



2022 Report: Measuring Abuse Prevention and Safe Environment Programs as Reported Online in Diocesan Policies and Practices

Executive Summary

Twenty years have passed since the public exposé of clergy sexual abuse within the Catholic Church by *The Boston Globe Spotlight* Team (2002). Yet in many cases our dioceses do not adhere to child protection and safe environment standards set by the U.S. Conference of Catholic Bishops (USCCB) itself and Pope Francis. Nor do they follow best practice recommendations from abuse prevention specialists.

One measure of commitment to the USCCB's "promise to heal and protect" is diocesan website postings of child protection efforts. Website postings serve as a vital point of accountability and transparency. This report highlights the most egregious deficiencies in that commitment and suggests remedies.

Under the auspices of Voice of the Faithful, researchers examined the websites of all 177 dioceses and archdioceses in the United States and scored each on the content concerning protection of children. Reviewers used a specially developed worksheet that included 33 questions in the following 10 categories: Policy; Code of Conduct; Reporting Abuse; Background Checks; Prevention Education & Training; Contact Information; Annual Audit Reporting; Diocesan Review Boards; List of Accused Clergy; and Victim Assistance. (See Appendix A for the worksheet listing the categories and questions used in this review.)

Overall, out of a possible 100 points, the average score was 67. The most frequently achieved score for all dioceses was 63.5.

Individually, some dioceses are doing well but no diocese was awarded 100 points. Four dioceses received the highest scores, which were in the 90s. Three had the lowest, scoring in the 20s. Reviewers noted that some dioceses had excellent scores in an individual category but a poor overall score. The category scores indicate performance with a specific focus, such as content of abuse reporting information.

Here are some particularly important points from the report:

- ❖ Diocesan safe environment webpage content must align with its child protection policies. Lack of consistency calls into question the diligence afforded to safe environment and child protection efforts in the diocese and its commitment to transparency. Child protection and safe environment policies must be accessible, clearly stated, and in accord with website content.

Measuring and Ranking Diocesan Safe Environment Programs: 2022

- ❖ 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 webpages dedicated to child protection efforts.
- ❖ Dioceses must fully disclose credibly accused offenders' information. VOTF is disappointed that many dioceses received a relatively high total score on this review yet did not disclose information on credibly accused priests (Category #9). Although not a requirement of the USCCB *Charter for the Protection of Children and Young People*, full disclosure of credibly accused offenders' names and their current status, as well as their past assignments, is a best practice for abuse prevention. We urge the bishops to make these disclosures a component of the *Charter* so that dioceses are compelled to disclose this critical information.
- ❖ Diocesan Review Boards (DRB) must ensure that *Charter*-related policies and procedures are current and clearly stated. The names, credentials, and terms of office of DRB members should be posted on diocesan websites for transparency. During the 2020 Charter audit, the auditors reported finding dysfunction in the operation of DRBs. We recommend that the National Review Board address such dysfunction during the periodic diocesan audits.
- ❖ The USCCB should enforce mandatory participation in the annual audits that measure diocesan compliance with the *Charter* and *Essential Norms* as well as a time-limited period for correcting deficiencies. In addition, more frequent and regularly scheduled reviews and updates of the USCCB *Charter* and *Essential Norms* are needed.

None of these recommendations will keep our children safe if parishioners do not realize their own key roles in ensuring protection of children. Working with diocesan and parish safe environment personnel, parishioners can bolster safety guidelines at the diocesan level and ensure that safety measures are carried out in their 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.

Measuring and Ranking Diocesan Child Protection, Safe Environment, and Abuse Prevention Efforts

Twenty years have passed since the public exposé of clergy sexual abuse within the Boston Catholic Church by *The Boston Globe Spotlight* Team (2002). It also is 20 years since Boston-area Catholics founded Voice of the Faithful (VOTF) in response to those revelations. The organization quickly grew into an international movement as revelations increased in country after country about persistent sexual abuse and related coverups occurring globally in the Church.

Spurred into action by the horror of abuse revelations and the need to foster safe environments for protecting children in parishes and the broader community, Voice of the Faithful Protection of Children (POC) working group came together in the early months of 2002. Today, the POC mission continues to embrace the creation, education, and maintenance of child protection measures in our parishes.

The breadth of clergy sexual abuse cases within the Church indicates that historical responses to accusations of abuse by the hierarchy were inadequate. Those responses aimed to protect the reputation of the institution rather than support victims and prevent further child abuse within the Church. The hierarchical construct of a privileged, secretive, unaccountable, male-only institution provided the backdrop that produced a culture of leaders who enabled the protection of the abusers and church leadership, placing it above the victims' best interests and the suffering of children.

Some of those same constructs and an unchanging defense of this already damaged institution ignore the need to reform faulty structures such as the bishops' deficient compliance to their own standards and a lack of urgency and decisive actions that would demonstrate their professed resolve to protect and heal.

In reaction to the 2002 media revelations, bishops created "standards of change" to eliminate the potential of future instances of clergy sexual abuse. These standards of abuse prevention in the U.S. Church are spelled out in the mandates of the bishops' *Charter for the Protection of Children and Young People* and the *Essential Norms* and most recently in Pope Francis' 2019 *motu proprio* titled *Vos estis lux mundi*.

Additionally, the U.S. Conference of Catholic Bishops (USCCB) established a National Review Board (NRB) to monitor compliance with the Charter's norms as well as a Committee for the Protection of Children and Young People that provides the bishops with comprehensive planning and recommendations about child and youth protection in coordination with the NRB.

Measuring and Ranking Diocesan Safe Environment Programs: 2022

The monitoring function, using annual diocesan compliance “audits,” is conducted by a contracted agency. The data they collect largely consist of bishops’ self-reported answers to prepared inquiries. Thus, bishops remain in control of the information going into the audit. As StoneBridge auditors—the current contractor—note in their 2020 Audit Report, they are engaged by the bishops to audit compliance with the bishops’ *Charter* (p.15).

The audit process itself is conducted in two distinct phases: data collection from all dioceses, and on-site audits limited annually to one-third of all dioceses. Results are published in Annual Reports as the “Implementation of the Charter for the Protection of Children and Young People” on the USCCB website. ([Audits | USCCB](#)).

Individual diocesan efforts to maintain standards of child safety can be found on their websites under headings such as Safe Environment, Child Protection, and Abuse Prevention as well as in diocesan policies. Posted diocesan website information reflects efforts to set abuse prevention and child protection standards within that diocese.

To date, an extensive measurement of all website-posted diocesan efforts to meet the *Charter*, the *Essential Norms*, and *Vos estis lux mundi* has not been carried out. Child USA, a think tank headed by attorney Marci Hamilton, did conduct a limited survey that covered 32 Archdiocesan child protection and safe environment policies when conducting a study commissioned by the Ramsey County Attorney’s Office, St. Paul MN, on the Archdiocese of St. Paul & Minneapolis (Hamilton, 2020).

After noting the lack of a comprehensive review of all dioceses and archdioceses, VOTF recognized the need for an in-depth review of the publicly accessible policies and procedures regarding abuse prevention and safe environment measures that are posted on every U.S. diocesan website. This report provides that review.

The Importance of Child Protection, Safe Environment, and Abuse Prevention

During 2021, Voice of the Faithful carried out its first Review of the Safe Environment measures displayed on the websites of all 177 dioceses belonging to the USCCB. VOTF’s review focused on diocesan websites because the website display of safe environment policies and procedures presents the public face of bishops’ commitment to protect children and prevent further sexual abuse by clergy. Reviewing posted information is a way to identify statements of safety measures as found in the bishops’ *Charter* and *Essential Norms*, Pope Francis’ *moto proprio* (*Vos estis lux mundi*), and recognized best practices for child protection such as the CDC Guidelines for child protection policies (2007).

Measuring and Ranking Diocesan Online Financial Transparency: 2022

A diocese's stated policies and procedures are key elements in determining their bishop's public commitment to child protection standards. Note that this website review is not an audit of the bishops' actual compliance with stated policies and child safety commitments, but it sets a critical benchmark against which the faithful can measure accountability.

Also essential to prevent future abuse is raising awareness in our parishes that we need to maintain strong vigilance of safe environment efforts. The diocesan guidelines and stated policies set standards of expectation for the creation and maintenance of safe environments in our parishes. Those posted diocesan guidelines also should clarify the work of parishes to establish and maintain child protection and abuse prevention measures.

The public presentation of those diocesan guidelines is the focus of this study.

Our goal is to inspire parishioners not only to check that comprehensive diocesan guidelines are clearly stated but also to look into potential guideline shortcomings when their local parishes implement the diocesan standards.

If parishioners find deficiencies in posted diocesan abuse prevention measures, we encourage them to work with diocesan personnel such as the diocesan safe environment coordinator and chancellor to enhance those measures.

Implications and the Need for Ongoing Vigilance

The implications of the findings from this Review extend beyond simply identifying posted diocesan safe environment and abuse prevention measures. Total diocesan scores on this survey reflect an aspirational commitment to create safe environments, but they do not guarantee successful implementation. Our review measures the culture of transparency related to child protection measures; it is not an audit of their consistent implementation.

