0	5.0
Fall River MA	95.0	9.0	5.0	8.0	13.0	17.0	6.0	10.0	18.0	5.0	4.0
Rochester NY	93.5	10.0	5.0	8.0	14.0	15.5	6.0	7.5	18.0	5.0	4.5
Richmond VA	93.0	9.0	5.0	8.0	14.0	13.0	6.0	10.0	18.0	5.0	5.0
Salina KS	91.5	9.0	5.0	8.0	14.0	15.0	3.0	10.0	18.0	5.0	4.5
Boston MA	90.5	9.0	5.0	8.0	13.0	14.0	6.0	7.5	18.0	5.0	5.0
Brooklyn NY	89.5	10.0	5.0	5.0	14.0	15.0	3.0	10.0	18.0	5.0	4.5
Ogdensburg NY	89.5	10.0	5.0	8.0	14.0	13.5	6.0	7.5	18.0	2.5	5.0
Bridgeport CT	88.5	10.0	5.0	8.0	14.0	15.0	3.0	10.0	14.0	5.0	4.5
Ft Wayne-South Bend IN	88.0	9.0	5.0	8.0	14.0	15.0	6.0	7.5	14.0	5.0	4.5
San Diego CA	87.0	9.0	5.0	8.0	13.0	16.0	6.0	7.5	13.0	5.0	4.5
Gaylord MI	86.5	10.0	5.0	8.0	8.0	14.0	6.0	7.5	18.0	5.0	5.0
Tucson AZ	86.0	10.0	5.0	8.0	11.0	13.5	3.0	7.5	18.0	5.0	5.0
Cleveland OH	85.5	10.0	5.0	8.0	9.0	15.0	3.0	7.5	18.0	5.0	5.0
La Crosse WI	85.0	9.0	5.0	8.0	11.0	14.0	3.0	7.5	18.0	5.0	4.5
Buffalo NY	84.5	10.0	5.0	8.0	8.0	16.0	3.0	7.5	18.0	5.0	4.0
Philadelphia PA	84.0	10.0	5.0	8.0	13.0	14.0	6.0	0.0	18.0	5.0	5.0
Venice FL	84.0	10.0	5.0	8.0	12.0	13.0	6.0	2.5	18.0	5.0	4.5
Baltimore MD	84.0	9.0	5.0	8.0	13.0	13.0	6.0	2.5	18.0	5.0	4.5
Worcester MA	84.0	9.0	5.0	8.0	13.0	16.0	3.0	7.5	18.0	0.0	4.5
Syracuse NY	83.5	10.0	5.0	8.0	13.0	14.0	3.0	2.5	18.0	5.0	5.0
Washington DC	83.0	10.0	5.0	8.0	14.0	15.0	3.0	0.0	18.0	5.0	5.0
Wheeling-Charleston WV	83.0	9.0	5.0	8.0	12.0	15.0	6.0	0.0	18.0	5.0	5.0
Oklahoma City OK	83.0	8.0	5.0	8.0	11.0	14.0	3.0	7.5	18.0	5.0	3.5

