



# **2025 Report: Measuring Abuse Prevention and Safe Environment Programs as Reported Online in Diocesan Policies and Practices**





## Measuring and Ranking Diocesan Safe Environment Programs: 2025

---

In this 2025 review, Voice of the Faithful (VOTF) examines U.S. diocesan website postings for conformity to safeguarding principles that have been established by the U.S. Conference of Catholic Bishops (USCCB).

From early in the 21<sup>st</sup> Century, the USCCB enhanced their safeguarding strategies to prevent child sexual abuse within the Catholic Church. These efforts, a response to the revelations of clergy sexual abuse of children and cover up of that abuse, continue to be an important part of rebuilding trust in our diocesan leadership.

Safeguarding strategies utilized in the U.S. Catholic Church are mandated by the *Charter for the Protection of Children (Charter)* and *The Essential Norms (Norms)* that are known as standards. These documents have been revised regularly by the USCCB in the past 25 years. Each year, third-party auditors employed by the USCCB review the protocols found in diocesan safeguarding policies and procedures for compliance with these USCCB standards. Summarized results from the on-site and self-reporting data collection audits are used to verify that dioceses are meeting the mandated standards for child safeguarding.

The *Charter* and the *Norms* direct dioceses to establish and maintain child protection initiatives that establish screening and selection processes for all employees and volunteers; set training for clergy, employees and volunteers on prevention of child sexual abuse; establish procedures for responding to allegations or suspicions of abuse; and establish and maintain secure physical environments.

To strengthen safeguarding, the Catholic Church also has implemented many measures in the area of law and justice. For example, the Code of Canon Law has undergone several revisions, and numerous diocesan regulations on dealing with abuse have been put into effect. Comprehensive concepts and prevention regulations have been both created and declared binding. Establishing such standards and regulations is critical as a foundation for ensuring the safety of children entrusted to ministers of the faith. Equally important is ensuring that those requirements are maintained and that penalties apply when they fail.

While adhering to the letter of the law (as described above) is essential, it is not enough. Jesus called for compliance with the law (Mt 5:17-19) but also that the law be fulfilled. This fulfillment is essentially about the inner personal attitude of the person who obeys the law. As Jesus explains, this personal attitude helps to avoid hiding behind the letter of the law.

## Ongoing Need for Safeguarding

The Church's commitment to abuse prevention, the resources it allocates to prevention procedures, and the diocesan policies that ensure child safeguarding can be measured by adherence to the established standards. This commitment to safeguarding goes beyond a reaction to past abuse. It also embraces actions of prevention, education, and verification. Maintaining this commitment is a key element of accountability for survivors of clerical sexual abuse. And verification of ongoing safety policies and procedures protects against further abuse.

The need for continued monitoring of abuse prevention efforts within the U.S. Catholic Church remains a high priority that never diminishes. Awareness of this need must remain a primary focus within the Catholic Church. If we fail to maintain active awareness, our indifference will put children at risk for abuse.

## Review Process

The Protection of Children (POC) team of VOTF has concluded its third review of U.S. Catholic diocesan websites for abuse prevention and child protection measures. Prior to the start of the review, VOTF notified all U.S. diocesan leaders by letter. Two independent reviewers then examined 177 diocesan websites between June 1 and August 30, 2025; all diocesan websites were reviewed during that timeframe.

The reviewers utilized the POC Worksheet for 2025, which can be found in Appendix A. Following the format of previous POC Review Worksheets, this questionnaire was organized into 10 Categories. The Categories on the 2025 Worksheet are the same as in previous reviews, but there were minor changes to questions from the previously used Worksheets:

- ❖ Two questions were eliminated.
- ❖ Three new questions were added.
- ❖ Minor wording changes were made to questions in four Categories for clarification.

The total points assigned to each Category were also revised (see Table 1) while retaining the 100-point total. We highlight the importance of four of these categories by assigning each a maximum of 15 points.

**Table 1: Questionnaire Categories**

Category	Category Name/Description	Category Points
1	Policy	5
2	Codes of Conduct	5
3	Reporting of Abuse	10
4	Background Checks	15
5	Prevention Education & Training	15
6	Contact Information	4
7	Audit Reporting	15
8	Review Boards	15
9	Publication of Names of Clergy Accused of Abuse	10
10	Victim Assistance	6
<b>TOTAL SCORE POSSIBLE</b>		<b>100</b>

## Focus on Four Categories

Four Categories on the 2025 Questionnaire carry a maximum total of 15 points each. They focus on essential areas of abuse prevention and lay oversight: Prevention Education and Training; Background Checks; and two Lay Oversight measures called Audits and Review Boards.

The training provided in mandatory Abuse Prevention Education & Training is critical for child-serving organizations to proactively help identify risks, recognize grooming behaviors and establish a culture of safety. Training empowers staff and volunteers to recognize signs of abuse, to learn how to handle disclosures properly, and to fulfill their legal reporting responsibilities.

Background Checks of applicants for positions within a diocese are vital for child-serving organizations to ensure safety. These checks prevent unsuitable individuals from gaining access to children by identifying any criminal histories and serious behavioral concerns in an applicant’s past. These measures also act as deterrents to potential offenders applying for positions working with or around children.

Annual USCCB-sponsored Audits can identify strengths and weaknesses in established diocesan safe environment protocols. Compliance letters from auditors verify participation in the audit and whether the diocese has passed the audit.

## Measuring and Ranking Diocesan Safe Environment Programs: 2025

Published information on Diocesan Review Boards (DRBs) provides visibility into the workings of these Boards, such as membership disclosure, meeting frequency, publication of bylaws, and annual tasks of the DRB. The *Charter* and *Norms* adopted by the USCCB require every diocese to establish a DRB, and its membership is required to have a majority of lay, non-diocesan employee members. Moreover, publication of member names and credentials, as well as a listing of required annual tasks, provides visibility into compliance with the USCCB requirements for DRBs.

## Results and Analysis

Following completion of the independent website reviews of all U.S. diocesan websites, VOTF reconciled all scores to ensure that dioceses received proper credit. Average overall score for the 177 dioceses in the 2025 Review was 66.26, marginally lower than averages found in the 2022 and 2023 VOTF Reviews. Also, the most-frequent score on the 2025 Review is lower than those scores obtained in previous Reviews.

**Table 2 – Average Scores and Mode Scores by Report Year**

Report Year	Average Score	Most Frequent Score
2022	67.00	63.50
2023	70.50	73.50
2025	66.26	61.50

Full results of the 2025 Review are listed alphabetically by diocese in Appendix B and are listed by Ranked Scores in Appendix C. The diocese of Richmond VA received top score of 92 points. The diocese of Saint Thomas, USVI obtained the lowest score: 35 Points.

**Table 3 – Highest and Lowest Scoring Dioceses**

Top Scoring Dioceses	2025	2023	Lowest Scoring Dioceses	2025	2023
Richmond VA	92.5	93.0	St. Thomas USVI	35.0	55.5
Ogdensburg NY	91.0	89.5	San Antonio TX	38.0	69.5
Salina KS	89.0	91.5	Pueblo CO	40.0	8.5
Grand Isle NE	88.5	71.0	Military Service USA	42.0	34.5
Winona-Rochester NY	88.0	96.0	Las Vegas NV	43.5	42.5
Wheeling-Charleston WV	87.5	83.0	Laredo TX	44.0	68.0

## Detailed Summary—Scoring in Each Category

This Report explores scoring deficiencies and excellences within each of the 10 Categories.

### Category 1 – Policy (5 Points):

Average score in this Category was 4.61 out of a possible 5 points.

- ❖ Reviewers searched for posting of a named Diocesan Child Protection, Child Safeguarding, or Safe Environment Policy.
- ❖ Access to Policies: Ease of locating this Policy was also scored.
  - Some Policies were not easily located or required multiple clicks to open.
  - Reviewers searched for a direct link to this Policy either on the diocesan homepage or Child Protection/Safe Environment webpage.
- ❖ Search Engine: Internal search engines enhance navigation within a website. They allow users to easily locate content information.
  - Reviewers did not locate a search engine on the following websites: San Antonio TX, San Angela TX, Shreveport LA, San Bernardino CA, and Marquette MI.
  - With no effective way to search a website, even information that is available on the website may be very difficult to find.
  - Of note, policy information for the diocese of Belleville IL was easily found due in part to a remarkable search engine.
- ❖ Duplicate Policies: In some instances, reviewers found distinct versions of the Safe Environment / Child Protection policy on multiple locations, at times under the same name but with different content. Some policy and policy-revision documents were not dated.
- ❖ Lack of Posted Policy: Reviewers were unable to locate Safe Environment (SE) / Child Protection Policies for seven dioceses: Beaumont TX; Fort Worth TX; Laredo TX; Las Vegas NV; Oklahoma City OK; Saint Thomas USVI; and San Antonio TX.
  - While reviewers located some behavioral guidelines or safety requirements in Codes of Conduct documents, if they found no formally named Child/Youth Protection Policy, they gave no credit in this Category.
  - Of note, the Archdiocese of Anchorage-Juneau AK noted the addition of an addendum to their SE Policy after the diocese received improvement recommendations in a recent USCCB-sponsored Audit compliance letter that is posted on their website.

## Measuring and Ranking Diocesan Safe Environment Programs: 2025

### Category 2 – Codes of Conduct (5 Points):

Average score was 4.65 out of a possible 5 points.

- ❖ Populations: This Survey assessed whether Codes of Conduct (CoC) were posted for clergy, lay employees, and volunteers.
- ❖ Lack of CoC: Reviewers did not find CoCs on seven diocesan websites: Cincinnati, OH; Corpus Christi, TX; Military Services USA; Reno, NV; Saint Thomas, USVI; Sioux Falls, SD; and Toledo, OH.
  - A few other dioceses only posted CoC's for clergy, while others did not post any Conduct Code concerning volunteers.
- ❖ All six top-scoring dioceses had complete Codes of Conduct for the three populations.
- ❖ Location of CoCs: Reviewers found Codes of Conduct on a wide range of diocesan web pages, such as:
  - Within the Safe Environment Policy as a sub-section.
  - Named “Conduct Policy” and covering the three populations.
  - Individual CoCs for each population in separate documents.
- ❖ One-hundred fifty-seven dioceses posted CoCs for all three populations.
  - Although Oklahoma City OK posted CoCs, reviewers did not find a Safe Environment / Child Protection Policy.
- ❖ Specific or General Terminology: Questions in this Category did not query what is or what should be included in Codes of Conduct for employees and volunteers. Some CoCs contained positive behavioral guidelines while others contained general terms of unacceptable conduct.
  - Reviewers noted that language employed within the CoC for Rapid City SD was very general regarding conduct guidelines.
  - Consistency of content across dioceses would provide clear guidelines.

### Category 3 – Reporting Allegations of Abuse (10 Points):

Average score was 9.15 out of a possible 10 points.