Implementation and posted content may reflect outside pressures on a diocese—local or state civil requirements, legislation, investigations, even court orders may influence the information a diocese displays.

Posted content also may be inconsistent internally. For example, a diocese's policy may stipulate that all volunteers must undergo training and background checks while posted standards cite exceptions to the "all" volunteers.

Another factor to consider is how diocesan standards are carried out at the local, parish level. That implementation may not reflect the breadth and depth of posted abuse prevention measures. Moreover, vigilance is required to ensure that compliance to these standards

Measuring and Ranking Diocesan Safe Environment Programs: 2022

applies within all dioceses and in the local parishes—policies and standards must match practices as lived out at the local level.

The Review therefore included questions that examined both the standards to which the dioceses aspired and the level of consistency in posted content.

Total scores reflect the combined scores from the 10 categories detailed in the next pages. A diocese may score very high in one category but not in another, and high scores in one category do not ensure a high overall score.

Review Instrument

The heart of VOTF's Review consists of a worksheet that touches on 10 categories for child protection, abuse prevention, and safe environment measures. The 10 categories of interest (see Table 1) were developed by the POC Team, composed of VOTF officers and members, several of whom have years of experience in child well-being.

Within the 10 categories, the POC Team developed 33 distinct questions, giving special attention to employing objective questions in order to minimize the role of personal opinion. The maximum score achievable was 100 points. (See Appendix A for the worksheet utilized in this review.)

Table 1 – Assigned Category Points

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

Data Collection

The review of diocesan websites began in February 2021 and continued through December 2021. Two independent reviewers conducted this comprehensive review. Following the independent reviews, any scoring discrepancies were reconciled by a third POC member to ensure that each diocese received proper credit. (See Appendix B for diocesan scores in alphabetic order and Appendix C for scores in ranked order.)

Overall Results

The average overall score achieved by the 177 dioceses was 67 out of a possible 100 points. No diocese attained the maximum 100 points. The most frequently achieved overall score on this Review was 63.5. These overall scores reflect total scores from all 10 categories. However, it is important to remember that the individual category scores reveal more than the overall score does about a diocese's adherence to the set standards and guidelines.

The Top Scoring Dioceses

The top score achieved was 95.5 by the Diocese of Harrisburg PA. Researchers could easily access the link to their child protection policy. The website was well-organized and comprehensive on safe environment measures, which facilitated a speedy completion of questions on the worksheet. The list of credibly accused priests also was comprehensive, perhaps not surprising because the Pennsylvania grand jury's report, released in August 2018, was the broadest examination by a government agency in the U.S. of child sexual abuse in the Catholic Church (<https://www.attorneygeneral.gov/report/>).

Table 2 – Top Scoring Dioceses

Diocese	Total Score
Harrisburg PA	95.5
Winona-Rochester MN	93.5
Baltimore MD	92.5
Venice FL	92.5
Richmond VA	89.5
Brooklyn NY	89.0

Likewise, child safety and abuse prevention information was easily located on the websites of Winona-Rochester MN and the other four top scoring dioceses.

The Lowest Scoring Dioceses

Reviewers were unable to locate child protection policies for the three lowest scoring dioceses, and six of the lowest scoring dioceses did not post lists of credibly accused clergy. But the most evident deficiencies for these dioceses were found in the Audit and Diocesan Review Board categories.

The Archdiocese for Military Services USA differs slightly from the other dioceses in this list. It provides services to the U.S. Armed Forces but has no parishes. Yet that Archdiocese ministers to a large population worldwide and requires many safe environment measures, such as abuse prevention online training; the military Archdiocese also is included in the annual USCCB audit. Unfortunately, it also has one of the lowest overall scores.

Also note that during the Review, the USCCB merged two Alaska dioceses into one: Anchorage-Juneau. However, because we included the Military Services archdiocese in the report, we still cover a total of 177 dioceses.

Table 3 – Lowest Scoring Dioceses

Diocese	Total Score
Lake Charles LA	49.0
San Francisco CA	44.5
Pueblo CO	44.0
Trenton NJ	43.5
Kalamazoo MI	43.5
Peoria IL	41.5
Colorado Springs CO	41.5
Military Services USA	38.5
Corpus Christi TX	27.0
Lubbock TX	23.5
Shreveport LA	22.5

Detailed Summary—Scoring in Each of the 10 Categories

Scoring information in each of the 10 worksheet categories follows. This analysis provides an indication of compliance with specific mandates of the *Charter*, *Essential Norms*, and *Vos estis lux mundi*.

Category 1 – Policy (10 Points)

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

Reviewers searched for posted website policies under these possible names: abuse prevention, safe environment, child protection, policy. They also scored the total number of required “clicks” to see how easy it was to locate a posted policy and open it. Remarkably, reviewers were unable to locate posted safe environment or child protection policies for the following dioceses: Corpus Christi TX; Las Vegas NV; Lubbock TX; Rochester NY; and Shreveport LA. Of particular note, the only archdiocese with no publicly accessible policy was the Archdiocese of San Francisco CA.

Measuring and Ranking Diocesan Online Financial Transparency: 2022

Names assigned to safe environment and child protection policies varied. Some were named “Handbooks,” “Manuals,” or “Policy for Addressing Sexual Abuse” (Kansas City-St. Joseph). Other policies had unclear titles, such as “Abuse Policy” (Fairbanks AK), “Code of Conduct” (Portland ME), and “Morals & Ethics Policy” (Superior WI). Another diocese (Sioux City IA) put its safe environment policy within all the Codes of Conduct it described. Some policies were located under website tabs other than Child Protection or Safe Environment: for example, “Report Abuse” (Erie PA), “Report Misconduct” (Lansing MI), and “Policy against Sexual Misconduct” (Monterrey CA).

Links to a few policies were nonfunctioning (Error 404), such as that for Rochester NY. A note on their website indicated that the website was “under construction” at the time of review.

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

Many dioceses had separate policies for distinct child protection measures, using titles such as Background Checks; Training; Screening of Church Personnel; Ethical Conduct. Some used a listing under Protocols, such as for Visiting Clergy (St. Augustine FL).

Revised and updated safe environment and child protection policies were found on many websites during the review process. However, many dioceses did not eliminate older policies or indicate whether the newer policy superseded or simply added to the older policy. As a result, when reviewers found conflicting or contradicting information between these posted policies or between policy statements and website information, they could not award credit on that worksheet question.

Category 2 – Code of Conduct (5 Points)

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

Reviewers searched for postings of Codes of Conduct for various populations: clergy and lay employees, staff, and volunteers. Four dioceses did not post any Codes of Conduct: Military Services, Cincinnati OH, Colorado Springs CO, and Lubbock TX.

Nine dioceses did not post publicly accessible Conduct Codes for one of the populations that should be covered: Austin TX, Fall River MA, Fresno CA, Galveston-Houston TX, Gary IN, Hartford CT, Las Cruces NM, Memphis TN, and San Diego CA.

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)

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

This category contained four questions about the diocesan abuse reporting process, about mandated reporting to law enforcement, and about where to report complaints about bishops with an active link to the Catholic Bishops Abuse Reporting (CBAR) portal. Average score on this category was 7.58 out of 8 points, a welcome level. The average was brought down because 26 dioceses did not receive all possible points, indicating a lack of compliance with both the *Charter* and the 2019 *motu proprio* of Pope Francis: *Vos estis lux mundi*. This Review could not determine whether such omissions were unintentional or careless, but the results indicate a disregard in those dioceses for basic standards of abuse reporting. (See Appendix D for comments on the CBAR compliance.)

Category 4 – Background Checks (15 Points)

Average score = 11.01; maximum score 15, by no diocese

Screening and training of diocesan staff, clergy, and volunteers are important child abuse prevention requirements. Clearly stated standards for the screening and training mandates must be available to the public because the standards are foundational to preventing abuse. In addition, for the standards to be effective, compliance must be monitored in parishes, schools, and diocesan offices. Questions in Categories 4 and 5 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 description of the process to be followed if criminal information was found during the background check. They also checked for the name of a diocesan office or department that monitors background check compliance.

Three dioceses did not specify background checks for any of the populations that should be covered. Those dioceses are Shreveport LA, Lubbock TX, and Peoria IL.

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 has 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. Reviewers looked for a requirement for suitability letters or certifications in diocesan policy or in information posted on a Safe Environment website.

Measuring and Ranking Diocesan Online Financial Transparency: 2022

Overall, the reviewers found 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 guidelines from the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC, 2007). These guidelines also point to the necessity for clear and concise policy statements.

Category 5 – Prevention Education & Training (18 Points)

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

This category contained 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 in this category was 13 points out of 18 possible points:

- ❖ Six dioceses received the full credit of 18 points in this category: Indianapolis IN, Chicago IL, Covington KY, Bridgeport CT, Lexington KY, and Springfield IL, indicating full compliance.
- ❖ Forty-three dioceses received less than 10 points in this category.
- ❖ Reviewers were not able to access any prevention training information for the diocese of Lake Charles LA. Access to some of that diocese's training information was password-protected.