Appendix C: Ranked Listing Child Protection-Safe Environment Scores 2023

NOTE: Maximum score = 100

Diocese	Scores per category: Maximum possible per category										
	Total Score	C1:10	C2:5	C3:8	C4:15	C5:18	C6:6	C7:10	C8:18	C9:5	C10:5
Boise ID	81.5	10.0	5.0	5.0	13.0	15.0	3.0	2.5	18.0	5.0	5.0
Charleston SC	81.5	10.0	5.0	8.0	14.0	16.0	6.0	7.5	5.0	5.0	5.0
K.C.-Saint Joseph MO	81.5	9.0	5.0	8.0	12.0	13.0	3.0	7.5	14.0	5.0	5.0
San Jose CA	81.0	9.0	5.0	8.0	11.0	14.0	6.0	0.0	18.0	5.0	5.0
Detroit MI	81.0	8.0	5.0	8.0	10.0	13.0	3.0	7.5	18.0	5.0	3.5
Camden NJ	80.5	9.0	0.0	8.0	13.0	14.0	6.0	7.5	14.0	5.0	4.0
Cheyenne WY	80.0	10.0	5.0	8.0	11.0	16.0	6.0	0.0	14.0	5.0	5.0
Crookston MN	79.0	10.0	5.0	8.0	13.0	15.0	6.0	7.5	5.0	5.0	4.5
Louisville KY	79.0	10.0	5.0	8.0	10.0	10.0	6.0	2.5	18.0	5.0	4.5
Orlando FL	78.5	10.0	5.0	8.0	14.0	16.0	6.0	7.5	5.0	2.5	4.5
Dallas TX	78.0	10.0	5.0	8.0	13.0	14.0	6.0	7.5	5.0	5.0	4.5
Memphis TN	77.5	10.0	2.5	8.0	13.0	13.0	3.0	0.0	18.0	5.0	5.0
Youngstown OH	77.5	10.0	5.0	8.0	13.0	13.0	6.0	7.5	5.0	5.0	5.0
Albany NY	77.5	9.0	5.0	8.0	10.0	17.0	6.0	2.5	10.0	5.0	5.0
Erie PA	77.5	9.0	5.0	8.0	13.0	14.0	6.0	7.5	5.0	5.0	5.0
Altoona-Johnstown PA	77.0	9.0	5.0	8.0	10.0	16.0	6.0	0.0	13.0	5.0	5.0
Fairbanks AK	77.0	9.0	5.0	8.0	14.0	14.0	6.0	7.5	5.0	5.0	3.5
Paterson NJ	77.0	9.0	5.0	5.0	12.0	16.0	6.0	0.0	14.0	5.0	5.0
Oakland CA	76.5	10.0	5.0	8.0	11.0	16.0	3.0	0.0	14.0	5.0	4.5
Saginaw MI	76.5	10.0	5.0	8.0	13.0	15.0	3.0	7.5	5.0	5.0	5.0
Great Falls-Billings MT	76.5	9.0	5.0	8.0	13.0	13.0	3.0	0.0	18.0	2.5	5.0
Charlotte NC	76.0	10.0	5.0	8.0	12.0	15.0	6.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Dubuque IA	76.0	10.0	5.0	8.0	9.0	16.0	3.0	10.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Gary IN	76.0	10.0	5.0	8.0	12.0	14.0	3.0	0.0	14.0	5.0	5.0
Los Angeles CA	76.0	9.0	5.0	8.0	11.0	15.0	6.0	7.5	5.0	5.0	4.5