- ❖ Mandate to Report Suspected Abuse: *Vos estis lux mundi*, the *motu proprio* of Pope Francis, mandates procedural norms for reporting crimes of sexual abuse as well as for cover-up of such crimes when committed by a bishop or head of a religious congregation.
- ❖ There are required diocesan protocols for reporting suspected abuse to both the civil authorities and to the Catholic Bishops Abuse Reporting (CBAR).

## Measuring and Ranking Diocesan Safe Environment Programs: 2025

- ❖ Language: Reviewers found that some diocesan postings contained vague language regarding the mandate to report allegations. For example, the word “should” and the phrase “encouraged to report” were included in the mandate language rather than specific directions to do so. Such language can be confusing and may lead to uncertainty regarding the requirement to report all suspected abuse to civil authorities.
  - No credit was awarded to Oakland CA or to St. Augustine FL because their “mandate to report” web pages contained the phrase “should be reported to local authorities” or “should contact local police...”
  - Language posted by two dioceses (Spokane WA and Wheeling-Charleston WV) contained the statements “encouraged to report” or “encourages reporting” to the appropriate civil authorities. No credit was awarded to these dioceses.
- ❖ Catholic Bishops Abuse Reporting (CBAR) is a third-party system that receives reports of sexual abuse or related misconduct by U.S. Catholic bishops.<sup>1</sup> This system facilitates investigations into allegations of abuse.
  - Twenty-four dioceses lacked information about or link to CBAR.
  - The dioceses of Oakland CA, Rockville Centre NY, and Saint Augustine FL did post information about CBAR but no active link to CBAR was found.
  - Reviewers encountered an “Error 404 Bad Link” message on many websites when clicking on the provided hyperlink to CBAR.
    - No credit was awarded when these “bad link” notifications were found.  
*See Recommendations Section for proposed remediation.*
- ❖ Significance: The lack of clear contact information for Reporting Abuse on diocesan websites adds to the institutional betrayal experienced by many survivors of clergy sexual abuse. (See research on this topic, such as work by Judith Freyd<sup>2</sup>)
  - This betrayal can be layered by imperfect responses by church personnel to allegations of abuse. Difficulty locating reporting information and / or a very delayed response to survivor attempts to report abuse are layering factors of institutional abuse.

---

<sup>1</sup> USCCB Posting on How to Report Abuse including Link to CBAR. Accessed February 3, 2026: <https://www.usccb.org/committees/protection-children-young-people/how-report-abuse>

<sup>2</sup> Institutional Betrayal and Institutional Courage (<https://dynamic.uoregon.edu/jjf/institutionalbetrayal/>) Jennifer J. Freyd, PhD, Founder and President, Center for Institutional Courage.

## Measuring and Ranking Diocesan Safe Environment Programs: 2025

- Clear and current links as well as telephone and email contact information must be maintained to adequately allow the reporting of abuse or the cover up of abuse by church personnel.

### Category 4 – Background Checks (15 Points):

Average overall score was 9.53 out of a possible 15 points.

- ❖ Background Criminal History checks are an essential element to build a safe environment program.
- ❖ Screening of applicants: Best practices call for background checks of all clergy, lay employees, and volunteers who work or apply for positions of working in any capacity with or around children.
  - Also sought are requirements of background checks for members of religious communities, international priests, and temporarily assigned parish priests.
- ❖ Frequency: Ongoing Criminal History Record checks are essential screening measures; annual or more frequent Record Checks are best practice.
  - Questions in this Category inquire about diocesan departmental oversight of Record Checks as well as the frequency of running these Background Checks.
  - Some dioceses subscribe to services that automatically screen every employee, volunteer or clergy member on a quarterly basis.
- ❖ Positive Results: Reviewers searched for statements of procedures that apply if a Record Check turns up a criminal record of an applicant who seeks to serve within the diocese.

### Category 5 – Prevention Education & Training (15 Points)

Average score was 11.39 out of a possible 15 points.

- ❖ Awareness of tactics utilized by abusers and prevention education are foundational elements within a safe environment program.
- ❖ Five dioceses received perfect scores of 15 points: New Orleans LA; Norwich CT; St. Augustine FL; St. Paul/Minneapolis MN; Washington DC; and Wilmington DE.
  - Seventeen dioceses received scores of 14 points.
- ❖ Best practices call for awareness and prevention training for all clergy, lay employees and adult volunteers who work with or around children, as well as awareness training for children and youth.

## Measuring and Ranking Diocesan Safe Environment Programs: 2025

- The 2025 Questionnaire also asked about prevention training for visiting international priests and temporarily assigned priests. Many dioceses did not have clear information about training requirements for those populations.
- An example of inclusive training requirements for these populations was found in the Comprehensive Screening Policy from the Diocese of Norwich CT.
- ❖ Included in the required populations for prevention training were children who attend religious education, Catholic schools, and diocesan-sponsored youth activities.
  - Many dioceses did not include mandated training for youth who attend diocesan-sponsored activities.
- ❖ Significance: These proactive measures establish a culture of safety, accountability, and care within our faith community.

### Category 6 – Contact Information (4 Points):

Average score was 3.74 out of a possible 4 points.

- ❖ Contacts: Reviewers searched websites for contact information to a Child Protection or Safe Environment office or ministry, such as a phone number or email address.
- ❖ Filing a public Complaint / Allegation: Reviewers searched the Safe Environment / Child Protection pages and the Safe Environment Policy for posting of contact information to a civil (state, city, or county) authority, such as a department of family and child services, for filing a child abuse complaint.
  - Best Practice: Many dioceses included direct links to these agencies by city or county within their state.
- ❖ Clarity of information: Of note, the Diocese of Brooklyn has distinct offices for divisions or procedures regarding Child and Youth Protection, including an Office of Safe Environment; an Office of Victim Assistance; and an Office for Protection of Our Children, which contains a link to their Child Protection Policy.

### Category 7 – Audit Reporting (15 Points):

Average overall score was **3.09 out of a total 15 points**.

- ❖ Audits prevent abuse in the Church by uncovering deficiencies in adherence to regulations found in the *Charter*. Audits also provide recommendations for improvements. Dioceses that fail to report the audit findings may be hiding

## Measuring and Ranking Diocesan Safe Environment Programs: 2025

negative results and comments from those audits. Without clear reporting of the findings, parishioners may not realize their diocese is not in compliance.

- ❖ Reviewers searched for posted findings from the most recent USCCB-sponsored audits and whether the diocese passed the audit.
  - Also sought were posting of the Auditor Compliance Letter and posted responses information that a diocesan bishop has addressed the results.
- ❖ Detail of Scores:
  - One-hundred nineteen dioceses had no website postings on results from the most recent annual USCCB-sponsored Audit conducted by StoneBridge Business Partners and received 0 points.
  - Twenty-six dioceses scored less than 10 points; and 25 dioceses scored 11 or 12 points.
  - Seven dioceses received a perfect score of 15 points in this Category: Buffalo NY; Gaylord MI; Newark NJ; Ogdensburg NY; Scranton PA, Wheeling-Charleston WV; Winona-Rochester MN.
- ❖ Importance of posting Audit result information:
  - **Compliance Verification:** Audits confirm that dioceses are adhering to the *Charter* and *Norms*, including conducting background checks, providing safe environment training to clergy, employees, and volunteers, and establishing working Diocesan Review Boards.
  - **Transparency:** Public reporting of annual audit results demonstrates accountability to parishioners and the public at large and contributes to restoring trust in the institution.
  - Audit result-reporting by both Wheeling-Charleston WV and Winona-Rochester MN are exemplary.

### Category 8 – Diocesan Review Boards (DRB) (15 Points)

Average overall score was **6.59 out of a total 15 points**.

- ❖ DRBs are composed primarily of laypeople. DRBs provide independent, expert and confidential advice to Bishops, especially in the evaluation of the credibility, substance, and gravity of accusations of sexual abuse of minors.
- ❖ Reviewers searched for postings of DRB member names, their credentials, a named chairperson, and for the bylaws and annual tasks of the DRB.
- ❖ Also sought was information about whether the DRB reviewed child protection policies and procedures on an annual basis.

## Measuring and Ranking Diocesan Safe Environment Programs: 2025

- ❖ Reviewers searched for mention that all abuse allegations are reported to the chair of the DRB or to the entire DRB.
- ❖ Scores of Note:
  - Nine dioceses received full credit: Allentown PA; Arlington VA; Des Moines IA; Harrisburg PA; Lexington KY; Louisville KY; Richmond VA; Salina KS; and Syracuse NY.
  - Ten dioceses did not post any information on their DRB and received 0 points:

**Table 4: No Posted Diocesan Review Board Information**

Altoona-Johnstown PA	Lubbock TX
Colorado Springs CO	Pittsburgh PA
Fort Worth TX	Pueblo CO
Lafayette LA	Salt Lake City UT
Little Rock AR	Trenton NJ

- ❖ Significance: The USCCB *Charter* mandates the establishment of DRBs. They provide independent, expert, and consistent oversight of sexual abuse allegations against clergy to ensure accountability and the protection of minors.
  - As a confidential consultative body that advises the bishop on policy matters related to the protection of children, these boards also evaluate evidence of abuse allegations for credibility.
  - Both these responsibilities contribute to safety within the community.
- ❖ Publication of names and pertinent credentials of DRB membership augments the trust, openness, and accountability of the Board's processes. While it is up to a bishop whether to make public the names of the DRB members<sup>3</sup>, public posting of this information fosters accountability and transparency in the institution and may rebuild trust by healing the effects of institutional betrayal. The USCCB's 2012 resource booklet encourages publication of the names of members.
  - The level of detail provided across diocesan postings of DRB information varies significantly because there is no universal, standard or mandatory procedure to follow.

---

<sup>3</sup> According to the DRB Resource Booklet accessed February 2026 and found on: <https://www.usccb.org/issues-and-action/child-and-youth-protection/upload/2012-Diocesan-Review-Board-Resource.pdf>

## Measuring and Ranking Diocesan Safe Environment Programs: 2025

- The posting on the diocese of Des Moines IA website contains an excellent example of full disclosure of DRB information.
- The diocese of Richmond VA has an excellent Policy that includes DRB information and is dated July 2024.
- The diocese of Salina KS posts a helpful Chart in their policy as an example of good documentation of DRB information.

### Category 9 – Publication of Names of Clergy Accused of Abuse (10 Points)

Average is 8.84 out of a possible 10 points.