Category 6 – Contact Information (6 Points)

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

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

Ninety-three of the 177 dioceses received full credit in this category; 75 dioceses did not display either diocesan contact information or a link for filing a child abuse complaint to a civil authority. Another nine dioceses did not post either piece of contact information and received zero credit: Military Services, Cleveland OH, Fargo ND, Gary IN, Great-Falls-Billings MT, Knoxville TN, Las Cruces NM, Peoria IL, and Steubenville OH.

Category 7 – Audit Reporting (10 Points)

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

Reviewers searched for information posted about recent USCCB-sponsored audit findings and whether that audit was conducted onsite or was 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 should report its results in that audit to the faithful.

Nineteen dioceses did not post any information concerning USCCB audit report findings.

Only nine of the 177 diocesan websites received full credit on questions in this category.

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

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

This category utilized four worksheet inquiries: names and credentials of DRB members; whether lay people constituted a majority of the non-employee DRB members; whether the dioceses posted the name of the DRB chair; and whether DRB is notified about all abuse allegations.

Reviewers found variations in the naming of DRBs, which can lead to confusion when someone searches for terminology utilized in *Charter* mandates. Examples of the names used are: Permanent Review Board (Alexandria LA); Independent Oversight Board (Altoona-Johnstown PA, Great Falls-Billings MT, Sacramento CA, St. Augustine FL); Consultative Committee (Biloxi MS); Ministerial Review Board (Crookston MN); Allegation Review Committee (Des Moines and Fall River MA); Case Review Board (Mobile, Washington DC); and Charter Review Board (Wichita).

Thirty-five diocesan websites did not receive any credit for questions in this category about DRBs, and only 21 dioceses received full credit of 18 points in this category. The most frequently missing information was the names of DRB members and their credentials. Some dioceses posted statements that they chose to keep the names of DRB members hidden.

StoneBridge Auditors, hired by the bishops to assess Charter compliance, noted in its 2020 audit how important it is for a diocese to have a functioning and informed diocesan review board—and that some were dysfunctional (StoneBridge, p.18).

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

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

The vast majority of dioceses published lists of clergy who were credibly accused of abuse (149 out of 177 dioceses); only 23 dioceses did not publish these 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 location of the accused's past assignments (See Appendix E for the dioceses with incomplete listings).

Disclosure of names of credibly accused clergy is not a requirement of the *Charter*, but such disclosures are a recognized best practice for abuse prevention and as a deterrent to future abuse. Full disclosure can demonstrate diocesan transparency about issues of clergy sexual abuse and positively inform the needed trust in the institution.

Note that in this category, reviewers assumed that some disclosures of credibly accused clergy information were made involuntarily as a result of a court order or of nonmonetary settlements between diocese and survivor (McChesney, 2015). However, full transparency and accountability should not require a court order.

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

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

Reviewers noted that many diocesan websites listed a member of the clergy (priest or deacon) as the Victim Assistance Coordinator. This can be considered a conflict of interest, especially in providing pastoral care for those abused, their families, and the affected communities. However, the reviewers did not withhold points for those who had a clergy member for the VAC; those dioceses still received full credit.

Sixty-eight dioceses obtained full credit (5 points) in this category, which examined whether contact information for the VAC was posted on the website and whether pastoral and counseling services were made available to survivors, families of survivors, and affected communities. (Clergy sexual abuse affects more than the immediate victims.)

Two dioceses (Norwich CT and Pueblo NM) did not post either contact information for the VAC or a website or policy statement about supporting victims with counseling services.

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

Key Issues: Final Comments and Recommendations

One key issue that can lead to a decline in diocesan child protection and safe environment efforts is the turnover of key staffing positions within a diocese. StoneBridge Auditors noted in their 2020 Audit Report to the USCCB that turnover of key personnel, such as Bishop, Review Board Chair, Safe Environment Coordinator or Director, and Victim Assistance Coordinator may lead in some cases to noncompliance with the *Charter*. (StoneBridge p.15)

In addition to this general assessment, we urge improvements in these areas:

Website Content

Reviewers noted a huge variance in the safe environment and child protection information posted on diocesan websites. Consistent content and title templates used by multiple dioceses could ensure that critical information is included on the websites and that the faithful can easily find the information needed. We recommend the creation and utilization of best-practice templates for website content on these measures.

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.

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 should 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. We recommend that older and outdated policies posted on diocesan websites be archived to avoid posting potentially conflicting information and creating confusion about directives for safe environments and child protection in parishes.
- ❖ We also recommend regular reviews in a diocese so that content on Safe Environment or Abuse Prevention webpages 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 Online Financial Transparency: 2022

- ❖ Directives posted on webpages and in policies should be clearly stated, and policy content must agree with information found on website pages. Likewise, policy content should be available to the public and not password-protected.
- ❖ Policies should be posted in every major language spoken by diocesan members.
- ❖ Policies on child protection should contain clear statements and mandates. They should be easily located on websites and grouped under intuitive or self-explanatory headings such as Safe Environments, Child Protection, or Abuse Prevention.

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 also should be completely independent of each diocese (Hamilton, 2020).

StoneBridge auditors note in the conclusions section of their 2020 Annual Report that “the structure of the Church and Canon Law leaves the response of the Church in the hands of each Bishop.” The auditors' conclusion goes on, encouraging “... Bishops to continue discerning an appropriate path for the U.S. Conference as a whole to pursue regarding *Charter* issues and other forms of abuse within the clergy” (StoneBridge, p.16). This would include mandatory participation in the audit process by every diocese, follow-up on audit findings, and an enforced, time-limited period for correcting deficiencies.

Diocesan Review Boards (DRB)

As noted in the analysis of Worksheet Category 8 in this report, 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. However, the Annual 2020 Audit noted some dysfunction of Review Boards. That dysfunction must be remedied because this body is charged with oversight of handling all abuse accusations within the diocese (StoneBridge, p.18). We question why dioceses have been found in compliance with an audit when their DRB is noted as dysfunctional.

The names of members who serve on the National Review Board are clearly posted on the USCCB website. So, too, should the names, credentials, and terms of office of DRB members be posted on diocesan websites. Diocesan policies also should contain information on the function and role of DRBs.

Disclosure of Names of Credibly Accused Clergy

Although disclosing names and status of credibly accused clergy is not a requirement of the *Charter*, it is an abuse prevention best practice. If disclosure of these names were made a component of the *Charter*, child protection and survivor healing would be enhanced in our faith communities. More dioceses would feel compelled to disclose this critical information if there were a mandate in the *Charter*.

Overall Recommendations to Enhance Child Protection

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 20 years ago. National efforts to look into sex abuse in the Church have been undertaken in Ireland, Australia, France, and Germany to name a few, as well as in many U.S. States, notably in Pennsylvania. 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.

- ❖ Echoing the recommendation from StoneBridge Auditors in their 2020 Audit of U.S. Catholic dioceses, VOTF recommends that dioceses consult with the USCCB Office of Child and Youth Protection for suggestions and materials to **reduce negative impact of turnover** in key diocesan positions (StoneBridge, p. 15).
- ❖ 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.
- ❖ 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 webpages 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.

Parishioners 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 and 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.

Appendices

Appendix A: Worksheet for Measuring Child Protection

Appendix B: Transparency Scores, Alphabetical Listing

Appendix C: Transparency Scores, Ranked by Score

Appendix D: Comments on CBAR-Category 3

Appendix E: Category 9 Disclosures

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 <u>both</u> .	
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 (<i>continued</i>)					
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 2022

Alphabetical listing (**archdioceses** in bold) 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
Albany NY	76.0	9.0	5.0	8.0	12.0	16.0	6.0	7.5	5.0	5.0	2.5
Alexandria LA	63.5	8.0	5.0	5.0	13.0	16.0	3.0	-	5.0	5.0	3.5
Allentown PA	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	64.5	10.0	5.0	8.0	12.0	16.0	6.0	-	-	5.0	2.5
Amarillo TX	67.0	8.0	5.0	5.0	13.0	15.0	6.0	2.5	5.0	5.0	2.5
Anchor.-Juneau AK	79.5	9.0	5.0	8.0	14.0	14.0	6.0	10.0	5.0	5.0	3.5
Arch. Mili. Services	38.5	8.0	-	5.0	4.0	13.0	-	5.0	-	-	3.5
Arlington VA	79.5	8.0	5.0	8.0	12.0	16.0	3.0	5.0	14.0	5.0	3.5
Atlanta GA	77.5	9.0	5.0	8.0	13.0	14.0	6.0	7.5	5.0	5.0	5.0
Austin TX	58.0	9.0	2.5	8.0	8.0	15.0	6.0	-	-	5.0	4.5
Baker-Redmond OR	64.5	9.0	5.0	8.0	13.0	16.0	6.0	-	5.0	-	2.5
Baltimore MD	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	62.5	10.0	5.0	5.0	8.0	16.0	6.0	-	5.0	5.0	2.5
Beaumont TX	73.0	10.0	5.0	5.0	11.0	16.0	3.0	-	13.0	5.0	5.0
Belleville IL	68.0	9.0	5.0	8.0	13.0	17.0	6.0	-	-	5.0	5.0
Biloxi MS	61.0	9.0	5.0	8.0	12.0	9.0	3.0	2.5	5.0	5.0	2.5
Birmingham AL	60.0	8.0	5.0	5.0	10.0	16.0	6.0	-	5.0	-	5.0
Bismarck ND	62.0	10.0	5.0	8.0	7.0	16.0	6.0	-	-	5.0	5.0
Boise ID	78.0	9.0	5.0	5.0	13.0	15.0	3.0	2.5	18.0	5.0	2.5
Boston MA	82.5	10.0	5.0	8.0	13.0	9.0	6.0	7.5	14.0	5.0	5.0
Bridgeport CT	72.0	9.0	5.0	8.0	14.0	18.0	6.0	2.5	-	5.0	4.5
Brooklyn NY	89.0	9.0	5.0	8.0	12.0	15.0	3.0	10.0	18.0	5.0	4.0
Brownsville TX	58.0	10.0	5.0	8.0	11.0	9.0	6.0	-	-	5.0	4.0
Buffalo NY	72.0	9.0	5.0	5.0	10.0	11.0	3.0	7.5	14.0	5.0	2.5
Burlington VT	68.5	9.0	5.0	5.0	12.0	9.0	6.0	7.5	5.0	5.0	5.0
Camden NJ	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 2022