Appendix C: Ranked Listing Child Protection-Safe Environment Scores 2023

NOTE: Maximum score = 100

Diocese	Total Score	Scores per category: Maximum possible per category									
		C1:10	C2:5	C3:8	C4:15	C5:18	C6:6	C7:10	C8:18	C9:5	C10:5
Chicago IL	75.0	8.0	5.0	8.0	14.0	15.0	6.0	0.0	9.0	5.0	5.0
Omaha NE	74.5	10.0	5.0	8.0	12.0	10.0	3.0	2.5	14.0	5.0	5.0
Santa Rosa CA	74.5	10.0	5.0	8.0	12.0	13.0	3.0	0.0	14.0	5.0	4.5
Spring-Cape Girar.MO	74.5	10.0	5.0	8.0	11.0	15.0	6.0	10.0	0.0	5.0	4.5
Atlanta GA	74.5	8.0	5.0	8.0	10.0	15.0	6.0	7.5	5.0	5.0	5.0
Davenport IA	74.0	10.0	5.0	8.0	11.0	14.0	6.0	7.5	5.0	2.5	5.0
Evansville IN	74.0	10.0	5.0	8.0	10.0	13.0	6.0	7.5	5.0	5.0	4.5
Helena MT	74.0	10.0	5.0	8.0	11.0	14.0	3.0	0.0	13.0	5.0	5.0
Fresno CA	74.0	9.0	5.0	8.0	8.0	13.0	3.0	0.0	18.0	5.0	5.0
Owensboro KY	74.0	9.0	5.0	8.0	11.0	13.0	6.0	7.5	5.0	5.0	4.5
Nashville TN	73.5	10.0	5.0	8.0	15.0	15.0	6.0	0.0	5.0	5.0	4.5
Allentown PA	73.5	9.0	5.0	8.0	13.0	13.0	3.0	0.0	13.0	5.0	4.5
Cincinnati OH	73.5	9.0	5.0	8.0	12.0	14.0	3.0	7.5	5.0	5.0	5.0
Mobile AL	73.5	9.0	5.0	8.0	13.0	13.0	3.0	7.5	5.0	5.0	5.0
New York NY	73.5	9.0	5.0	8.0	15.0	15.0	6.0	1.0	5.0	5.0	4.5
Wichita KS	73.5	9.0	5.0	8.0	10.0	13.0	6.0	7.5	5.0	5.0	5.0
Arlington VA	73.5	8.0	5.0	5.5	12.0	13.0	6.0	0.0	14.0	5.0	5.0
Biloxi MS	73.0	10.0	5.0	8.0	14.0	15.0	6.0	0.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Burlington VT	73.0	10.0	5.0	5.0	10.0	13.0	6.0	10.0	5.0	5.0	4.0
Beaumont TX	73.0	9.0	5.0	8.0	11.0	13.0	3.0	0.0	14.0	5.0	5.0
Jefferson City MO	73.0	8.0	5.0	8.0	12.0	14.0	6.0	7.5	5.0	5.0	2.5
Santa Fe NM	72.5	10.0	5.0	8.0	10.0	16.0	6.0	2.5	5.0	5.0	5.0
Scranton PA	72.5	10.0	5.0	8.0	12.0	11.5	6.0	10.0	0.0	5.0	5.0
St.Paul-Minneap. MN	72.5	9.0	5.0	8.0	14.0	16.0	6.0	0.0	5.0	5.0	4.5
Grand Rapids MI	72.0	10.0	5.0	8.0	10.0	16.0	3.0	10.0	5.0	0.0	5.0

Appendix C: Ranked Listing Child Protection-Safe Environment Scores 2023

NOTE: Maximum score = 100

Diocese	Total Score	Scores per category: Maximum possible per category									
		C1:10	C2:5	C3:8	C4:15	C5:18	C6:6	C7:10	C8:18	C9:5	C10:5
Newark NJ	72.0	10.0	5.0	8.0	10.0	13.0	3.0	0.0	14.0	5.0	4.0
Orange CA	72.0	9.0	5.0	8.0	6.0	13.0	3.0	0.0	18.0	5.0	5.0
Reno NV	72.0	9.0	5.0	8.0	10.0	15.0	3.0	7.5	5.0	5.0	4.5
Springfield IL	72.0	9.0	5.0	8.0	12.0	15.0	3.0	7.5	5.0	5.0	2.5
Tulsa OK	71.5	10.0	5.0	8.0	12.0	11.5	3.0	7.5	5.0	5.0	4.5
Lansing MI	71.5	0.0	5.0	8.0	10.0	14.0	3.0	7.5	14.0	5.0	5.0
Green Bay WI	71.0	10.0	5.0	8.0	9.0	13.0	3.0	0.0	13.0	5.0	5.0
Lexington KY	71.0	10.0	5.0	5.0	10.0	13.0	3.0	7.5	14.0	0.0	3.5
Belleville IL	71.0	9.0	5.0	8.0	13.0	15.0	6.0	0.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Grand Island NE	71.0	9.0	5.0	8.0	13.0	14.0	3.0	0.0	14.0	0.0	5.0
Sacramento CA	71.0	9.0	5.0	8.0	12.0	13.0	3.0	7.5	4.0	5.0	4.5
Bismarck ND	70.5	10.0	5.0	8.0	12.0	15.0	6.0	0.0	5.0	5.0	4.5
Gallup NM	70.5	10.0	5.0	7.0	14.0	15.0	6.0	0.0	5.0	5.0	3.5
Saint Petersburg FL	70.5	10.0	5.0	8.0	13.0	15.0	6.0	7.5	0.0	2.5	3.5
Baker-Redmond OR	70.5	9.0	5.0	8.0	9.0	15.0	6.0	0.0	14.0	0.0	4.5
Milwaukee WI	70.5	9.0	5.0	8.0	10.0	13.0	6.0	0.0	10.0	5.0	4.5
Des Moines IA	70.5	8.0	5.0	8.0	11.0	11.0	0.0	0.0	18.0	5.0	4.5
Yakima WA	70.0	10.0	5.0	8.0	10.0	16.0	6.0	0.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Lincoln NE	70.0	9.0	0.0	5.0	14.0	15.0	3.0	0.0	14.0	5.0	5.0
San Antonio TX	69.5	10.0	5.0	6.0	13.0	16.0	6.0	0.0	5.0	5.0	3.5
Madison WI	69.5	9.0	5.0	8.0	8.0	16.0	6.0	2.5	5.0	5.0	5.0
Manchester NH	69.5	9.0	5.0	8.0	13.0	14.0	3.0	7.5	0.0	5.0	5.0
Seattle WA	69.5	9.0	5.0	8.0	8.0	13.0	3.0	0.0	14.0	5.0	4.5
Alexandria VA	69.0	10.0	5.0	5.0	12.0	15.0	3.0	0.0	9.0	5.0	5.0