- ❖ Publication adds to the transparency and accountability of the Church and may lead to healing those who have been harmed.
  - Published lists allow for public scrutiny of church actions.
  - Published lists help track serial offenders and can encourage other victims to come forward.
  - Effectiveness of these lists can be questioned for completeness, delay in postings, or failure to include all cases of abuse. The current VOTF Review does not explore these potential weaknesses that may be contained in published lists. See [bishopaccountability.org](http://bishopaccountability.org) for detailed information on abuser lists.<sup>4</sup>
- ❖ One-hundred fifty-four diocesan websites published Lists that contained the outcome of each allegation, such as dismissal from the priesthood, laicization, or deceased.
- ❖ Significance of Publication: Example of concrete actions.
  - “Christian safeguarding is not limited to wordy confessions about one’s own failures, expressions of shame in view of event, or prayers and liturgical celebrations for victims of abuse. All of this must be proven in concrete action, even when the critical public is not closely following the actions of the Church and its actors.”<sup>5</sup>
- ❖ Posted Lists from five dioceses lacked resolution of each allegation: Great Falls-Billings MT; Rockville Centre NY; Saint Petersburg FL; Venice FL; and Wilmington DE.

---

<sup>4</sup> Bishopaccountability.org list information accessed February 2026: [https://www.bishop-accountability.org/AtAGlance/diocesan\\_and\\_order\\_lists.htm](https://www.bishop-accountability.org/AtAGlance/diocesan_and_order_lists.htm)

<sup>5</sup> Lenten reflection from IADC of the Pontifical Gregorian University, accessed February 18, 2026. <https://www.unigre.it/en/events-and-communication/communication/news-and-press-releases/encounters-in-conversion-a-online-lenten-retreat/>

**Measuring and Ranking Diocesan Safe Environment Programs: 2025**

- ❖ Eighteen dioceses did not post published Lists of Credibly accused clergy.

**Table 5: No Posted Diocesan Review Board Information**

Baker-Redmond OR	Lexington KY	Pueblo CO
Colorado Springs CO	<b>Miami FL</b>	Saint Thomas USVI
Grand Rapids MI	<b>Military Services USA</b>	<b>San Antonio TX</b>
Honolulu HI	Palm Beach FL	<b>San Francisco CA</b>
Houma-Thibodaux LA	Portland OR	Shreveport LA
Laredo TX	Portland ME	Worcester MA

**Category 10 – Victim Assistance (VAC) (6 Points)**

Average score is 4.67 out of a possible 6 points.

- ❖ Access: Reviewers searched an entire diocesan website for contact information of the VAC. The significance of locating this data is to assess ease of access when / if survivors seek support from within a diocese.
  - Additionally, locating the name of a support person propels the process to a personal level.
  - Reviewers did not find contact / name information for VACs on 16 diocesan websites. They are:

▪ **Table 6: VAC Name and Contact Information NOT Found**

Boise ID	Phoenix AZ	Savannah GA
Corpus Christi TX	Portland ME	Springfield IL
Dodge City KS	Pueblo CO	Springfield-Cape Girardeau
*Memphis TN	**Raleigh NC	Wilmington DE
Newark NJ	^Rockville Centre NY	*Yakima WA
Norwich CT		

*In each of the instances noted in Table 6, the scoring reconciler consulted the list of diocesan VACs posted on the USCCB website to cross-check whether a VAC was named for that diocese (<https://www.usccb.org/node/25794>).*

\*Memphis TN and \*Yakima WA list a Victim Assistance Hotline, but no name or VAC was mentioned.

\*\*Raleigh NC lists a phone number for the Victim Assistance Program but no name.

^ Rockville Centre NY: Although the position is mentioned in policy, no name or contact information was found.

## Measuring and Ranking Diocesan Safe Environment Programs: 2025

- ❖ The difficulty presented by these deficiencies for survivors and their families was evident to VOTF during the past year when either survivors or a family member contacted VOTF for information on how to contact the VAC in the diocese where their abuse had occurred. Their voice and email messages had been unanswered by the dioceses. This is an example of the many layers encountered in institutional betrayal.
- ❖ Reviewers also searched whether pastoral and counseling services were offered to survivors, families of survivors, and affected parishes or communities.

### **Recommendations**

**Policy:** The website location for the diocesan Policy for Child Protection has not been studied in detail in this current Survey. The Review process instructions did not delineate boundaries for locating the Policy in any of the VOTF Surveys conducted to date—reviewers could search for the information on any diocesan web pages. Yet frequently the deficiencies in locating a policy made it difficult to address many of the questions on the Worksheet. In many instances, policy location was directly found on the Safe Environment or Child Protection web pages as well as on the homepage. Credit was awarded if the information was found in either place.

To support genuine transparency, dioceses should post each policy document in a single location and remove superseded versions when updates are posted so readers are not left comparing outdated copies. In the future, the POC team plans to explore the varied locations where the information is found.

**Codes of Conduct:** Codes for clergy, lay employees, and volunteers should be named as such and be searchable on the website. If these documents are contained within a larger Policy, dioceses should clearly indicate the location of these documents. A Policy section located on a Safe Environment or a Child Protection webpage could include these Codes of Conduct. Consistency of content in CoCs across all dioceses would be a best practice.

**CBAR reporting:** Catholic Bishop Abuse Reporting service should be notified of the deficiencies found in links that are posted on many diocesan websites. Each diocese should frequently check if the link to CBAR is active.

**Background Checks:** Annual or more frequent criminal history checks are best practice to identify potential risks to children. Policies should include actions to be taken if there is a positive result in these checks.

## Measuring and Ranking Diocesan Safe Environment Programs: 2025

**Prevention Education and Training:** Mandates for training of international and visiting clergy should be clearly stated within policies under this category. Forms for these populations to request permission to provide services within a diocese should be readily available. And instructions for completion and submission of the forms should be noted in the policies.

**Diocesan Review Boards:** Posting names of members and their credentials and length of appointment provides transparency into these majority-lay boards.

**Published List of Credibly Accused Clergy:** Enforcement of the mandatory publication of these lists by all U.S. dioceses is essential in abuse prevention measures. Completeness and accuracy of each list must likewise be verified frequently, perhaps by an organization outside of the USCCB.

**Victim Assistance information:** Every diocese must list the VAC and contact information according to the *Charter* and *Norms*. Full compliance should be checked periodically and websites updated as needed.

**Website maintenance:** Updates to safeguarding-related content must be ongoing to ensure utmost protection of children.

### An Important Reminder

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 to safeguard 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 safeguarding 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.*

---

## ***Appendices***

Appendix A: 2025 Worksheet for Measuring Child Protection

Appendix B: Transparency Scores, Alphabetical Listing

Appendix C: Transparency Scores, Ranked by Scores

## ***Tables***

Table 1: Questionnaire Categories & Point Distribution

Table 2: Average & Mode Scores by Report Year

Table 3: Highest & Lowest Scoring Dioceses

Table 4: No Posted Diocesan Review Board Information

Table 5: No Published Lists of Credibly Accused Clergy

Table 6: VAC Name and Contact Information NOT Found

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

Diocese Name: \_\_\_\_\_ Date of Search: \_\_\_\_\_ Website: \_\_\_\_\_  
 Researcher Name: \_\_\_\_\_ Browser Used: \_\_\_\_\_

Description	Possible Points	Awarded Points	Scoring Instruction	Researcher's Comment
<b>1. Policy -- 5 points total</b>				
1a Is the Diocesan Child Protection, Child Safeguarding, or Safe Environments <b>Policy</b> posted on the Diocesan website?	3	_____	Note the webpage where the Policy was found.	
1b Is there a direct link to the Child Protection, Child Safeguarding, or Safe Environment Policy located on the Diocesan <b>homepage</b> ?	2	_____	Score 2 if Yes; score 0 if No.	
<b>2. Code of Conduct -- 5 points total</b>				
2a Is a Diocesan Code or Codes of Conduct for <b>clergy and lay employees</b> posted on the website?	3	_____	Score 1.5 if COC found for Clergy. Score 1.5 if COC found for Lay employees.	
2b Is a Diocesan Code of Conduct for <b>volunteers</b> posted on the website?	2	_____	Note the webpage where that information was found.	
<b>3. Reporting of Abuse -- 10 points total</b>				
3a Is the Diocesan <b>process</b> for reporting abuse posted on the Diocesan website?	4	_____	Stating the process-system is mandated in <i>Moto Proprio</i> 2019.* Note webpage where stated.	
3b Does that website state that all suspected abuse <b>must be reported</b> to law enforcement or civil authorities?	4	_____	Note the webpage where that information was found.	
3c Does the website contain information for reporting complaints <b>against bishops</b> for abuse or concerns in dealing with abuse?	1	_____		
3d Does the website contain an <b>active link</b> to Catholic Bishops Abuse Reporting ( <b>CBAR</b> ) portal?	1	_____	Score 1 if there is an <b>active link</b> , not simply the phone number.	

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

Description	Possible Points	Awarded Points	Scoring Instruction	Researcher's Comment	
<b>4. Background Checks -- 15 points total</b>					
4a	Does the website state <b>who must undergo Criminal History Record checks</b> ?	3	_____	Award 1 pt each: Clergy; Employees; Volunteers.	
4b	Does the website state that Criminal History Record checks are <b>required annually</b> for those who volunteer or work in any capacity with or around children in the Diocese?	2	_____	Score 2 if required <b>annually</b> . Score 1 if required but not annually.	
4c	Does the website name who or what <b>Diocesan Department has oversight</b> of Criminal History Record checks?	2	_____	The oversight may be conducted by a unique group or by the Safe Environment office.	
4d	Does the website state what happens when Criminal History Record checks <b>turn up a criminal record</b> ?	2	_____	Process/Procedure	
4e	Does the website state that Criminal History Record checks are required of members of <b>religious communities</b> who serve in any capacity with or around children?	2	_____	Note the webpage where that information was found.	
4f	Does the website state that <b>background checks</b> and a <b>letter of suitability</b> are required of international and temporarily assigned parish priests?	4	_____	Award 2 points if both are required of <u>either</u> foreign-born or temporarily assigned priests. Award 4 points if <u>both</u> are required of the <b>two groups</b> .	
<b>5. Prevention Education &amp; Training -- 15 points</b>					
5a	Does the Diocesan website contain information about the child abuse education and prevention training for <b>adults</b> ?	3	_____	Note the webpage where that information was found.	
5b	Does the website state the Diocesan requirements for abuse prevention training of <b>all clergy</b> ?	3	_____	Note the webpage where that information was found.	

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

Description	Possible Points	Awarded Points	Scoring Instruction	Researcher's Comment	
<b>5. Prevention Education &amp; Training (continued)</b>					
5c	Does the website state the Diocesan requirements for abuse prevention training of <b>temporarily assigned priests</b> and <b>visiting international priests</b> ?	3	_____	Award 1.5 points if required of <u>either</u> international or temporarily assigned priests. Award 3 points if required of <u>both groups</u> .	
5d	Does the website state the Diocesan requirements for mandatory abuse prevention training for <b>volunteers</b> who serve in any capacity <b>with or around children</b> ?	3	_____	Note the webpage where this information was found.	
5e	Does the Diocesan website state that specific prevention training is required of <b>all children and youth</b> who attend religious education, Catholic Schools, and youth activities within the Diocese?	3	_____	Award 1 point each if required of: students in religious education; students in Catholic Schools; partici-pants in	
<b>6. Contact Information -- 4 points</b>					
6a	Is <b>contact information</b> for the Diocesan Office of Child Protection, Child Safeguarding, or Safe Environments posted on the website?	2	_____	Note the webpage where this information was found.	
6b	Does the Diocesan website state contact information to a <b>civil authority</b> for filing a child abuse complaint?	2	_____	May be phone number <b>OR</b> an active link. Note webpage where information	
<b>7. Audit Reporting -- 15 points</b>					
7a	Are the date of and findings from the most recent (i.e., last year's) USCCB-sponsored Annual Report on Implementation of the Charter Audit for this Diocese stated on the Diocesan website?	4	_____	Note the webpage where this information was found.	
7b	Was this Diocese found to be in compliance with the Charter and Essential Norms during this audit period?	4	_____	Charter Audit letter will contain this information. If the compliance findings are not stated, score 0.	