Alphabetical listing (*archdioceses* in bold)

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
Charleston SC	88.5	9.0	5.0	8.0	14.0	16.0	6.0	7.5	13.0	5.0	5.0
Charlotte NC	74.0	9.0	5.0	8.0	14.0	12.0	6.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Cheyenne WY	74.0	8.0	5.0	8.0	8.0	15.0	6.0	-	14.0	5.0	5.0
Chicago IL	71.0	6.0	5.0	8.0	14.0	18.0	6.0	-	4.0	5.0	5.0
Cincinnati OH	57.0	10.0	-	8.0	12.0	14.0	3.0	-	-	5.0	5.0
Cleveland OH	88.5	10.0	5.0	8.0	13.0	17.0	-	7.5	18.0	5.0	5.0
Colorado Springs CO	41.5	8.0	-	8.0	7.0	10.0	6.0	-	-	-	2.5
Columbus OH	57.5	9.0	5.0	8.0	12.0	11.0	3.0	-	-	5.0	4.5
Corpus Christi TX	27.0	-	5.0	2.5	3.0	6.0	3.0	-	-	5.0	2.5
Covington KY	71.5	10.0	5.0	8.0	14.0	18.0	3.0	-	5.0	5.0	3.5
Crookston MN	77.0	10.0	5.0	8.0	12.0	15.0	6.0	7.5	5.0	5.0	3.5
Dallas TX	57.5	10.0	5.0	8.0	12.0	9.0	6.0	-	-	5.0	2.5
Davenport IA	71.0	10.0	5.0	8.0	11.0	14.0	3.0	7.5	5.0	2.5	5.0
Denver CO	61.5	9.0	5.0	8.0	10.0	14.0	6.0	-	-	5.0	4.5
Des Moines IA	73.5	10.0	5.0	8.0	10.0	10.0	3.0	-	18.0	5.0	4.5
Detroit MI	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	67.5	9.0	5.0	8.0	13.0	14.0	6.0	-	5.0	5.0	2.5
Dubuque IA	62.0	10.0	5.0	8.0	11.0	15.0	3.0	-	-	5.0	5.0
Duluth MN	67.5	10.0	5.0	8.0	13.0	14.0	3.0	-	5.0	5.0	4.5
El Paso TX	50.5	9.0	5.0	5.5	9.0	9.0	3.0	-	-	5.0	5.0
Erie PA	69.5	8.0	5.0	8.0	14.0	11.0	6.0	7.5	-	5.0	5.0
Evansville IN	72.0	10.0	5.0	8.0	13.0	15.0	6.0	7.5	-	5.0	2.5
Fairbanks AK	66.0	10.0	5.0	8.0	10.0	16.0	3.0	-	5.0	5.0	4.0
Fall River MA	82.5	9.0	2.5	8.0	13.0	17.0	6.0	-	18.0	5.0	4.0
Fargo ND	61.5	10.0	5.0	8.0	11.0	14.0	-	-	5.0	5.0	3.5
Ft Wayne-So.Bend IN	77.0	7.0	5.0	8.0	13.0	15.0	3.0	7.5	9.0	5.0	4.5

Appendix B: Child Protection-Safe Environment Scores 2022

Alphabetical listing (**archdioceses** in bold)

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
Fort Worth TX	60.0	10.0	5.0	8.0	10.0	14.0	3.0	-	-	5.0	5.0
Fresno CA	57.5	8.0	2.5	8.0	6.0	15.0	3.0	5.0	5.0	-	5.0
Gallup NM	64.0	10.0	5.0	7.0	14.0	11.0	6.0	-	5.0	2.5	3.5
Galves.-Hous. TX	65.0	10.0	2.5	8.0	7.0	17.0	6.0	-	5.0	5.0	4.5
Gary IN	63.5	9.0	2.5	8.0	10.0	14.0	-	-	10.0	5.0	5.0
Gaylord MI	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	74.0	9.0	5.0	8.0	12.0	9.0	6.0	7.5	14.0	-	3.5
Grand Rapids MI	58.0	7.0	5.0	8.0	10.0	9.0	3.0	7.5	5.0	-	3.5
Grt. Falls-Billings MT	54.5	9.0	5.0	5.5	13.0	9.0	-	-	8.0	2.5	2.5
Green Bay WI	78.5	10.0	5.0	8.0	6.0	14.0	6.0	7.5	13.0	5.0	4.0
Greensburg PA	64.0	10.0	5.0	8.0	8.0	12.0	6.0	-	5.0	5.0	5.0
Harrisburg PA	95.5	10.0	5.0	8.0	14.0	16.0	6.0	10.0	18.0	5.0	3.5
Hartford CT	68.5	9.0	2.5	8.0	13.0	14.0	3.0	-	9.0	5.0	5.0
Helena MT	75.5	10.0	5.0	8.0	9.0	15.0	3.0	2.5	13.0	5.0	5.0
Honolulu HI	63.5	9.0	5.0	8.0	13.0	14.0	6.0	-	5.0	-	3.5
Houma-Thibodeaux LA	69.0	9.0	5.0	8.0	10.0	14.0	3.0	2.5	9.0	5.0	3.5
Indianapolis IN	68.0	10.0	5.0	8.0	9.0	18.0	3.0	-	5.0	5.0	5.0
Jackson MS	77.5	10.0	5.0	8.0	12.0	14.0	6.0	7.5	5.0	5.0	5.0
Jefferson City MO	71.0	10.0	5.0	8.0	12.0	15.0	6.0	7.5	-	5.0	2.5
Joliet IL	67.5	9.0	5.0	8.0	12.0	9.0	6.0	-	9.0	5.0	4.5
Kalamazoo MI	43.5	8.0	5.0	8.0	5.0	10.0	3.0	-	-	-	4.5
Kansas City KS	64.5	9.0	5.0	8.0	8.0	16.0	6.0	-	5.0	5.0	2.5
KC-St. Joseph MO	82.0	9.0	5.0	8.0	12.0	14.0	3.0	7.5	14.0	5.0	4.5
Knoxville TN	77.5	10.0	5.0	8.0	10.0	14.0	-	7.5	13.0	5.0	5.0

Appendix B: Child Protection-Safe Environment Scores 2022

Alphabetical listing (**archdioceses** in bold) 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
La Crosse WI	75.0	7.0	5.0	5.0	11.0	14.0	3.0	2.5	18.0	5.0	4.5
Lafayette IN	59.0	10.0	5.0	8.0	12.0	11.0	3.0	-	-	5.0	5.0
Lafayette LA	61.0	10.0	5.0	5.0	11.0	14.0	6.0	-	-	5.0	5.0
Lake Charles LA	49.0	10.0	5.0	5.0	6.0	-	6.0	7.5	-	5.0	4.5
Lansing MI	63.5	9.0	5.0	8.0	9.0	11.0	3.0	-	10.0	5.0	3.5
Laredo TX	54.0	10.0	5.0	8.0	11.0	9.0	6.0	-	-	-	5.0
Las Cruces NM	58.0	9.0	2.5	5.5	14.0	17.0	-	-	-	5.0	5.0
Las Vegas NV	57.0	2.0	5.0	8.0	5.0	11.0	6.0	7.5	4.0	5.0	3.5
Lexington KY	77.0	9.0	5.0	8.0	12.0	18.0	6.0	-	9.0	5.0	5.0
Lincoln NE	76.0	9.0	5.0	5.0	13.0	17.0	3.0	-	14.0	5.0	5.0
Little Rock AR	68.0	10.0	5.0	8.0	9.0	9.0	6.0	7.5	5.0	5.0	3.5
Los Angeles CA	67.0	10.0	5.0	8.0	13.0	10.0	6.0	-	5.0	5.0	5.0
Louisville KY	73.5	10.0	5.0	8.0	11.0	9.0	3.0	-	18.0	5.0	4.5
Lubbock TX	23.5	-	-	8.0	-	5.0	3.0	-	-	5.0	2.5
Madison WI	61.0	9.0	5.0	8.0	10.0	9.0	6.0	-	5.0	5.0	4.0
Manchester NH	69.5	10.0	5.0	8.0	11.0	15.0	3.0	7.5	-	5.0	5.0
Marquette MI	67.0	10.0	5.0	8.0	10.0	14.0	6.0	-	5.0	5.0	4.0
Memphis TN	65.5	10.0	2.5	8.0	11.0	5.0	6.0	-	13.0	5.0	5.0
Metuchen NJ	57.5	8.0	5.0	8.0	12.0	5.0	6.0	-	5.0	5.0	3.5
Miami FL	65.0	10.0	5.0	8.0	14.0	15.0	3.0	-	5.0	-	5.0
Milwaukee WI	63.5	9.0	5.0	8.0	8.0	14.0	6.0	-	5.0	5.0	3.5
Mobile AL	63.5	9.0	5.0	8.0	12.0	14.0	3.0	7.5	-	-	5.0
Monterey CA	56.0	10.0	5.0	8.0	11.0	9.0	3.0	-	-	5.0	5.0
Nashville TN	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	65.5	9.0	5.0	8.0	13.0	16.0	6.0	-	-	5.0	3.5
New Ulm MN	65.5	9.0	5.0	8.0	9.0	15.0	6.0	-	5.0	5.0	3.5