Appendix C: Ranked Listing Child Protection-Safe Environment Scores 2023

NOTE: Maximum score = 100

Diocese	Total Score	Scores per category: Maximum possible per category									
		C1:10	C2:5	C3:8	C4:15	C5:18	C6:6	C7:10	C8:18	C9:5	C10:5
Denver CO	69.0	9.0	5.0	8.0	13.0	13.0	6.0	0.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Amarillo TX	68.5	10.0	5.0	5.0	13.0	14.0	6.0	1.0	5.0	5.0	4.5
Jackson MS	68.5	10.0	5.0	8.0	5.0	12.0	6.0	7.5	5.0	5.0	5.0
Anchorage-Juneau AK	68.5	9.0	5.0	8.0	13.0	13.0	6.0	0.0	5.0	5.0	4.5
Houma-Thibodaux LA	68.5	9.0	5.0	8.0	10.0	16.0	3.0	0.0	9.0	5.0	3.5
Victoria TX	68.5	9.0	5.0	8.0	12.0	14.0	6.0	0.0	5.0	5.0	4.5
Greensburg PA	68.0	10.0	5.0	8.0	12.0	12.0	6.0	0.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Laredo TX	68.0	10.0	5.0	8.0	11.0	13.0	6.0	0.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Marquette MI	68.0	10.0	5.0	8.0	12.0	13.0	6.0	0.0	5.0	5.0	4.0
Sioux Falls SD	68.0	9.0	5.0	8.0	11.0	14.0	6.0	0.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Providence RI	67.5	10.0	5.0	8.0	5.0	10.0	3.0	7.5	9.0	5.0	5.0
San Angelo TX	67.5	10.0	5.0	8.0	11.0	13.0	6.0	0.0	5.0	5.0	4.5
Austin TX	67.5	9.0	5.0	8.0	10.0	15.0	6.0	0.0	5.0	5.0	4.5
Joliet IL	67.5	9.0	5.0	8.0	9.0	11.5	6.0	0.0	9.0	5.0	5.0
Norwich CT	67.5	9.0	5.0	8.0	14.0	16.0	3.0	0.0	5.0	5.0	2.5
Pensac.-Tallahas. FL	67.5	9.0	5.0	8.0	12.0	13.0	6.0	0.0	5.0	5.0	4.5
Spokane WA	67.5	7.0	5.0	8.0	13.0	14.0	3.0	7.5	0.0	5.0	5.0
Hartford CT	67.0	10.0	5.0	8.0	14.0	13.0	3.0	0.0	5.0	5.0	4.0
Superior WI	67.0	10.0	5.0	8.0	13.0	13.0	3.0	0.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Kansas City KS	67.0	9.0	5.0	8.0	10.0	14.0	6.0	0.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Rapid City SD	67.0	9.0	5.0	8.0	12.0	15.0	3.0	0.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Baton Rouge LA	66.5	10.0	5.0	8.0	8.0	15.0	6.0	0.0	5.0	5.0	4.5
Brownsville TX	66.5	10.0	5.0	8.0	11.0	12.5	6.0	0.0	5.0	5.0	4.0
Knoxville TN	66.5	10.0	5.0	8.0	11.0	10.0	0.0	7.5	5.0	5.0	5.0