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

Description	Possible Points	Awarded Points	Scoring Instruction	Researcher's Comment
<b>7. Audit Reporting (continued)</b>				
7c Is a copy of the <b>Compliance Letter</b> from the USCCB-sponsored auditors noting the most recent Audit findings posted on the website?	4	_____	Note the webpage where this information was found.	
7d Is there a website posting where the bishop addresses the results of the most recent USCCB-sponsored Annual Audit and the Report on the Implementation of the Charter?	3	_____	This is NOT a Promulgation Letter. The Bishop's statement of findings could be found in a Diocesan Article/Interview. (Score 3 even if the statement was found through a link).	
<b>8. Review Boards -- 15 points</b>				
8a Are the names and credentials of the Diocesan Review Board (DRB) posted on the website?	3	_____	The Charter notes the DRB is a confidential consultative body to the bishop and the majority of members must be lay and not diocesan employees. This item is verification.	
8b Is the Chair of the Diocesan Review Board a lay person not employed by the Diocese?	3	_____	Score 1.5 if chair is lay. Score 1.5 if chair is not a diocesan employee. Score 3 if both.	
8c Are the bylaws of the DRB posted on the website and does the DRB meet at least annually?	3	_____	Score 1.5 if DRB Bylaws are posted on the website, and score 1.5 if the DRB meets at least annually. Score 3 if both.	
8d Does the DRB review the Diocesan Safe Environment policies and procedures at least annually?	3	_____	Note the webpage where this information was found.	
8e Is the Chair or the entire membership of the DRB notified of all abuse allegations?	3	_____	Score 3 if either Chair or entire DRB are notified. Score 3 if both. Note the webpage where this information was found.	

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

Description	Possible Points	Awarded Points	Scoring Instruction	Researcher's Comment	
<b>9. Publication of Names of Clergy Accused of Abuse -- 10 points</b>					
9a	Is a list of credibly accused Diocesan clergy, living and deceased, stated on their webpage, <b>or</b> is there a statement that no credible allegations have been made against Diocesan clergy?	5	_____	NOTE: Diocese may state that there are no credible allegations within the Diocese; if this is stated, score 5. Note webpage where information was found.	
9b	Does the published Diocesan list contain the outcome of each allegation, such as dismissal, laicization, or deceased?	5	_____	If there is a statement that there are no credible accusations against clergy in the diocese, score 5.	
<b>10. Victim Assistance -- 6 points</b>					
10a	Is contact information for the <b>Victim Assistance Coordinator</b> stated on the website?	3	_____	If credit given, note where information was found on the website	
10b	Are the pastoral and counseling services available to <b>survivors, families of survivors and affected parishes or communities</b> described on the website?	3	_____	Score 1 for each population mentioned: survivors; families of survivors; affected parishes and communities. Note webpage(s) where information was found.	

**Total Points      100**

## Appendix B: Child Protection-Safe Environment Scores 2025

Alphabetical listing (*archdioceses in bold*)

NOTE: Maximum score = 100

Scores per category: Maximum possible per category

Diocese	TOTALS	C1:5	C2:5	C3:10	C4:15	C5:15	C6:4	C7:15	C8:15	C9:10	C10:6
Albany NY	86.5	5.0	5.0	10.0	14.0	14.0	4.0	8.0	10.5	10.0	6.0
Alexandria LA	66.5	5.0	5.0	8.0	10.0	11.0	4.0	0.0	7.5	10.0	6.0
Allentown PA	77.0	5.0	5.0	9.0	11.0	11.0	4.0	2.0	15.0	10.0	5.0
Altoona-Johnstown PA	55.0	3.0	5.0	9.0	10.0	9.0	4.0	0.0	0.0	10.0	5.0
Amarillo TX	71.0	5.0	5.0	8.0	12.0	13.5	4.0	4.0	4.5	10.0	5.0
<b>Anchorage-Juneau AK</b>	67.5	5.0	5.0	10.0	12.0	11.0	4.0	0.0	4.5	10.0	6.0
Arlington VA	75.0	5.0	5.0	9.0	10.0	12.0	4.0	0.0	15.0	10.0	5.0
<b>Atlanta GA</b>	80.5	3.0	5.0	9.0	14.0	14.0	4.0	12.0	4.5	10.0	5.0
Austin TX	66.5	3.0	5.0	9.0	12.0	12.5	4.0	0.0	6.0	10.0	5.0
Baker-Redmond OR	54.0	3.0	5.0	10.0	7.0	11.0	4.0	0.0	9.0	0.0	5.0
<b>Baltimore MD</b>	77.5	5.0	5.0	10.0	10.0	9.0	4.0	8.0	10.5	10.0	6.0
Baton Rouge LA	82.0	5.0	5.0	10.0	14.0	14.0	4.0	12.0	3.0	10.0	5.0
Beaumont TX	57.0	0.0	5.0	9.0	6.0	11.0	2.0	0.0	9.0	10.0	5.0
Belleville IL	79.5	5.0	5.0	9.0	12.0	10.0	4.0	8.0	10.5	10.0	6.0
Biloxi MS	70.5	5.0	5.0	9.0	12.0	12.0	2.0	0.0	10.5	10.0	5.0
Birmingham AL	63.0	5.0	5.0	8.0	9.0	11.0	4.0	0.0	6.0	10.0	5.0
Bismarck ND	69.0	5.0	5.0	9.0	6.0	11.0	4.0	11.0	3.0	10.0	5.0
Boise ID	65.0	5.0	5.0	8.0	11.0	10.0	4.0	0.0	9.0	10.0	3.0
<b>Boston MA</b>	72.5	5.0	5.0	9.0	12.0	11.0	4.0	0.0	10.5	10.0	6.0
Bridgeport CT	80.5	3.0	5.0	8.0	14.0	13.0	4.0	8.0	10.5	10.0	5.0
Brooklyn NY	65.0	5.0	5.0	10.0	6.0	9.0	4.0	0.0	12.0	10.0	4.0
Brownsville TX	58.0	5.0	5.0	9.0	7.0	10.0	4.0	0.0	3.0	10.0	5.0
Buffalo NY	83.5	5.0	5.0	10.0	8.0	12.0	4.0	15.0	10.5	10.0	4.0
Burlington VT	61.5	5.0	5.0	9.0	8.0	11.0	4.0	0.0	4.5	10.0	5.0
Camden NJ	70.0	5.0	3.5	10.0	11.0	11.0	4.0	0.0	10.5	10.0	5.0
Charleston SC	81.0	5.0	5.0	9.0	13.0	15.0	4.0	8.0	6.0	10.0	6.0

## Appendix B: Child Protection-Safe Environment Scores 2025

Alphabetical listing (*archdioceses in bold*)

NOTE: Maximum score = 100

Scores per category: Maximum possible per category

Diocese	TOTALS	C1:5	C2:5	C3:10	C4:15	C5:15	C6:4	C7:15	C8:15	C9:10	C10:6
Charlotte NC	63.5	5.0	5.0	9.0	10.0	10.0	4.0	2.0	4.5	10.0	4.0
Cheyenne WY	66.0	5.0	5.0	9.0	8.0	11.0	4.0	0.0	9.0	10.0	5.0
<b>Chicago IL</b>	<b>62.0</b>	5.0	5.0	9.0	7.0	11.0	4.0	0.0	6.0	10.0	5.0
<b>Cincinnati OH</b>	<b>59.0</b>	5.0	0.0	9.0	10.0	12.0	2.0	0.0	6.0	10.0	5.0
Cleveland OH	61.5	5.0	5.0	9.0	10.0	11.0	2.0	0.0	4.5	10.0	5.0
Colorado Springs CO	51.5	5.0	5.0	9.0	11.0	12.5	4.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	5.0
Columbus OH	60.5	5.0	5.0	10.0	10.0	9.0	4.0	0.0	4.5	10.0	3.0
Corpus Christi TX	45.0	3.0	0.0	8.0	4.0	8.0	4.0	0.0	6.0	10.0	2.0
Covington KY	59.0	5.0	5.0	9.0	8.0	11.0	4.0	0.0	3.0	10.0	4.0
Crookston MN	65.0	5.0	5.0	9.0	10.0	12.5	4.0	0.0	4.5	10.0	5.0
Dallas TX	57.5	5.0	5.0	8.0	10.0	6.0	4.0	0.0	4.5	10.0	5.0
Davenport IA	87.0	5.0	5.0	10.0	12.0	14.0	4.0	12.0	9.0	10.0	6.0
<b>Denver CO</b>	<b>61.0</b>	3.0	5.0	10.0	10.0	11.0	4.0	0.0	3.0	10.0	5.0
Des Moines IA	68.0	5.0	5.0	9.0	8.0	9.0	2.0	0.0	15.0	10.0	5.0
<b>Detroit MI</b>	<b>67.5</b>	5.0	5.0	10.0	7.0	13.5	4.0	0.0	9.0	10.0	4.0
Dodge City KS	66.0	5.0	5.0	9.0	11.0	11.0	4.0	0.0	9.0	10.0	2.0
<b>Dubuque IA</b>	<b>61.5</b>	3.0	5.0	10.0	6.0	11.0	4.0	0.0	7.5	10.0	5.0
Duluth MN	58.5	5.0	5.0	9.0	7.0	11.0	2.0	0.0	4.5	10.0	5.0
El Paso TX	55.0	5.0	5.0	9.0	6.0	9.0	4.0	0.0	3.0	10.0	4.0
Erie PA	65.5	5.0	5.0	8.0	10.0	12.5	4.0	0.0	6.0	10.0	5.0
Evansville IN	80.5	5.0	5.0	9.0	8.0	10.5	4.0	12.0	12.0	10.0	5.0
Fairbanks AK	70.5	5.0	5.0	10.0	14.0	12.0	2.0	0.0	7.5	10.0	5.0
Fall River MA	71.0	5.0	3.5	9.0	12.0	12.0	4.0	0.0	10.5	10.0	5.0
Fargo ND	55.0	5.0	5.0	9.0	8.0	11.0	0.0	0.0	3.0	10.0	4.0
Fort Wayne-South Bend IN	86.0	5.0	5.0	9.0	12.0	14.0	4.0	12.0	9.0	10.0	6.0