Appendix B: Child Protection-Safe Environment Scores 2022

Alphabetical listing (*archdioceses* in bold)

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
New York NY	67.0	9.0	5.0	8.0	12.0	14.0	3.0	2.5	5.0	5.0	3.5
Newark NJ	69.5	9.0	5.0	8.0	11.0	10.0	3.0	-	14.0	5.0	4.5
Norwich CT	68.0	9.0	5.0	8.0	14.0	16.0	6.0	-	5.0	5.0	-
Oakland CA	66.5	8.0	5.0	8.0	12.0	11.0	3.0	-	10.0	5.0	4.5
Ogdensburg NY	78.0	10.0	5.0	8.0	13.0	14.0	3.0	10.0	10.0	-	5.0
Oklahoma City OK	72.5	9.0	5.0	8.0	11.0	15.0	3.0	-	13.0	5.0	3.5
Omaha NE	84.5	10.0	5.0	8.0	13.0	14.0	3.0	7.5	14.0	5.0	5.0
Orange CA	77.5	9.0	5.0	8.0	8.0	14.0	6.0	-	18.0	5.0	4.5
Orlando FL	81.0	10.0	5.0	8.0	14.0	16.0	6.0	7.5	5.0	5.0	4.5
Owensboro KY	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	61.5	9.0	5.0	8.0	14.0	16.0	6.0	-	-	-	3.5
Paterson NJ	75.5	9.0	5.0	5.0	13.0	14.0	6.0	-	14.0	5.0	4.5
Pensac.-Tallahas. FL	63.5	9.0	5.0	8.0	12.0	14.0	6.0	-	-	5.0	4.5
Peoria IL	41.5	9.0	5.0	5.0	-	9.0	-	-	5.0	5.0	3.5
Philadelphia PA	76.0	10.0	5.0	8.0	14.0	9.0	6.0	-	14.0	5.0	5.0
Phoenix AZ	69.0	10.0	5.0	8.0	13.0	17.0	6.0	-	-	5.0	5.0
Pittsburgh PA	64.5	9.0	5.0	8.0	13.0	14.0	6.0	-	-	5.0	4.5
Portland ME	74.0	10.0	5.0	8.0	13.0	15.0	3.0	10.0	5.0	-	5.0
Portland OR	60.0	10.0	5.0	8.0	12.0	14.0	6.0	-	-	-	5.0
Providence RI	69.5	7.0	5.0	8.0	6.0	14.0	3.0	7.5	9.0	5.0	5.0
Pueblo CO	44.0	9.0	5.0	8.0	10.0	9.0	3.0	-	-	-	-
Raleigh NC	63.0	8.0	5.0	8.0	12.0	9.0	6.0	-	5.0	5.0	5.0
Rapid City SD	61.0	9.0	5.0	8.0	12.0	9.0	3.0	-	5.0	5.0	5.0
Reno NV	54.5	10.0	5.0	8.0	5.0	9.0	3.0	-	5.0	5.0	4.5
Richmond VA	89.5	9.0	5.0	8.0	12.0	14.0	6.0	7.5	18.0	5.0	5.0
Rochester NY	63.0	2.0	5.0	8.0	9.0	10.0	3.0	7.5	9.0	5.0	4.5

Appendix B: Child Protection-Safe Environment Scores 2022

Alphabetical listing (*archdioceses* in bold)

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
Rockford IL	63.5	10.0	5.0	8.0	14.0	11.0	6.0	-	-	5.0	4.5
Rockville Centre NY	63.0	9.0	5.0	5.0	14.0	17.0	3.0	2.5	5.0	-	2.5
Sacramento CA	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	14.0	14.0	3.0	7.5	5.0	5.0	5.0
Saint Augustine FL	70.0	8.0	5.0	8.0	13.0	17.0	3.0	-	9.0	2.5	4.5
Saint Cloud MN	59.0	10.0	5.0	8.0	10.0	9.0	3.0	-	4.0	5.0	5.0
Saint Louis MO	62.5	9.0	5.0	8.0	14.0	9.0	3.0	-	5.0	5.0	4.5
St.Paul -Minneap. MN	70.0	9.0	5.0	8.0	12.0	15.0	6.0	-	5.0	5.0	5.0
Saint Petersburg FL	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	50.0	8.0	5.0	7.0	10.0	10.0	3.0	-	5.0	-	2.0
Salina KS	75.5	8.0	5.0	8.0	11.0	10.0	6.0	-	18.0	5.0	4.5
Salt Lake City UT	56.5	8.0	5.0	5.0	11.0	14.0	6.0	-	-	5.0	2.5
San Angelo TX	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	68.5	10.0	5.0	8.0	12.0	14.0	6.0	-	5.0	5.0	3.5
San Bernardino CA	66.5	10.0	5.0	8.0	9.0	14.0	6.0	-	5.0	5.0	4.5
San Diego CA	74.0	9.0	2.5	8.0	12.0	10.0	6.0	7.5	9.0	5.0	5.0
San Francisco CA	44.5	-	5.0	8.0	6.0	9.0	3.0	-	10.0	-	3.5
San Jose CA	67.5	9.0	5.0	8.0	11.0	14.0	6.0	-	5.0	5.0	4.5
Santa Fe NM	67.5	9.0	5.0	5.0	12.0	16.0	3.0	2.5	5.0	5.0	5.0
Santa Rosa CA	72.5	10.0	5.0	8.0	10.0	9.0	3.0	-	18.0	5.0	4.5
Savannah GA	58.5	10.0	5.0	8.0	11.0	14.0	3.0	-	-	5.0	2.5
Scranton PA	75.0	10.0	5.0	8.0	12.0	14.0	6.0	10.0	-	5.0	5.0
Seattle WA	73.5	9.0	5.0	8.0	11.0	15.0	3.0	-	14.0	5.0	3.5
Shreveport LA	22.5	-	5.0	8.0	-	4.0	3.0	-	-	-	2.5
Sioux City IA	57.5	8.0	5.0	8.0	11.0	9.0	3.0	-	5.0	5.0	3.5
Sioux Falls SD	70.5	9.0	5.0	8.0	13.0	15.0	6.0	-	5.0	5.0	4.5

Appendix B: Child Protection-Safe Environment Scores 2022

Alphabetical listing (*archdioceses* in bold)