Appendix C: Ranked Listing Child Protection-Safe Environment Scores 2023

NOTE: Maximum score = 100

Diocese	Total Score	Scores per category: Maximum possible per category									
		C1:10	C2:5	C3:8	C4:15	C5:18	C6:6	C7:10	C8:18	C9:5	C10:5
Lafayette IN	66.5	9.0	5.0	8.0	13.0	14.0	3.0	0.0	5.0	5.0	4.5
Saint Augustine FL	66.5	9.0	5.0	8.0	14.0	16.0	6.0	0.0	5.0	0.0	3.5
Portland ME	66.0	10.0	5.0	8.0	10.0	10.0	3.0	10.0	5.0	0.0	5.0
Toledo OH	66.0	10.0	5.0	8.0	11.0	14.0	3.0	0.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Phoenix AZ	65.5	10.0	5.0	8.0	8.0	16.0	6.0	0.0	5.0	5.0	2.5
San Bernardino CA	65.5	9.0	5.0	8.0	10.0	14.0	6.0	0.0	5.0	5.0	3.5
Saint Louis MO	65.5	8.0	5.0	8.0	14.0	14.0	3.0	0.0	5.0	5.0	3.5
Indianapolis IN	65.0	10.0	5.0	8.0	10.0	14.0	3.0	0.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Palm Beach FL	65.0	9.0	5.0	8.0	13.0	13.0	6.0	2.5	5.0	0.0	3.5
Pittsburgh PA	65.0	9.0	5.0	5.0	12.0	13.0	6.0	0.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Stockton CA	65.0	7.0	5.0	5.0	10.0	13.0	3.0	7.5	5.0	5.0	4.5
Duluth MN	64.5	10.0	5.0	8.0	10.0	14.0	3.0	0.0	5.0	5.0	4.5
New Ulm MN	64.5	9.0	5.0	8.0	13.0	10.0	6.0	0.0	5.0	5.0	3.5
Honolulu HI	64.0	9.0	5.0	8.0	12.0	13.0	6.0	7.5	0.0	0.0	3.5
Raleigh NC	64.0	9.0	5.0	8.0	9.0	12.0	6.0	0.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Springfield MA	64.0	8.0	5.0	8.0	12.0	13.0	3.0	0.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Columbus OH	63.5	9.0	5.0	8.0	12.0	10.0	6.0	0.0	5.0	5.0	3.5
Covington KY	63.5	9.0	5.0	8.0	11.0	17.0	0.0	0.0	5.0	5.0	3.5
Fort Worth TX	63.5	9.0	5.0	8.0	8.0	16.0	3.0	0.0	5.0	5.0	4.5
Salt Lake City UT	63.5	9.0	5.0	5.0	11.0	13.0	6.0	0.0	5.0	5.0	4.5
Little Rock AR	63.0	10.0	5.0	8.0	6.0	6.0	6.0	7.5	5.0	5.0	4.5
Monterey CA	63.0	10.0	5.0	8.0	13.0	9.0	3.0	0.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Tyler TX	63.0	10.0	5.0	8.0	9.0	15.0	6.0	0.0	0.0	5.0	5.0
Dodge City KS	63.0	9.0	5.0	8.0	13.0	13.0	3.0	0.0	5.0	5.0	2.0