## Appendix B: Child Protection-Safe Environment Scores 2025

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

Scores per category: Maximum possible per category

Diocese	TOTALS	C1:5	C2:5	C3:10	C4:15	C5:15	C6:4	C7:15	C8:15	C9:10	C10:6
Fort Worth TX	51.0	0.0	5.0	9.0	6.0	12.0	4.0	0.0	0.0	10.0	5.0
Fresno CA	67.0	3.0	5.0	9.0	2.0	11.0	4.0	8.0	9.0	10.0	6.0
Gallup NM	65.5	5.0	5.0	8.0	11.0	12.5	4.0	0.0	6.0	10.0	4.0
<b>Galveston-Houston TX</b>	<b>53.0</b>	3.0	2.0	9.0	6.0	12.0	4.0	0.0	3.0	10.0	4.0
Gary IN	75.5	5.0	5.0	10.0	10.0	13.5	4.0	0.0	12.0	10.0	6.0
Gaylord MI	82.5	5.0	5.0	9.0	8.0	12.0	2.0	15.0	10.5	10.0	6.0
Grand Island NE	88.0	5.0	5.0	10.0	14.0	15.0	2.0	12.0	9.0	10.0	6.0
Grand Rapids MI	52.5	5.0	5.0	10.0	8.0	9.0	4.0	3.0	4.5	0.0	4.0
Great Falls-Billings MT	70.5	5.0	5.0	9.0	12.0	11.0	4.0	0.0	13.5	5.0	6.0
Green Bay WI	66.0	5.0	5.0	9.0	8.0	11.0	2.0	0.0	12.0	10.0	4.0
Greensburg PA	59.0	5.0	5.0	10.0	7.0	9.0	4.0	0.0	3.0	10.0	6.0
Harrisburg PA	82.0	5.0	5.0	10.0	14.0	11.0	4.0	3.0	15.0	10.0	5.0
<b>Hartford CT</b>	<b>59.0</b>	5.0	5.0	9.0	8.0	11.0	4.0	0.0	3.0	10.0	4.0
Helena MT	81.0	5.0	5.0	9.0	8.0	11.0	4.0	12.0	12.0	10.0	5.0
Honolulu HI	50.0	5.0	5.0	9.0	9.0	11.0	4.0	0.0	3.0	0.0	4.0
Houma-Thibodaux LA	45.0	5.0	5.0	9.0	8.0	7.0	4.0	0.0	3.0	0.0	4.0
<b>Indianapolis IN</b>	<b>66.5</b>	5.0	5.0	9.0	13.0	12.5	4.0	0.0	3.0	10.0	5.0
Jackson MS	64.0	5.0	5.0	9.0	9.0	9.0	4.0	4.0	3.0	10.0	6.0
Jefferson City MO	69.5	5.0	5.0	10.0	11.0	12.5	4.0	0.0	9.0	10.0	3.0
Joliet IL	66.0	5.0	5.0	10.0	6.0	12.0	4.0	0.0	9.0	10.0	5.0
Kalamazoo MI	49.5	5.0	1.5	9.0	6.0	7.0	4.0	0.0	3.0	10.0	4.0
<b>Kansas City KS</b>	<b>72.0</b>	5.0	5.0	10.0	8.0	12.0	4.0	0.0	12.0	10.0	6.0
Kansas City-Saint Joseph MO	65.0	5.0	5.0	9.0	10.0	10.0	4.0	0.0	6.0	10.0	6.0
Knoxville TN	73.0	5.0	5.0	9.0	9.0	9.0	2.0	12.0	6.0	10.0	6.0
La Crosse WI	70.5	5.0	5.0	9.0	8.0	12.5	4.0	0.0	12.0	10.0	5.0
Lafayette IN	62.0	5.0	5.0	9.0	10.0	10.0	4.0	0.0	3.0	10.0	6.0
Lafayette LA	57.0	3.0	5.0	9.0	9.0	11.0	4.0	0.0	0.0	10.0	6.0
Lake Charles LA	69.5	5.0	5.0	8.0	6.0	11.0	4.0	11.0	4.5	10.0	5.0

## Appendix B: Child Protection-Safe Environment Scores 2025

Alphabetical listing (*archdioceses in bold*)

NOTE: Maximum score = 100

Scores per category: Maximum possible per category

Diocese	TOTALS	C1:5	C2:5	C3:10	C4:15	C5:15	C6:4	C7:15	C8:15	C9:10	C10:6
Lansing MI	81.0	5.0	5.0	10.0	12.0	14.0	4.0	8.0	9.0	10.0	4.0
Laredo TX	44.0	0.0	3.5	8.0	6.0	11.0	4.0	0.0	7.5	0.0	4.0
Las Cruces NM	58.5	5.0	3.5	9.0	10.0	10.0	0.0	0.0	6.0	10.0	5.0
<b>Las Vegas NV</b>	43.5	0.0	3.5	9.0	3.0	7.0	4.0	0.0	3.0	10.0	4.0
Lexington KY	76.0	5.0	5.0	10.0	10.0	11.0	4.0	12.0	15.0	0.0	4.0
Lincoln NE	77.0	5.0	5.0	8.0	13.0	14.0	4.0	7.0	6.0	10.0	5.0
Little Rock AR	51.0	5.0	5.0	9.0	6.0	7.0	4.0	0.0	0.0	10.0	5.0
<b>Los Angeles CA</b>	82.5	5.0	5.0	10.0	14.0	13.5	4.0	12.0	3.0	10.0	6.0
<b>Louisville KY</b>	72.0	5.0	5.0	9.0	8.0	11.0	4.0	0.0	15.0	10.0	5.0
Lubbock TX	49.0	3.0	5.0	10.0	6.0	6.0	4.0	0.0	0.0	10.0	5.0
Madison WI	64.5	5.0	5.0	9.0	10.0	11.0	4.0	0.0	4.5	10.0	6.0
Manchester NH	80.0	5.0	5.0	10.0	12.0	12.5	4.0	8.0	7.5	10.0	6.0
Marquette MI	62.5	5.0	5.0	9.0	10.0	11.0	4.0	0.0	4.5	10.0	4.0
Memphis TN	64.5	5.0	2.0	10.0	8.0	9.0	4.0	0.0	13.5	10.0	3.0
Metuchen NJ	72.0	5.0	5.0	9.0	12.0	14.0	4.0	0.0	9.0	10.0	4.0
<b>Miami FL</b>	60.5	5.0	5.0	10.0	14.0	13.0	4.0	0.0	4.5	0.0	5.0
<b>Military Services USA</b>	42.0	5.0	0.0	4.0	8.0	9.0	0.0	4.0	9.0	0.0	3.0
<b>Milwaukee WI</b>	66.5	5.0	5.0	10.0	6.0	11.0	4.0	0.0	10.5	10.0	5.0
<b>Mobile AL</b>	64.0	5.0	5.0	9.0	10.0	12.0	4.0	0.0	3.0	10.0	6.0
Monterey CA	57.5	5.0	5.0	9.0	8.0	6.0	4.0	0.0	4.5	10.0	6.0
Nashville TN	82.0	5.0	5.0	9.0	12.0	14.0	4.0	12.0	6.0	10.0	5.0
<b>New Orleans LA</b>	71.0	5.0	5.0	10.0	14.0	15.0	4.0	0.0	3.0	10.0	5.0
New Ulm MN	65.5	5.0	5.0	10.0	11.0	9.0	4.0	0.0	7.5	10.0	4.0
<b>New York NY</b>	69.0	5.0	5.0	10.0	14.0	14.0	4.0	0.0	3.0	10.0	4.0
<b>Newark NJ</b>	85.5	5.0	5.0	10.0	14.0	13.0	4.0	15.0	7.5	10.0	2.0

## Appendix B: Child Protection-Safe Environment Scores 2025

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

Scores per category: Maximum possible per category

Diocese	TOTALS	C1:5	C2:5	C3:10	C4:15	C5:15	C6:4	C7:15	C8:15	C9:10	C10:6
Norwich CT	68.5	5.0	5.0	10.0	14.0	15.0	4.0	0.0	4.5	10.0	1.0
Oakland CA	57.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	11.0	2.0	0.0	9.0	10.0	5.0
Ogdensburg NY	91.0	5.0	5.0	10.0	12.0	13.5	4.0	15.0	10.5	10.0	6.0
<b>Oklahoma City OK</b>	76.0	0.0	5.0	10.0	12.0	11.5	4.0	12.0	7.5	10.0	4.0
<b>Omaha NE</b>	70.5	5.0	5.0	9.0	10.0	12.0	4.0	3.0	7.5	10.0	5.0
Orange CA	64.0	5.0	5.0	10.0	5.0	11.0	4.0	0.0	9.0	10.0	5.0
Orlando FL	75.5	5.0	5.0	9.0	12.0	9.0	4.0	12.0	4.5	10.0	5.0
Owensboro KY	73.0	5.0	3.5	9.0	11.0	12.5	4.0	8.0	6.0	10.0	4.0
Palm Beach FL	50.5	5.0	5.0	10.0	10.0	11.0	4.0	0.0	1.5	0.0	4.0
Paterson NJ	65.5	5.0	5.0	8.0	10.0	11.0	4.0	0.0	7.5	10.0	5.0
Pensacola-Tallahassee FL	63.5	5.0	5.0	9.0	10.0	11.0	4.0	0.0	4.5	10.0	5.0
Peoria IL	61.5	5.0	5.0	10.0	6.0	11.0	4.0	0.0	4.5	10.0	6.0
<b>Philadelphia PA</b>	74.0	5.0	5.0	9.0	12.0	12.5	4.0	0.0	10.5	10.0	6.0
Phoenix AZ	58.0	5.0	5.0	9.0	6.0	12.5	4.0	0.0	4.5	10.0	2.0
Pittsburgh PA	64.0	5.0	5.0	10.0	12.0	14.0	4.0	0.0	0.0	10.0	4.0
Portland ME	56.5	5.0	5.0	10.0	7.0	10.0	2.0	11.0	4.5	0.0	2.0
<b>Portland OR</b>	52.0	5.0	5.0	9.0	11.0	11.0	4.0	0.0	3.0	0.0	4.0
Providence RI	62.5	5.0	5.0	9.0	6.0	10.0	4.0	0.0	7.5	10.0	6.0
Pueblo CO	40.0	3.0	5.0	9.0	8.0	11.0	4.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Raleigh NC	61.0	5.0	5.0	9.0	10.0	10.5	4.0	0.0	4.5	10.0	3.0
Rapid City SD	58.0	5.0	5.0	9.0	8.0	11.0	2.0	0.0	3.0	10.0	5.0
Reno NV	72.0	3.0	0.0	9.0	10.0	14.0	4.0	8.0	9.0	10.0	5.0
Richmond VA	92.0	5.0	5.0	10.0	15.0	11.0	4.0	11.0	15.0	10.0	6.0
Rochester NY	79.0	5.0	5.0	10.0	14.0	14.0	4.0	4.0	9.0	10.0	4.0
Rockford IL	61.5	5.0	5.0	9.0	8.0	11.0	4.0	0.0	4.5	10.0	5.0