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
Spokane WA	70.5	9.0	5.0	8.0	13.0	15.0	3.0	7.5	-	5.0	5.0
Springfield IL	87.0	10.0	5.0	8.0	14.0	18.0	3.0	7.5	14.0	5.0	2.5
Springfield MA	62.0	10.0	5.0	8.0	5.0	14.0	6.0	-	4.0	5.0	5.0
Spring.-Cape Gir. MO	68.0	9.0	5.0	8.0	12.0	14.0	3.0	7.5	-	5.0	4.5
Steubenville OH	62.0	10.0	5.0	8.0	11.0	9.0	-	-	9.0	5.0	5.0
Stockton CA	58.5	9.0	5.0	5.0	10.0	9.0	3.0	7.5	-	5.0	5.0
Superior WI	69.0	8.0	5.0	8.0	11.0	17.0	6.0	7.5	4.0	-	2.5
Syracuse NY	88.5	10.0	5.0	8.0	13.0	14.0	3.0	7.5	18.0	5.0	5.0
Toledo OH	72.0	9.0	5.0	8.0	13.0	10.0	3.0	5.0	9.0	5.0	5.0
Trenton NJ	43.5	7.0	5.0	5.0	6.0	9.0	3.0	-	-	5.0	3.5
Tucson AZ	56.5	9.0	5.0	8.0	10.0	9.0	3.0	-	5.0	5.0	2.5
Tulsa OK	72.0	10.0	5.0	8.0	12.0	14.0	3.0	7.5	5.0	5.0	2.5
Tyler TX	56.5	10.0	5.0	8.0	9.0	9.0	6.0	-	-	5.0	4.5
Venice FL	92.5	10.0	5.0	8.0	12.0	14.0	6.0	10.0	18.0	5.0	4.5
Victoria TX	65.0	10.0	5.0	8.0	12.0	9.0	6.0	-	5.0	5.0	5.0
Washington DC	60.0	10.0	5.0	8.0	11.0	9.0	3.0	-	4.0	5.0	5.0
Wheel.-Charlest. WV	81.0	9.0	5.0	8.0	14.0	11.0	6.0	-	18.0	5.0	5.0
Wichita KS	64.5	7.0	5.0	8.0	10.0	14.0	6.0	-	5.0	5.0	4.5
Wilmington DE	64.0	10.0	5.0	8.0	12.0	9.0	3.0	7.5	-	5.0	4.5
Winona-Rochest. MN	93.5	9.0	5.0	8.0	14.0	16.0	6.0	7.5	18.0	5.0	5.0
Worcester MA	88.0	9.0	5.0	8.0	13.0	17.0	6.0	7.5	18.0	-	4.5
Yakima WA	60.5	10.0	5.0	8.0	10.0	9.0	6.0	-	5.0	5.0	2.5
Youngstown OH	75.0	10.0	5.0	8.0	13.0	14.0	6.0	7.5	5.0	2.5	4.0

Appendix C: Child Protection-Safe Environment Scores 2022

Listing by scores (*archdioceses* in bold) 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
Harrisburg PA	95.5	10.0	5.0	8.0	14.0	16.0	6.0	10.0	18.0	5.0	3.5
Winona-Rochest. MN	93.5	9.0	5.0	8.0	14.0	16.0	6.0	7.5	18.0	5.0	5.0
Baltimore MD	92.5	9.0	5.0	8.0	13.0	16.0	6.0	7.5	18.0	5.0	5.0
Venice FL	92.5	10.0	5.0	8.0	12.0	14.0	6.0	10.0	18.0	5.0	4.5
Richmond VA	89.5	9.0	5.0	8.0	12.0	14.0	6.0	7.5	18.0	5.0	5.0
Brooklyn NY	89.0	9.0	5.0	8.0	12.0	15.0	3.0	10.0	18.0	5.0	4.0
Charleston SC	88.5	9.0	5.0	8.0	14.0	16.0	6.0	7.5	13.0	5.0	5.0
Cleveland OH	88.5	10.0	5.0	8.0	13.0	17.0	-	7.5	18.0	5.0	5.0
Syracuse NY	88.5	10.0	5.0	8.0	13.0	14.0	3.0	7.5	18.0	5.0	5.0
Worcester MA	88.0	9.0	5.0	8.0	13.0	17.0	6.0	7.5	18.0	-	4.5
Detroit MI	87.0	6.0	5.0	8.0	13.0	15.0	6.0	7.5	18.0	5.0	3.5
Springfield IL	87.0	10.0	5.0	8.0	14.0	18.0	3.0	7.5	14.0	5.0	2.5
Camden NJ	86.5	8.0	5.0	8.0	13.0	16.0	6.0	2.5	18.0	5.0	5.0
Omaha NE	84.5	10.0	5.0	8.0	13.0	14.0	3.0	7.5	14.0	5.0	5.0
Allentown PA	83.5	9.0	5.0	8.0	10.0	9.0	6.0	10.0	18.0	5.0	3.5
Boston MA	82.5	10.0	5.0	8.0	13.0	9.0	6.0	7.5	14.0	5.0	5.0
Fall River MA	82.5	9.0	2.5	8.0	13.0	17.0	6.0	-	18.0	5.0	4.0
KC-St. Joseph MO	82.0	9.0	5.0	8.0	12.0	14.0	3.0	7.5	14.0	5.0	4.5
Orlando FL	81.0	10.0	5.0	8.0	14.0	16.0	6.0	7.5	5.0	5.0	4.5
Wheel.-Charlest. WV	81.0	9.0	5.0	8.0	14.0	11.0	6.0	-	18.0	5.0	5.0
Anchor.-Juneau AK	79.5	9.0	5.0	8.0	14.0	14.0	6.0	10.0	5.0	5.0	3.5
Arlington VA	79.5	8.0	5.0	8.0	12.0	16.0	3.0	5.0	14.0	5.0	3.5
Nashville TN	79.0	10.0	5.0	8.0	12.0	16.0	6.0	7.5	5.0	5.0	4.5
Green Bay WI	78.5	10.0	5.0	8.0	6.0	14.0	6.0	7.5	13.0	5.0	4.0
Boise ID	78.0	9.0	5.0	5.0	13.0	15.0	3.0	2.5	18.0	5.0	2.5
Ogdensburg NY	78.0	10.0	5.0	8.0	13.0	14.0	3.0	10.0	10.0	-	5.0

Appendix C: Child Protection-Safe Environment Scores 2022

Listing by scores (*archdioceses in bold*) 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
Atlanta GA	77.5	9.0	5.0	8.0	13.0	14.0	6.0	7.5	5.0	5.0	5.0
Jackson MS	77.5	10.0	5.0	8.0	12.0	14.0	6.0	7.5	5.0	5.0	5.0
Knoxville TN	77.5	10.0	5.0	8.0	10.0	14.0	-	7.5	13.0	5.0	5.0
Orange CA	77.5	9.0	5.0	8.0	8.0	14.0	6.0	-	18.0	5.0	4.5
Crookston MN	77.0	10.0	5.0	8.0	12.0	15.0	6.0	7.5	5.0	5.0	3.5
Ft Wayne-So.Bend IN	77.0	7.0	5.0	8.0	13.0	15.0	3.0	7.5	9.0	5.0	4.5
Lexington KY	77.0	9.0	5.0	8.0	12.0	18.0	6.0	-	9.0	5.0	5.0
Saginaw MI	76.5	10.0	5.0	8.0	14.0	14.0	3.0	7.5	5.0	5.0	5.0
Albany NY	76.0	9.0	5.0	8.0	12.0	16.0	6.0	7.5	5.0	5.0	2.5
Lincoln NE	76.0	9.0	5.0	5.0	13.0	17.0	3.0	-	14.0	5.0	5.0
Owensboro KY	76.0	9.0	5.0	8.0	12.0	14.0	6.0	7.5	5.0	5.0	4.5
Philadelphia PA	76.0	10.0	5.0	8.0	14.0	9.0	6.0	-	14.0	5.0	5.0
Helena MT	75.5	10.0	5.0	8.0	9.0	15.0	3.0	2.5	13.0	5.0	5.0
Paterson NJ	75.5	9.0	5.0	5.0	13.0	14.0	6.0	-	14.0	5.0	4.5
Salina KS	75.5	8.0	5.0	8.0	11.0	10.0	6.0	-	18.0	5.0	4.5
La Crosse WI	75.0	7.0	5.0	5.0	11.0	14.0	3.0	2.5	18.0	5.0	4.5
San Angelo TX	75.0	10.0	5.0	8.0	11.0	10.0	6.0	10.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Scranton PA	75.0	10.0	5.0	8.0	12.0	14.0	6.0	10.0	-	5.0	5.0
Youngstown OH	75.0	10.0	5.0	8.0	13.0	14.0	6.0	7.5	5.0	2.5	4.0
Charlotte NC	74.0	9.0	5.0	8.0	14.0	12.0	6.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Cheyenne WY	74.0	8.0	5.0	8.0	8.0	15.0	6.0	-	14.0	5.0	5.0
Grand Island NE	74.0	9.0	5.0	8.0	12.0	9.0	6.0	7.5	14.0	-	3.5
Portland ME	74.0	10.0	5.0	8.0	13.0	15.0	3.0	10.0	5.0	-	5.0
San Diego CA	74.0	9.0	2.5	8.0	12.0	10.0	6.0	7.5	9.0	5.0	5.0
Des Moines IA	73.5	10.0	5.0	8.0	10.0	10.0	3.0	-	18.0	5.0	4.5
Louisville KY	73.5	10.0	5.0	8.0	11.0	9.0	3.0	-	18.0	5.0	4.5