Appendix C: Ranked Listing Child Protection-Safe Environment Scores 2023

NOTE: Maximum score = 100

Diocese	Total Score: Scores per category: Maximum possible per category											
	C1:10	C2:5	C3:8	C4:15	C5:18	C6:6	C7:10	C8:18	C9:5	C10:5		
Shreveport LA	62.5	10.0	5.0	8.0	8.0	3.0	13.0	6.0	7.5	5.0	0.0	5.0
Peoria IL	62.0	10.0	5.0	8.0	8.0	8.0	13.0	3.0	0.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Portland OR	62.0	10.0	5.0	7.0	14.0	15.0	6.0	6.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	5.0
Wilmington DE	62.0	10.0	5.0	8.0	10.0	14.0	3.0	3.0	2.5	0.0	5.0	4.5
Rockford IL	62.0	6.0	5.0	8.0	9.0	13.0	6.0	6.0	0.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Las Cruces NM	61.0	10.0	5.0	8.0	11.0	14.0	3.0	3.0	0.0	0.0	5.0	5.0
Steubenville OH	61.0	10.0	5.0	8.0	14.0	14.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	5.0	5.0
Sioux City IA	60.5	9.0	5.0	8.0	14.0	6.5	3.0	3.0	0.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Kalamazoo MI	60.0	9.0	5.0	8.0	11.0	14.0	3.0	3.0	0.0	5.0	0.0	5.0
New Orleans LA	59.5	9.0	5.0	8.0	8.0	14.0	6.0	6.0	0.0	0.0	5.0	4.5
Miami FL	59.0	10.0	5.0	8.0	13.0	11.0	3.0	3.0	0.0	5.0	0.0	4.0
Saint Cloud MN	59.0	10.0	5.0	8.0	10.0	13.0	3.0	3.0	0.0	0.0	5.0	5.0
Rockville Centre NY	58.5	9.0	5.0	5.0	13.0	16.0	3.0	3.0	0.0	5.0	0.0	2.5
Savannah GA	58.5	9.0	5.0	8.0	8.0	13.0	3.0	3.0	0.0	5.0	5.0	2.5
Galveston-Houston TX	57.5	9.0	2.5	8.0	8.0	13.5	3.0	3.0	0.0	5.0	5.0	3.5
Trenton NJ	57.5	9.0	5.0	5.0	8.0	14.0	3.0	3.0	0.0	5.0	5.0	3.5
Fargo ND	57.0	10.0	5.0	8.0	6.0	13.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Lake Charles LA	57.0	6.0	5.0	5.0	8.0	10.0	6.0	6.0	7.5	0.0	5.0	4.5
El Paso TX	56.5	9.0	5.0	8.0	9.0	10.0	6.0	6.0	0.0	0.0	5.0	4.5
Birmingham AL	55.5	10.0	5.0	5.0	10.0	13.0	3.0	3.0	0.0	5.0	0.0	4.5
Colorado Springs CO	55.5	10.0	5.0	8.0	8.0	11.0	6.0	6.0	0.0	0.0	5.0	2.5
Saint Thomas VI	55.5	10.0	5.0	5.0	8.0	12.0	6.0	6.0	0.0	5.0	0.0	4.5
San Francisco CA	55.5	2.0	5.0	8.0	11.0	9.0	3.0	3.0	0.0	14.0	0.0	3.5
Metuchen NJ	54.5	9.0	5.0	8.0	12.0	0.0	6.0	6.0	0.0	5.0	5.0	4.5