## Appendix B: Child Protection-Safe Environment Scores 2025

Alphabetical listing (*archdioceses in bold*)

NOTE: Maximum score = 100

Scores per category: Maximum possible per category

Diocese	TOTALS	C1:5	C2:5	C3:10	C4:15	C5:15	C6:4	C7:15	C8:15	C9:10	C10:6
Rockville Centre NY	55.5	5.0	5.0	8.0	12.0	11.0	2.0	0.0	4.5	5.0	3.0
Sacramento CA	66.5	5.0	5.0	10.0	10.0	11.0	4.0	0.0	7.5	10.0	4.0
Saginaw MI	68.0	5.0	5.0	9.0	8.0	12.0	4.0	0.0	9.0	10.0	6.0
Saint Augustine FL	80.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	12.0	15.0	4.0	8.0	12.0	10.0	4.0
Saint Cloud MN	54.5	5.0	5.0	9.0	6.0	10.0	4.0	0.0	1.5	10.0	4.0
<b>Saint Louis MO</b>	61.5	5.0	5.0	9.0	9.0	11.0	4.0	0.0	4.5	10.0	4.0
<b>Saint Paul-Minneapolis MN</b>	72.5	5.0	5.0	10.0	14.0	15.0	4.0	0.0	4.5	10.0	5.0
Saint Petersburg FL	62.5	5.0	5.0	8.0	8.0	10.5	4.0	4.0	9.0	5.0	4.0
Saint Thomas VI	35.0	0.0	0.0	8.0	4.0	11.0	4.0	0.0	3.0	0.0	5.0
Salina KS	89.0	5.0	5.0	9.0	14.0	14.0	4.0	8.0	15.0	10.0	5.0
Salt Lake City UT	52.5	3.0	3.5	10.0	11.0	8.0	4.0	0.0	0.0	10.0	3.0
San Angelo TX	65.5	5.0	5.0	9.0	6.0	11.0	2.0	11.0	1.5	10.0	5.0
<b>San Antonio TX</b>	38.0	0.0	5.0	8.0	3.0	11.0	4.0	0.0	3.0	0.0	4.0
San Bernardino CA	62.0	5.0	5.0	10.0	8.0	12.0	4.0	0.0	3.0	10.0	5.0
San Diego CA	72.5	5.0	5.0	8.0	13.0	13.5	4.0	0.0	9.0	10.0	5.0
<b>San Francisco CA</b>	58.0	5.0	3.5	10.0	9.0	13.0	4.0	0.0	7.5	0.0	6.0
San Jose CA	59.0	5.0	1.5	10.0	8.0	12.5	4.0	0.0	3.0	10.0	5.0
<b>Santa Fe NM</b>	78.5	5.0	5.0	10.0	7.0	13.5	4.0	12.0	6.0	10.0	6.0
Santa Rosa CA	63.5	5.0	5.0	10.0	6.0	11.0	4.0	0.0	7.5	10.0	5.0
Savannah GA	58.0	5.0	5.0	10.0	6.0	11.0	4.0	0.0	6.0	10.0	1.0
Scranton PA	86.0	5.0	5.0	9.0	14.0	12.0	4.0	15.0	6.0	10.0	6.0
<b>Seattle WA</b>	77.0	3.0	5.0	10.0	10.0	11.0	4.0	12.0	6.0	10.0	6.0
Shreveport LA	65.0	5.0	5.0	10.0	6.0	11.0	4.0	12.0	6.0	0.0	6.0
Sioux City IA	63.0	5.0	5.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	4.0	0.0	6.0	10.0	3.0
Sioux Falls SD	59.5	3.0	0.0	9.0	10.0	12.5	4.0	0.0	6.0	10.0	5.0

## Appendix B: Child Protection-Safe Environment Scores 2025

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

Scores per category: Maximum possible per category

Diocese	TOTALS	C1:5	C2:5	C3:10	C4:15	C5:15	C6:4	C7:15	C8:15	C9:10	C10:6
Spokane WA	72.5	5.0	5.0	6.0	10.0	12.5	4.0	12.0	3.0	10.0	5.0
Springfield IL	60.0	5.0	3.0	9.0	8.0	11.0	4.0	4.0	6.0	10.0	0.0
Springfield MA	79.0	5.0	5.0	8.0	10.0	10.0	4.0	12.0	9.0	10.0	6.0
Springfield-Cape Girardea	61.5	5.0	5.0	10.0	12.0	11.0	4.0	0.0	1.5	10.0	3.0
Steubenville OH	61.5	5.0	5.0	10.0	8.0	10.5	4.0	0.0	6.0	10.0	3.0
Stockton CA	59.5	5.0	5.0	8.0	8.0	11.0	4.0	0.0	4.5	10.0	4.0
Superior WI	58.5	5.0	5.0	10.0	4.0	11.0	4.0	0.0	4.5	10.0	5.0
Syracuse NY	79.5	5.0	5.0	10.0	12.0	12.5	4.0	0.0	15.0	10.0	6.0
Toledo OH	64.0	5.0	0.0	10.0	11.0	11.0	4.0	4.0	3.0	10.0	6.0
Trenton NJ	59.0	5.0	5.0	8.0	12.0	11.0	4.0	0.0	0.0	10.0	4.0
Tucson AZ	83.0	5.0	5.0	10.0	8.0	11.0	4.0	12.0	12.0	10.0	6.0
Tulsa OK	69.0	5.0	5.0	9.0	10.0	12.0	4.0	0.0	9.0	10.0	5.0
Tyler TX	57.5	5.0	5.0	10.0	6.0	12.0	4.0	0.0	1.5	10.0	4.0
Venice FL	64.5	5.0	5.0	9.0	10.0	11.0	4.0	0.0	10.5	5.0	5.0
Victoria TX	60.5	5.0	5.0	10.0	9.0	8.0	4.0	0.0	4.5	10.0	5.0
<b>Washington DC</b>	<b>84.0</b>	5.0	5.0	9.0	14.0	15.0	4.0	11.0	6.0	10.0	5.0
Wheeling-Charleston WV	87.5	5.0	5.0	6.0	12.0	14.0	4.0	15.0	10.5	10.0	6.0
Wichita KS	63.5	5.0	5.0	9.0	6.0	12.0	4.0	0.0	7.5	10.0	5.0
Wilmington DE	58.0	5.0	5.0	9.0	10.0	15.0	4.0	0.0	3.0	5.0	2.0
Winona-Rochester MN	88.0	5.0	5.0	9.0	12.0	14.0	4.0	15.0	9.0	10.0	5.0
Worcester MA	57.5	5.0	5.0	10.0	9.0	11.0	2.0	0.0	10.5	0.0	5.0
Yakima WA	58.5	5.0	5.0	9.0	8.0	10.0	4.0	0.0	4.5	10.0	3.0
Youngstown OH	79.5	5.0	5.0	10.0	14.0	14.0	4.0	4.0	10.5	10.0	3.0

## Appendix C: Child Protection-Safe Environment Scores 2025

Rank listing (*archdioceses in bold*)

NOTE: Maximum score = 100

Scores per category: Maximum possible per category

Diocese	TOTALS	C1: 5	C2:5	C3:10	C4:15	C5:15	C6:4	C7:15	C8:15	C9:10	C10:6
Richmond VA	92.0	5.0	5.0	10.0	15.0	11.0	4.0	11.0	15.0	10.0	6.0
Ogdensburg NY	91.0	5.0	5.0	10.0	12.0	13.5	4.0	15.0	10.5	10.0	6.0
Salina KS	89.0	5.0	5.0	9.0	14.0	14.0	4.0	8.0	15.0	10.0	5.0
Grand Island NE	88.0	5.0	5.0	10.0	14.0	15.0	2.0	12.0	9.0	10.0	6.0
Winona-Rochester MN	88.0	5.0	5.0	9.0	12.0	14.0	4.0	15.0	9.0	10.0	5.0
Wheeling-Charleston WV	87.5	5.0	5.0	6.0	12.0	14.0	4.0	15.0	10.5	10.0	6.0
Davenport IA	87.0	5.0	5.0	10.0	12.0	14.0	4.0	12.0	9.0	10.0	6.0
Albany NY	86.5	5.0	5.0	10.0	14.0	14.0	4.0	8.0	10.5	10.0	6.0
Fort Wayne-South Bend IN	86.0	5.0	5.0	9.0	12.0	14.0	4.0	12.0	9.0	10.0	6.0
Scranton PA	86.0	5.0	5.0	9.0	14.0	12.0	4.0	15.0	6.0	10.0	6.0
<b>Newark NJ</b>	85.5	5.0	5.0	10.0	14.0	13.0	4.0	15.0	7.5	10.0	2.0
<b>Washington DC</b>	84.0	5.0	5.0	9.0	14.0	15.0	4.0	11.0	6.0	10.0	5.0
Buffalo NY	83.5	5.0	5.0	10.0	8.0	12.0	4.0	15.0	10.5	10.0	4.0
Tucson AZ	83.0	5.0	5.0	10.0	8.0	11.0	4.0	12.0	12.0	10.0	6.0
Gaylord MI	82.5	5.0	5.0	9.0	8.0	12.0	2.0	15.0	10.5	10.0	6.0
<b>Los Angeles CA</b>	82.5	5.0	5.0	10.0	14.0	13.5	4.0	12.0	3.0	10.0	6.0
Baton Rouge LA	82.0	5.0	5.0	10.0	14.0	14.0	4.0	12.0	3.0	10.0	5.0
Harrisburg PA	82.0	5.0	5.0	10.0	14.0	11.0	4.0	3.0	15.0	10.0	5.0
Nashville TN	82.0	5.0	5.0	9.0	12.0	14.0	4.0	12.0	6.0	10.0	5.0
Charleston SC	81.0	5.0	5.0	9.0	13.0	15.0	4.0	8.0	6.0	10.0	6.0
Helena MT	81.0	5.0	5.0	9.0	8.0	11.0	4.0	12.0	12.0	10.0	5.0
Lansing MI	81.0	5.0	5.0	10.0	12.0	14.0	4.0	8.0	9.0	10.0	4.0
<b>Atlanta GA</b>	80.5	3.0	5.0	9.0	14.0	14.0	4.0	12.0	4.5	10.0	5.0
Bridgeport CT	80.5	3.0	5.0	8.0	14.0	13.0	4.0	8.0	10.5	10.0	5.0
Evansville IN	80.5	5.0	5.0	9.0	8.0	10.5	4.0	12.0	12.0	10.0	5.0
Manchester NH	80.0	5.0	5.0	10.0	12.0	12.5	4.0	8.0	7.5	10.0	6.0