Appendix C: Child Protection-Safe Environment Scores 2022

Listing by scores (**archdioceses** in bold) 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
Seattle WA	73.5	9.0	5.0	8.0	11.0	15.0	3.0	-	14.0	5.0	3.5
Beaumont TX	73.0	10.0	5.0	5.0	11.0	16.0	3.0	-	13.0	5.0	5.0
Oklahoma City OK	72.5	9.0	5.0	8.0	11.0	15.0	3.0	-	13.0	5.0	3.5
Santa Rosa CA	72.5	10.0	5.0	8.0	10.0	9.0	3.0	-	18.0	5.0	4.5
Bridgeport CT	72.0	9.0	5.0	8.0	14.0	18.0	6.0	2.5	-	5.0	4.5
Buffalo NY	72.0	9.0	5.0	5.0	10.0	11.0	3.0	7.5	14.0	5.0	2.5
Evansville IN	72.0	10.0	5.0	8.0	13.0	15.0	6.0	7.5	-	5.0	2.5
Saint Petersburg FL	72.0	10.0	5.0	8.0	13.0	10.0	6.0	7.5	4.0	5.0	3.5
Toledo OH	72.0	9.0	5.0	8.0	13.0	10.0	3.0	5.0	9.0	5.0	5.0
Tulsa OK	72.0	10.0	5.0	8.0	12.0	14.0	3.0	7.5	5.0	5.0	2.5
Covington KY	71.5	10.0	5.0	8.0	14.0	18.0	3.0	-	5.0	5.0	3.5
Gaylord MI	71.5	7.0	5.0	8.0	8.0	14.0	3.0	7.5	9.0	5.0	5.0
Chicago IL	71.0	6.0	5.0	8.0	14.0	18.0	6.0	-	4.0	5.0	5.0
Davenport IA	71.0	10.0	5.0	8.0	11.0	14.0	3.0	7.5	5.0	2.5	5.0
Jefferson City MO	71.0	10.0	5.0	8.0	12.0	15.0	6.0	7.5	-	5.0	2.5
Sioux Falls SD	70.5	9.0	5.0	8.0	13.0	15.0	6.0	-	5.0	5.0	4.5
Spokane WA	70.5	9.0	5.0	8.0	13.0	15.0	3.0	7.5	-	5.0	5.0
Saint Augustine FL	70.0	8.0	5.0	8.0	13.0	17.0	3.0	-	9.0	2.5	4.5
St.Paul -Minneap. MN	70.0	9.0	5.0	8.0	12.0	15.0	6.0	-	5.0	5.0	5.0
Erie PA	69.5	8.0	5.0	8.0	14.0	11.0	6.0	7.5	-	5.0	5.0
Manchester NH	69.5	10.0	5.0	8.0	11.0	15.0	3.0	7.5	-	5.0	5.0
Newark NJ	69.5	9.0	5.0	8.0	11.0	10.0	3.0	-	14.0	5.0	4.5
Providence RI	69.5	7.0	5.0	8.0	6.0	14.0	3.0	7.5	9.0	5.0	5.0
Houma-Thibodeaux LA	69.0	9.0	5.0	8.0	10.0	14.0	3.0	2.5	9.0	5.0	3.5
Phoenix AZ	69.0	10.0	5.0	8.0	13.0	17.0	6.0	-	-	5.0	5.0
Superior WI	69.0	8.0	5.0	8.0	11.0	17.0	6.0	7.5	4.0	-	2.5

Appendix C: Child Protection-Safe Environment Scores 2022

Listing by scores (*archdioceses in bold*) 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
Burlington VT	68.5	9.0	5.0	5.0	12.0	9.0	6.0	7.5	5.0	5.0	5.0
Hartford CT	68.5	9.0	2.5	8.0	13.0	14.0	3.0	-	9.0	5.0	5.0
San Antonio TX	68.5	10.0	5.0	8.0	12.0	14.0	6.0	-	5.0	5.0	3.5
Belleville IL	68.0	9.0	5.0	8.0	13.0	17.0	6.0	-	-	5.0	5.0
Indianapolis IN	68.0	10.0	5.0	8.0	9.0	18.0	3.0	-	5.0	5.0	5.0
Little Rock AR	68.0	10.0	5.0	8.0	9.0	9.0	6.0	7.5	5.0	5.0	3.5
Norwich CT	68.0	9.0	5.0	8.0	14.0	16.0	6.0	-	5.0	5.0	-
Spring.-Cape Gir. MO	68.0	9.0	5.0	8.0	12.0	14.0	3.0	7.5	-	5.0	4.5
Dodge City KS	67.5	9.0	5.0	8.0	13.0	14.0	6.0	-	5.0	5.0	2.5
Duluth MN	67.5	10.0	5.0	8.0	13.0	14.0	3.0	-	5.0	5.0	4.5
Joliet IL	67.5	9.0	5.0	8.0	12.0	9.0	6.0	-	9.0	5.0	4.5
San Jose CA	67.5	9.0	5.0	8.0	11.0	14.0	6.0	-	5.0	5.0	4.5
Santa Fe NM	67.5	9.0	5.0	5.0	12.0	16.0	3.0	2.5	5.0	5.0	5.0
Amarillo TX	67.0	8.0	5.0	5.0	13.0	15.0	6.0	2.5	5.0	5.0	2.5
Los Angeles CA	67.0	10.0	5.0	8.0	13.0	10.0	6.0	-	5.0	5.0	5.0
Marquette MI	67.0	10.0	5.0	8.0	10.0	14.0	6.0	-	5.0	5.0	4.0
New York NY	67.0	9.0	5.0	8.0	12.0	14.0	3.0	2.5	5.0	5.0	3.5
Oakland CA	66.5	8.0	5.0	8.0	12.0	11.0	3.0	-	10.0	5.0	4.5
San Bernardino CA	66.5	10.0	5.0	8.0	9.0	14.0	6.0	-	5.0	5.0	4.5
Fairbanks AK	66.0	10.0	5.0	8.0	10.0	16.0	3.0	-	5.0	5.0	4.0
Memphis TN	65.5	10.0	2.5	8.0	11.0	5.0	6.0	-	13.0	5.0	5.0
New Orleans LA	65.5	9.0	5.0	8.0	13.0	16.0	6.0	-	-	5.0	3.5
New Ulm MN	65.5	9.0	5.0	8.0	9.0	15.0	6.0	-	5.0	5.0	3.5
Galves.-Hous. TX	65.0	10.0	2.5	8.0	7.0	17.0	6.0	-	5.0	5.0	4.5
Miami FL	65.0	10.0	5.0	8.0	14.0	15.0	3.0	-	5.0	-	5.0
Victoria TX	65.0	10.0	5.0	8.0	12.0	9.0	6.0	-	5.0	5.0	5.0

Appendix C: Child Protection-Safe Environment Scores 2022

Listing by scores (*archdioceses* in bold) 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
Altoona-Johnstown PA	64.5	10.0	5.0	8.0	12.0	16.0	6.0	-	-	5.0	2.5
Baker-Redmond OR	64.5	9.0	5.0	8.0	13.0	16.0	6.0	-	5.0	-	2.5
Kansas City KS	64.5	9.0	5.0	8.0	8.0	16.0	6.0	-	5.0	5.0	2.5
Pittsburgh PA	64.5	9.0	5.0	8.0	13.0	14.0	6.0	-	-	5.0	4.5
Wichita KS	64.5	7.0	5.0	8.0	10.0	14.0	6.0	-	5.0	5.0	4.5
Gallup NM	64.0	10.0	5.0	7.0	14.0	11.0	6.0	-	5.0	2.5	3.5
Greensburg PA	64.0	10.0	5.0	8.0	8.0	12.0	6.0	-	5.0	5.0	5.0
Wilmington DE	64.0	10.0	5.0	8.0	12.0	9.0	3.0	7.5	-	5.0	4.5
Alexandria LA	63.5	8.0	5.0	5.0	13.0	16.0	3.0	-	5.0	5.0	3.5
Gary IN	63.5	9.0	2.5	8.0	10.0	14.0	-	-	10.0	5.0	5.0
Honolulu HI	63.5	9.0	5.0	8.0	13.0	14.0	6.0	-	5.0	-	3.5
Lansing MI	63.5	9.0	5.0	8.0	9.0	11.0	3.0	-	10.0	5.0	3.5
Milwaukee WI	63.5	9.0	5.0	8.0	8.0	14.0	6.0	-	5.0	5.0	3.5
Mobile AL	63.5	9.0	5.0	8.0	12.0	14.0	3.0	7.5	-	-	5.0
Pensac.-Tallahas. FL	63.5	9.0	5.0	8.0	12.0	14.0	6.0	-	-	5.0	4.5
Rockford IL	63.5	10.0	5.0	8.0	14.0	11.0	6.0	-	-	5.0	4.5
Raleigh NC	63.0	8.0	5.0	8.0	12.0	9.0	6.0	-	5.0	5.0	5.0
Rochester NY	63.0	2.0	5.0	8.0	9.0	10.0	3.0	7.5	9.0	5.0	4.5
Rockville Centre NY	63.0	9.0	5.0	5.0	14.0	17.0	3.0	2.5	5.0	-	2.5
Baton Rouge LA	62.5	10.0	5.0	5.0	8.0	16.0	6.0	-	5.0	5.0	2.5
Saint Louis MO	62.5	9.0	5.0	8.0	14.0	9.0	3.0	-	5.0	5.0	4.5
Bismarck ND	62.0	10.0	5.0	8.0	7.0	16.0	6.0	-	-	5.0	5.0
Dubuque IA	62.0	10.0	5.0	8.0	11.0	15.0	3.0	-	-	5.0	5.0
Sacramento CA	62.0	8.0	5.0	8.0	13.0	9.0	3.0	2.5	4.0	5.0	4.5
Springfield MA	62.0	10.0	5.0	8.0	5.0	14.0	6.0	-	4.0	5.0	5.0
Steubenville OH	62.0	10.0	5.0	8.0	11.0	9.0	-	-	9.0	5.0	5.0