Appendix C: Ranked Listing Child Protection-Safe Environment Scores 2023

NOTE: Maximum score = 100

Total Score: Scores per category: Maximum possible per category											
Diocese	Total Score	C1:10	C2:5	C3:8	C4:15	C5:18	C6:6	C7:10	C8:18	C9:5	C10:5
Lafayette LA	54.5	8.0	5.0	7.0	7.0	14.0	6.0	0.0	0.0	5.0	2.5
Lubbock TX	48.5	10.0	5.0	8.0	5.0	5.0	6.0	0.0	0.0	5.0	4.5
Las Vegas NV	42.5	2.0	2.5	8.0	5.0	8.5	3.0	0.0	4.0	5.0	4.5
Arch.Military Svcs USA	34.5	10.0	0.0	2.5	6.0	11.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	5.0
Corpus Christi TX	31.5	2.0	2.5	2.5	7.0	4.0	6.0	0.0	0.0	5.0	2.5
Pueblo CO	8.5	0.0	0.0	5.5	0.0	0.0	3.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Averages	70.55	9.14	4.83	7.61	11.09	13.43	4.51	3.01	8.08	4.39	4.46

Appendix D: Bishop Abuse Reporting (CBAR)

Category 3: Abuse Reporting and CBAR Information (8 points total)

Diocese	Score	Comments
Gallup NM	7.00	No active link to CBAR portal
Lafayette LA	7.00	No active link to CBAR portal
Portland OR	7.00	No active link to CBAR portal
Alexandria VA	5.00	No CBAR information
Amarillo TX	5.00	No CBAR information
Arch. Military Services USA	2.50	No CBAR information
Birmingham AL	5.00	No CBAR information
Boise ID	5.00	No CBAR information
Brooklyn NY	5.00	No CBAR information
Burlington VT	5.00	No CBAR information
Corpus Christi TX	2.50	No CBAR information
Lake Charles LA	5.00	No CBAR information
Lexington KY	5.00	No CBAR information
Lincoln NE	5.00	No CBAR information
Paterson NJ	5.00	No CBAR information
Pittsburgh PA	5.00	No CBAR information
Rockville Centre NY	5.00	No CBAR information
Saint Thomas VI	5.00	No CBAR information
Salt Lake City UT	5.00	No CBAR information
Stockton CA	5.00	No CBAR information
Trenton NJ	5.00	No CBAR information
San Antonio TX	6.00	No clear website info on reporting bishops
Arlington VA	5.50	No statement on mandatory report to law enforcement
Pueblo CO	5.50	No statement on mandatory report to law enforcement

CBAR is the Catholic Bishop Abuse Reporting Service that has been established to receive reports of sexual abuse and related misconduct by bishops, and to relay those reports to proper Church authorities for investigation.



Appendix E: Reporting on Credibly Accused Clergy

Category 9 on the worksheet covers diocesan reporting of credibly accused clergy and their current status. Maximum score possible in the category is 5. These are the lowest-scoring dioceses in that category.

Diocese	Score	Comments
Arch. Military Services USA	0.00	No list found
Baker-Redmond OR	0.00	No list found
Birmingham AL	0.00	No list found
Grand Island NE	0.00	No list found
Grand Rapids ME	0.00	No list found
Honolulu HI	0.00	No list found
Kalamazoo MI	0.00	No list found
Lexington KY	0.00	No list found
Miami FL	0.00	No list found
Palm Beach FL	0.00	No list found
Portland OR	0.00	No list found
Portland ME	0.00	No list found
Pueblo CO	0.00	No list found
Rockville Centre NY	0.00	No list found
Saint Augustine FL	0.00	No list found
Saint Thomas VI	0.00	No list found
San Francisco CA	0.00	No list found
Shreveport LA	0.00	No list found
Worcester MA	0.00	No list found
Davenport IA	2.50	List does not clarify if accused was dismissed or laicized
Great Falls-Billings MT	2.50	List does not mention if accused is deceased, laicized, dismissed, etc.
Ogdensburg NY	2.50	List does not clarify if accused was dismissed or laicized
Orlando FL	2.50	List only notes if living or deceased; no info on laicization etc.
Saint Petersburg FL	2.50	List does not say whether accused is dismissed or deceased

Appendix F: Bankruptcy Filings

More than 30 U.S. Catholic dioceses have filed for bankruptcy protection since the clergy sexual abuse scandal broke in 2002. The list below contains the date of each diocesan bankruptcy filing as well as the scores obtained by each diocese on the VOTF Protection of Children website reviews from both 2022 and 2023.