## Appendix C: Child Protection-Safe Environment Scores 2025

Rank listing (*archdioceses in bold*)

NOTE: Maximum score = 100

Scores per category: Maximum possible per category

Diocese	TOTALS	C1: 5	C2:5	C3:10	C4:15	C5:15	C6:4	C7:15	C8:15	C9:10	C10:6
Saint Augustine FL	80.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	12.0	15.0	4.0	8.0	12.0	10.0	4.0
Belleville IL	79.5	5.0	5.0	9.0	12.0	10.0	4.0	8.0	10.5	10.0	6.0
Syracuse NY	79.5	5.0	5.0	10.0	12.0	12.5	4.0	0.0	15.0	10.0	6.0
Youngstown OH	79.5	5.0	5.0	10.0	14.0	14.0	4.0	4.0	10.5	10.0	3.0
Rochester NY	79.0	5.0	5.0	10.0	14.0	14.0	4.0	4.0	9.0	10.0	4.0
Springfield MA	79.0	5.0	5.0	8.0	10.0	10.0	4.0	12.0	9.0	10.0	6.0
<b>Santa Fe NM</b>	78.5	5.0	5.0	10.0	7.0	13.5	4.0	12.0	6.0	10.0	6.0
<b>Baltimore MD</b>	77.5	5.0	5.0	10.0	10.0	9.0	4.0	8.0	10.5	10.0	6.0
Allentown PA	77.0	5.0	5.0	9.0	11.0	11.0	4.0	2.0	15.0	10.0	5.0
Lincoln NE	77.0	5.0	5.0	8.0	13.0	14.0	4.0	7.0	6.0	10.0	5.0
<b>Seattle WA</b>	77.0	3.0	5.0	10.0	10.0	11.0	4.0	12.0	6.0	10.0	6.0
Lexington KY	76.0	5.0	5.0	10.0	10.0	11.0	4.0	12.0	15.0	0.0	4.0
<b>Oklahoma City OK</b>	76.0	0.0	5.0	10.0	12.0	11.5	4.0	12.0	7.5	10.0	4.0
Gary IN	75.5	5.0	5.0	10.0	10.0	13.5	4.0	0.0	12.0	10.0	6.0
Orlando FL	75.5	5.0	5.0	9.0	12.0	9.0	4.0	12.0	4.5	10.0	5.0
Arlington VA	75.0	5.0	5.0	9.0	10.0	12.0	4.0	0.0	15.0	10.0	5.0
<b>Philadelphia PA</b>	74.0	5.0	5.0	9.0	12.0	12.5	4.0	0.0	10.5	10.0	6.0
Knoxville TN	73.0	5.0	5.0	9.0	9.0	9.0	2.0	12.0	6.0	10.0	6.0
Owensboro KY	73.0	5.0	3.5	9.0	11.0	12.5	4.0	8.0	6.0	10.0	4.0
<b>Boston MA</b>	72.5	5.0	5.0	9.0	12.0	11.0	4.0	0.0	10.5	10.0	6.0
<b>Saint Paul-Minneapolis MN</b>	72.5	5.0	5.0	10.0	14.0	15.0	4.0	0.0	4.5	10.0	5.0
San Diego CA	72.5	5.0	5.0	8.0	13.0	13.5	4.0	0.0	9.0	10.0	5.0
Spokane WA	72.5	5.0	5.0	6.0	10.0	12.5	4.0	12.0	3.0	10.0	5.0
<b>Kansas City KS</b>	72.0	5.0	5.0	10.0	8.0	12.0	4.0	0.0	12.0	10.0	6.0
<b>Louisville KY</b>	72.0	5.0	5.0	9.0	8.0	11.0	4.0	0.0	15.0	10.0	5.0
Metuchen NJ	72.0	5.0	5.0	9.0	12.0	14.0	4.0	0.0	9.0	10.0	4.0

## Appendix C: Child Protection-Safe Environment Scores 2025

Rank listing (*archdioceses in bold*)

NOTE: Maximum score = 100

Scores per category: Maximum possible per category

Diocese	TOTALS	C1: 5	C2:5	C3:10	C4:15	C5:15	C6:4	C7:15	C8:15	C9:10	C10:6
Reno NV	72.0	3.0	0.0	9.0	10.0	14.0	4.0	8.0	9.0	10.0	5.0
Amarillo TX	71.0	5.0	5.0	8.0	12.0	13.5	4.0	4.0	4.5	10.0	5.0
Fall River MA	71.0	5.0	3.5	9.0	12.0	12.0	4.0	0.0	10.5	10.0	5.0
<b>New Orleans LA</b>	71.0	5.0	5.0	10.0	14.0	15.0	4.0	0.0	3.0	10.0	5.0
Biloxi MS	70.5	5.0	5.0	9.0	12.0	12.0	2.0	0.0	10.5	10.0	5.0
Fairbanks AK	70.5	5.0	5.0	10.0	14.0	12.0	2.0	0.0	7.5	10.0	5.0
Great Falls-Billings MT	70.5	5.0	5.0	9.0	12.0	11.0	4.0	0.0	13.5	5.0	6.0
La Crosse WI	70.5	5.0	5.0	9.0	8.0	12.5	4.0	0.0	12.0	10.0	5.0
<b>Omaha NE</b>	70.5	5.0	5.0	9.0	10.0	12.0	4.0	3.0	7.5	10.0	5.0
Camden NJ	70.0	5.0	3.5	10.0	11.0	11.0	4.0	0.0	10.5	10.0	5.0
Jefferson City MO	69.5	5.0	5.0	10.0	11.0	12.5	4.0	0.0	9.0	10.0	3.0
Lake Charles LA	69.5	5.0	5.0	8.0	6.0	11.0	4.0	11.0	4.5	10.0	5.0
Bismarck ND	69.0	5.0	5.0	9.0	6.0	11.0	4.0	11.0	3.0	10.0	5.0
<b>New York NY</b>	69.0	5.0	5.0	10.0	14.0	14.0	4.0	0.0	3.0	10.0	4.0
Tulsa OK	69.0	5.0	5.0	9.0	10.0	12.0	4.0	0.0	9.0	10.0	5.0
Norwich CT	68.5	5.0	5.0	10.0	14.0	15.0	4.0	0.0	4.5	10.0	1.0
Des Moines IA	68.0	5.0	5.0	9.0	8.0	9.0	2.0	0.0	15.0	10.0	5.0
Saginaw MI	68.0	5.0	5.0	9.0	8.0	12.0	4.0	0.0	9.0	10.0	6.0
<b>Anchorage-Juneau AK</b>	67.5	5.0	5.0	10.0	12.0	11.0	4.0	0.0	4.5	10.0	6.0
<b>Detroit MI</b>	67.5	5.0	5.0	10.0	7.0	13.5	4.0	0.0	9.0	10.0	4.0
Fresno CA	67.0	3.0	5.0	9.0	2.0	11.0	4.0	8.0	9.0	10.0	6.0
Alexandria VA	66.5	5.0	5.0	8.0	10.0	11.0	4.0	0.0	7.5	10.0	6.0
Austin TX	66.5	3.0	5.0	9.0	12.0	12.5	4.0	0.0	6.0	10.0	5.0
<b>Indianapolis IN</b>	66.5	5.0	5.0	9.0	13.0	12.5	4.0	0.0	3.0	10.0	5.0
<b>Milwaukee WI</b>	66.5	5.0	5.0	10.0	6.0	11.0	4.0	0.0	10.5	10.0	5.0
Sacramento CA	66.5	5.0	5.0	10.0	10.0	11.0	4.0	0.0	7.5	10.0	4.0

## Appendix C: Child Protection-Safe Environment Scores 2025

Rank listing (*archdioceses in bold*)

NOTE: Maximum score = 100

Scores per category: Maximum possible per category

Diocese	TOTALS	C1: 5	C2:5	C3:10	C4:15	C5:15	C6:4	C7:15	C8:15	C9:10	C10:6
Cheyenne WY	66.0	5.0	5.0	9.0	8.0	11.0	4.0	0.0	9.0	10.0	5.0
Dodge City KS	66.0	5.0	5.0	9.0	11.0	11.0	4.0	0.0	9.0	10.0	2.0
Green Bay WI	66.0	5.0	5.0	9.0	8.0	11.0	2.0	0.0	12.0	10.0	4.0
Joliet IL	66.0	5.0	5.0	10.0	6.0	12.0	4.0	0.0	9.0	10.0	5.0
Erie PA	65.5	5.0	5.0	8.0	10.0	12.5	4.0	0.0	6.0	10.0	5.0
Gallup NM	65.5	5.0	5.0	8.0	11.0	12.5	4.0	0.0	6.0	10.0	4.0
New Ulm MN	65.5	5.0	5.0	10.0	11.0	9.0	4.0	0.0	7.5	10.0	4.0
Paterson NJ	65.5	5.0	5.0	8.0	10.0	11.0	4.0	0.0	7.5	10.0	5.0
San Angelo TX	65.5	5.0	5.0	9.0	6.0	11.0	2.0	11.0	1.5	10.0	5.0
Boise ID	65.0	5.0	5.0	8.0	11.0	10.0	4.0	0.0	9.0	10.0	3.0
Brooklyn NY	65.0	5.0	5.0	10.0	6.0	9.0	4.0	0.0	12.0	10.0	4.0
Crookston MN	65.0	5.0	5.0	9.0	10.0	12.5	4.0	0.0	4.5	10.0	5.0
Kansas City-Saint Joseph MO	65.0	5.0	5.0	9.0	10.0	10.0	4.0	0.0	6.0	10.0	6.0
Shreveport LA	65.0	5.0	5.0	10.0	6.0	11.0	4.0	12.0	6.0	0.0	6.0
Madison WI	64.5	5.0	5.0	9.0	10.0	11.0	4.0	0.0	4.5	10.0	6.0
Memphis TN	64.5	5.0	2.0	10.0	8.0	9.0	4.0	0.0	13.5	10.0	3.0
Venice FL	64.5	5.0	5.0	9.0	10.0	11.0	4.0	0.0	10.5	5.0	5.0
Jackson MS	64.0	5.0	5.0	9.0	9.0	9.0	4.0	4.0	3.0	10.0	6.0
<b>Mobile AL</b>	64.0	5.0	5.0	9.0	10.0	12.0	4.0	0.0	3.0	10.0	6.0
Orange CA	64.0	5.0	5.0	10.0	5.0	11.0	4.0	0.0	9.0	10.0	5.0
Pittsburgh PA	64.0	5.0	5.0	10.0	12.0	14.0	4.0	0.0	0.0	10.0	4.0
Toledo OH	64.0	5.0	0.0	10.0	11.0	11.0	4.0	4.0	3.0	10.0	6.0
Charlotte NC	63.5	5.0	5.0	9.0	10.0	10.0	4.0	2.0	4.5	10.0	4.0
Pensacola-Tallahassee FL	63.5	5.0	5.0	9.0	10.0	11.0	4.0	0.0	4.5	10.0	5.0
Santa Rosa CA	63.5	5.0	5.0	10.0	6.0	11.0	4.0	0.0	7.5	10.0	5.0
Wichita KS	63.5	5.0	5.0	9.0	6.0	12.0	4.0	0.0	7.5	10.0	5.0