Appendix C: Child Protection-Safe Environment Scores 2022

Listing by scores (*archdioceses* in bold) 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	61.5	9.0	5.0	8.0	10.0	14.0	6.0	-	-	5.0	4.5
Fargo ND	61.5	10.0	5.0	8.0	11.0	14.0	-	-	5.0	5.0	3.5
Palm Beach FL	61.5	9.0	5.0	8.0	14.0	16.0	6.0	-	-	-	3.5
Biloxi MS	61.0	9.0	5.0	8.0	12.0	9.0	3.0	2.5	5.0	5.0	2.5
Lafayette LA	61.0	10.0	5.0	5.0	11.0	14.0	6.0	-	-	5.0	5.0
Madison WI	61.0	9.0	5.0	8.0	10.0	9.0	6.0	-	5.0	5.0	4.0
Rapid City SD	61.0	9.0	5.0	8.0	12.0	9.0	3.0	-	5.0	5.0	5.0
Yakima WA	60.5	10.0	5.0	8.0	10.0	9.0	6.0	-	5.0	5.0	2.5
Birmingham AL	60.0	8.0	5.0	5.0	10.0	16.0	6.0	-	5.0	-	5.0
Fort Worth TX	60.0	10.0	5.0	8.0	10.0	14.0	3.0	-	-	5.0	5.0
Portland OR	60.0	10.0	5.0	8.0	12.0	14.0	6.0	-	-	-	5.0
Washington DC	60.0	10.0	5.0	8.0	11.0	9.0	3.0	-	4.0	5.0	5.0
Lafayette IN	59.0	10.0	5.0	8.0	12.0	11.0	3.0	-	-	5.0	5.0
Saint Cloud MN	59.0	10.0	5.0	8.0	10.0	9.0	3.0	-	4.0	5.0	5.0
Savannah GA	58.5	10.0	5.0	8.0	11.0	14.0	3.0	-	-	5.0	2.5
Stockton CA	58.5	9.0	5.0	5.0	10.0	9.0	3.0	7.5	-	5.0	5.0
Austin TX	58.0	9.0	2.5	8.0	8.0	15.0	6.0	-	-	5.0	4.5
Brownsville TX	58.0	10.0	5.0	8.0	11.0	9.0	6.0	-	-	5.0	4.0
Grand Rapids MI	58.0	7.0	5.0	8.0	10.0	9.0	3.0	7.5	5.0	-	3.5
Las Cruces NM	58.0	9.0	2.5	5.5	14.0	17.0	-	-	-	5.0	5.0
Columbus OH	57.5	9.0	5.0	8.0	12.0	11.0	3.0	-	-	5.0	4.5
Dallas TX	57.5	10.0	5.0	8.0	12.0	9.0	6.0	-	-	5.0	2.5
Fresno CA	57.5	8.0	2.5	8.0	6.0	15.0	3.0	5.0	5.0	-	5.0
Metuchen NJ	57.5	8.0	5.0	8.0	12.0	5.0	6.0	-	5.0	5.0	3.5
Sioux City IA	57.5	8.0	5.0	8.0	11.0	9.0	3.0	-	5.0	5.0	3.5
Cincinnati OH	57.0	10.0	-	8.0	12.0	14.0	3.0	-	-	5.0	5.0

Appendix C: Child Protection-Safe Environment Scores 2022

Listing by scores (*archdioceses in bold*) 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
Las Vegas NV	57.0	2.0	5.0	8.0	5.0	11.0	6.0	7.5	4.0	5.0	3.5
Salt Lake City UT	56.5	8.0	5.0	5.0	11.0	14.0	6.0	-	-	5.0	2.5
Tucson AZ	56.5	9.0	5.0	8.0	10.0	9.0	3.0	-	5.0	5.0	2.5
Tyler TX	56.5	10.0	5.0	8.0	9.0	9.0	6.0	-	-	5.0	4.5
Monterey CA	56.0	10.0	5.0	8.0	11.0	9.0	3.0	-	-	5.0	5.0
Grt. Falls-Billings MT	54.5	9.0	5.0	5.5	13.0	9.0	-	-	8.0	2.5	2.5
Reno NV	54.5	10.0	5.0	8.0	5.0	9.0	3.0	-	5.0	5.0	4.5
Laredo TX	54.0	10.0	5.0	8.0	11.0	9.0	6.0	-	-	-	5.0
El Paso TX	50.5	9.0	5.0	5.5	9.0	9.0	3.0	-	-	5.0	5.0
Saint Thomas VI	50.0	8.0	5.0	7.0	10.0	10.0	3.0	-	5.0	-	2.0
Lake Charles LA	49.0	10.0	5.0	5.0	6.0	-	6.0	7.5	-	5.0	4.5
San Francisco CA	44.5	-	5.0	8.0	6.0	9.0	3.0	-	10.0	-	3.5
Pueblo CO	44.0	9.0	5.0	8.0	10.0	9.0	3.0	-	-	-	-
Kalamazoo MI	43.5	8.0	5.0	8.0	5.0	10.0	3.0	-	-	-	4.5
Trenton NJ	43.5	7.0	5.0	5.0	6.0	9.0	3.0	-	-	5.0	3.5
Colorado Springs CO	41.5	8.0	-	8.0	7.0	10.0	6.0	-	-	-	2.5
Peoria IL	41.5	9.0	5.0	5.0	-	9.0	-	-	5.0	5.0	3.5
Arch. Mili. Services	38.5	8.0	-	5.0	4.0	13.0	-	5.0	-	-	3.5
Corpus Christi TX	27.0	-	5.0	2.5	3.0	6.0	3.0	-	-	5.0	2.5
Lubbock TX	23.5	-	-	8.0	-	5.0	3.0	-	-	5.0	2.5
Shreveport LA	22.5	-	5.0	8.0	-	4.0	3.0	-	-	-	2.5

Appendix D: CBAR Reporting (Category 3)

CBAR is the Catholic Bishop Abuse Reporting Service that has been established to receive reports of sexual abuse and related misconduct by bishops, including coverups, and to relay those reports to proper Church authorities for investigation. These are the dioceses where links, which should be available in every diocese, do not meet the standard.

Diocese	Score	Researcher Comment
Corpus Christi TX	2.5	No CBAR information; no mandate to report to law enforcement
Alexandria LA	5.0	No CBAR information
Amarillo TX	5.0	No CBAR information
Arch Military Serv	5.0	No CBAR information
Baton Rouge LA	5.0	No CBAR information
Beaumont TX	5.0	No CBAR information
Birmingham AL	5.0	No CBAR information
Boise ID	5.0	No CBAR information
Buffalo NY	5.0	No CBAR information
Burlington VT	5.0	No CBAR information; broken link
La Crosse WI	5.0	No CBAR information
Lafayette LA	5.0	No CBAR information
Lake Charles LA	5.0	No CBAR information
Lincoln NE	5.0	No CBAR information
Paterson NJ	5.0	No CBAR information
Peoria IL	5.0	No CBAR information
Rockville Centre NY	5.0	No CBAR information
Salt Lake City UT	5.0	No CBAR information
Santa Fe NM	5.0	No CBAR information
Stockton CA	5.0	No CBAR information
Trenton NJ	5.0	No CBAR information
El Paso TX	5.5	No mandate to report to law enforcement
Great Falls-Billings MT	5.5	No mandate to report to law enforcement
Las Cruces NM	5.5	No information on process to report abuse
Gallup NM	7.0	No link to CBAR site
St. Thomas VI	7.0	No link to CBAR site

Appendix E: Reporting on Credibly Accused Priests

Worksheet Category 9 (5 points total) assesses the disclosures on credibly accused priests.

Diocese	Score	Researcher Comment
Baker-Redmond OR	0	No list found
Birmingham AL	0	No list found
Colorado Springs CO	0	No list found
Fresno CA	0	No list found
Grand Island NE	0	No list found
Grand Rapids MI	0	No list found
Honolulu HI	0	No list found
Kalamazoo MI	0	No list found
Laredo TX	0	No list found
Miami FL	0	No list found
Arch. Military Services	0	No list found
Mobile AL	0	No list found
Ogdensburg NY	0	No list found
Palm Beach FL	0	No list found
Portland OR	0	No list found
Portland ME	0	No list found
Pueblo CO	0	No list found
Rockville Centre NY	0	No list found
St. Thomas VI	0	No list found
San Francisco CA	0	No list found
Shreveport LA	0	No list found
Superior WI	0	No list found
Worcester MA	0	No list found
Davenport IA	2.5	List does not indicate which clergy may have been laicized, dismissed, or removed.
Gallup NM	2.5	No status of allegation found, such as laicized or dismissed
Great Falls-Billings MT	2.5	List does not indicate which clergy may have been laicized, dismissed, or removed.
St. Augustine FL	2.5	List included in report to Florida Atty. General; the list notes names but not current status or list of assignments.
Youngstown OH	2.5	List of names reports who is deceased but not names of those removed from ministry.