The Diocese of Sacramento CA is the latest U.S. Catholic diocese to file for Chapter 11 bankruptcy protection. Their bankruptcy filing announcement cites the costs to settle more than 250 lawsuits filed against the diocese alleging abuse (Quinones, 2024). In notifying parishioners of the filing, Bishop Soto points to the failure of Church leadership to address the sin of clergy sexual abuse of minors and the vulnerable (Christian, 2024).

Bishop Soto also stated that only the “administrative office of the bishop ... will be seeking bankruptcy protection” in the filing and that pastors will need to prepare for potential challenges from diocesan creditors and must seek independent legal assistance (Christian, 2024).

We are reminded of the life-long pain and suffering experienced by victim-survivors of clergy sexual abuse and join in prayers for healing.

Diocese	2023 Score	2022 Score	Filing Dates
Albany NY	77.5	76.0	Bankruptcy filing 03/15/2023
Baltimore MD	84.0	92.5	Bankruptcy filing 06/29/2023
Buffalo NY	84.5	72.0	Bankruptcy filing 02/29/2020
Camden NJ	80.5	86.5	Bankruptcy filing 10/1/2020
Davenport IA	74.0	71.0	Bankruptcy filing 10-10-2006
Duluth MN	64.5	67.5	Bankruptcy filing 12/7/2015
Fairbanks AK	77.0	66.0	Bankruptcy filing 03/1/2008
Gallup NM	70.5	64.0	Bankruptcy filing 11/12/2013
Great Falls-Billings MT	76.5	54.5	Bankruptcy filing 03/31/2017
Harrisburg PA	96.5	95.5	Bankruptcy filing 02/19/2020

Appendix F: Bankruptcy Filings—2023 Protection of Children Report

Diocese	2023 Score	2022 Score	Filing Dates
Helena MT	74.0	75.5	Bankruptcy filing 01/31/2014
Milwaukee WI	70.5	63.5	Bankruptcy filing 01/4/2011
New Orleans LA	59.5	65.5	Bankruptcy filing 05/1/2020
New Ulm MN	64.5	65.5	Bankruptcy filing 03/3/2017
Norwich CT	67.5	68.0	Bankruptcy filing 07/15/2021
Oakland CA	76.5	66.5	Bankruptcy filing 05/8/2023
Ogdensburg NY	89.5	78.0	Bankruptcy filing 07/17 2023
Portland OR	62.0	60.0	Bankruptcy filing 07/6/2004
Rochester NY	93.5	63.0	Bankruptcy filing 09/12/2019
Rockville Centre NY	58.5	63.0	Bankruptcy filing 10/1/2020
Saint Cloud MN	59.0	59.0	Bankruptcy filing 06/15/2020
Saint Paul & Minneapolis MN	72.5	70.0	Bankruptcy filing 01/16/2015
Sacramento CA	71.0	62.0	Bankruptcy filing 04/1/2024
San Diego CA	87.0	74.0	Bankruptcy filing 02-27-2007
Santa Fe NM	72.5	67.5	Bankruptcy filing 12/3/2018
Santa Rosa CA	74.5	72.5	Bankruptcy filing 03/13/2023
Spokane WA	67.5	70.5	Bankruptcy filing 12/6/2004
Stockton CA	65.0	58.5	Bankruptcy filing 01/15/2014
Syracuse NY	83.5	88.5	Bankruptcy filing 06/19/2020
Tucson AZ	86.0	56.5	Bankruptcy filing 09/20/2004
Wilmington DE	62.0	64.0	Bankruptcy filing 10/18/2009
Winona-Rochester MN	96.0	93.5	Bankruptcy filing 11/30/2018

Note: **Archdioceses** in bold