## Appendix C: Child Protection-Safe Environment Scores 2025

Rank listing (*archdioceses in bold*)

NOTE: Maximum score = 100

Scores per category: Maximum possible per category

Diocese	TOTALS	C1: 5	C2:5	C3:10	C4:15	C5:15	C6:4	C7:15	C8:15	C9:10	C10:6
Birmingham AL	63.0	5.0	5.0	8.0	9.0	11.0	4.0	0.0	6.0	10.0	5.0
Sioux City IA	63.0	5.0	5.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	4.0	0.0	6.0	10.0	3.0
Marquette MI	62.5	5.0	5.0	9.0	10.0	11.0	4.0	0.0	4.5	10.0	4.0
Providence RI	62.5	5.0	5.0	9.0	6.0	10.0	4.0	0.0	7.5	10.0	6.0
Saint Petersburg FL	62.5	5.0	5.0	8.0	8.0	10.5	4.0	4.0	9.0	5.0	4.0
<b>Chicago IL</b>	62.0	5.0	5.0	9.0	7.0	11.0	4.0	0.0	6.0	10.0	5.0
Lafayette IN	62.0	5.0	5.0	9.0	10.0	10.0	4.0	0.0	3.0	10.0	6.0
San Bernardino CA	62.0	5.0	5.0	10.0	8.0	12.0	4.0	0.0	3.0	10.0	5.0
Burlington VT	61.5	5.0	5.0	9.0	8.0	11.0	4.0	0.0	4.5	10.0	5.0
Cleveland OH	61.5	5.0	5.0	9.0	10.0	11.0	2.0	0.0	4.5	10.0	5.0
<b>Dubuque IA</b>	61.5	3.0	5.0	10.0	6.0	11.0	4.0	0.0	7.5	10.0	5.0
Peoria IL	61.5	5.0	5.0	10.0	6.0	11.0	4.0	0.0	4.5	10.0	6.0
Rockford IL	61.5	5.0	5.0	9.0	8.0	11.0	4.0	0.0	4.5	10.0	5.0
<b>Saint Louis MO</b>	61.5	5.0	5.0	9.0	9.0	11.0	4.0	0.0	4.5	10.0	4.0
Springfield-Cape Girardeau MO	61.5	5.0	5.0	10.0	12.0	11.0	4.0	0.0	1.5	10.0	3.0
Steubenville OH	61.5	5.0	5.0	10.0	8.0	10.5	4.0	0.0	6.0	10.0	3.0
<b>Denver CO</b>	61.0	3.0	5.0	10.0	10.0	11.0	4.0	0.0	3.0	10.0	5.0
Raleigh NC	61.0	5.0	5.0	9.0	10.0	10.5	4.0	0.0	4.5	10.0	3.0
Columbus OH	60.5	5.0	5.0	10.0	10.0	9.0	4.0	0.0	4.5	10.0	3.0
<b>Miami FL</b>	60.5	5.0	5.0	10.0	14.0	13.0	4.0	0.0	4.5	0.0	5.0
Victoria TX	60.5	5.0	5.0	10.0	9.0	8.0	4.0	0.0	4.5	10.0	5.0
Springfield IL	60.0	5.0	3.0	9.0	8.0	11.0	4.0	4.0	6.0	10.0	0.0
Sioux Falls SD	59.5	3.0	0.0	9.0	10.0	12.5	4.0	0.0	6.0	10.0	5.0
Stockton CA	59.5	5.0	5.0	8.0	8.0	11.0	4.0	0.0	4.5	10.0	4.0
<b>Cincinnati OH</b>	59.0	5.0	0.0	9.0	10.0	12.0	2.0	0.0	6.0	10.0	5.0
Covington KY	59.0	5.0	5.0	9.0	8.0	11.0	4.0	0.0	3.0	10.0	4.0

## Appendix C: Child Protection-Safe Environment Scores 2025

Rank listing (*archdioceses in bold*)

NOTE: Maximum score = 100

Scores per category: Maximum possible per category

Diocese	TOTALS	C1: 5	C2:5	C3:10	C4:15	C5:15	C6:4	C7:15	C8:15	C9:10	C10:6
Greensburg PA	59.0	5.0	5.0	10.0	7.0	9.0	4.0	0.0	3.0	10.0	6.0
<b>Hartford CT</b>	59.0	5.0	5.0	9.0	8.0	11.0	4.0	0.0	3.0	10.0	4.0
San Jose CA	59.0	5.0	1.5	10.0	8.0	12.5	4.0	0.0	3.0	10.0	5.0
Trenton NJ	59.0	5.0	5.0	8.0	12.0	11.0	4.0	0.0	0.0	10.0	4.0
Duluth MN	58.5	5.0	5.0	9.0	7.0	11.0	2.0	0.0	4.5	10.0	5.0
Las Cruces NM	58.5	5.0	3.5	9.0	10.0	10.0	0.0	0.0	6.0	10.0	5.0
Superior WI	58.5	5.0	5.0	10.0	4.0	11.0	4.0	0.0	4.5	10.0	5.0
Yakima WA	58.5	5.0	5.0	9.0	8.0	10.0	4.0	0.0	4.5	10.0	3.0
Brownsville TX	58.0	5.0	5.0	9.0	7.0	10.0	4.0	0.0	3.0	10.0	5.0
Phoenix AZ	58.0	5.0	5.0	9.0	6.0	12.5	4.0	0.0	4.5	10.0	2.0
Rapid City SD	58.0	5.0	5.0	9.0	8.0	11.0	2.0	0.0	3.0	10.0	5.0
<b>San Francisco CA</b>	58.0	5.0	3.5	10.0	9.0	13.0	4.0	0.0	7.5	0.0	6.0
Savannah GA	58.0	5.0	5.0	10.0	6.0	11.0	4.0	0.0	6.0	10.0	1.0
Wilmington DE	58.0	5.0	5.0	9.0	10.0	15.0	4.0	0.0	3.0	5.0	2.0
Dallas TX	57.5	5.0	5.0	8.0	10.0	6.0	4.0	0.0	4.5	10.0	5.0
Monterey CA	57.5	5.0	5.0	9.0	8.0	6.0	4.0	0.0	4.5	10.0	6.0
Tyler TX	57.5	5.0	5.0	10.0	6.0	12.0	4.0	0.0	1.5	10.0	4.0
Worcester MA	57.5	5.0	5.0	10.0	9.0	11.0	2.0	0.0	10.5	0.0	5.0
Beaumont TX	57.0	0.0	5.0	9.0	6.0	11.0	2.0	0.0	9.0	10.0	5.0
Lafayette LA	57.0	3.0	5.0	9.0	9.0	11.0	4.0	0.0	0.0	10.0	6.0
Oakland CA	57.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	11.0	2.0	0.0	9.0	10.0	5.0
Portland ME	56.5	5.0	5.0	10.0	7.0	10.0	2.0	11.0	4.5	0.0	2.0
Rockville Centre NY	55.5	5.0	5.0	8.0	12.0	11.0	2.0	0.0	4.5	5.0	3.0
Altoona-Johnstown PA	55.0	3.0	5.0	9.0	10.0	9.0	4.0	0.0	0.0	10.0	5.0
El Paso TX	55.0	5.0	5.0	9.0	6.0	9.0	4.0	0.0	3.0	10.0	4.0
Fargo ND	55.0	5.0	5.0	9.0	8.0	11.0	0.0	0.0	3.0	10.0	4.0

## Appendix C: Child Protection-Safe Environment Scores 2025

Rank listing (*archdioceses in bold*)

NOTE: Maximum score = 100

Scores per category: Maximum possible per category

Diocese	TOTALS	C1: 5	C2:5	C3:10	C4:15	C5:15	C6:4	C7:15	C8:15	C9:10	C10:6
Saint Cloud MN	54.5	5.0	5.0	9.0	6.0	10.0	4.0	0.0	1.5	10.0	4.0
Baker-Redmond OR	54.0	3.0	5.0	10.0	7.0	11.0	4.0	0.0	9.0	0.0	5.0
<b>Galveston-Houston TX</b>	<b>53.0</b>	3.0	2.0	9.0	6.0	12.0	4.0	0.0	3.0	10.0	4.0
Grand Rapids MI	52.5	5.0	5.0	10.0	8.0	9.0	4.0	3.0	4.5	0.0	4.0
Salt Lake City UT	52.5	3.0	3.5	10.0	11.0	8.0	4.0	0.0	0.0	10.0	3.0
<b>Portland OR</b>	<b>52.0</b>	5.0	5.0	9.0	11.0	11.0	4.0	0.0	3.0	0.0	4.0
Colorado Springs CO	51.5	5.0	5.0	9.0	11.0	12.5	4.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	5.0
Fort Worth TX	51.0	0.0	5.0	9.0	6.0	12.0	4.0	0.0	0.0	10.0	5.0
Little Rock AR	51.0	5.0	5.0	9.0	6.0	7.0	4.0	0.0	0.0	10.0	5.0
Palm Beach FL	50.5	5.0	5.0	10.0	10.0	11.0	4.0	0.0	1.5	0.0	4.0
Honolulu HI	50.0	5.0	5.0	9.0	9.0	11.0	4.0	0.0	3.0	0.0	4.0
Kalamazoo MI	49.5	5.0	1.5	9.0	6.0	7.0	4.0	0.0	3.0	10.0	4.0
Lubbock TX	49.0	3.0	5.0	10.0	6.0	6.0	4.0	0.0	0.0	10.0	5.0
Corpus Christi TX	45.0	3.0	0.0	8.0	4.0	8.0	4.0	0.0	6.0	10.0	2.0
Houma-Thibodaux LA	45.0	5.0	5.0	9.0	8.0	7.0	4.0	0.0	3.0	0.0	4.0
Laredo TX	44.0	0.0	3.5	8.0	6.0	11.0	4.0	0.0	7.5	0.0	4.0
<b>Las Vegas NV</b>	<b>43.5</b>	0.0	3.5	9.0	3.0	7.0	4.0	0.0	3.0	10.0	4.0
<b>Military Services USA</b>	<b>42.0</b>	5.0	0.0	4.0	8.0	9.0	0.0	4.0	9.0	0.0	3.0
Pueblo CO	40.0	3.0	5.0	9.0	8.0	11.0	4.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
<b>San Antonio TX</b>	<b>38.0</b>	0.0	5.0	8.0	3.0	11.0	4.0	0.0	3.0	0.0	4.0
Saint Thomas VI	35.0	0.0	0.0	8.0	4.0	11.0	4.0	0.0	3.0	0.0	5.0