




Secretariat of
Child and
Youth Protection
•
National
Review Board
•
United States
Conference of
Catholic Bishops

2011 Annual Report

Findings and Recommendations

APRIL 2012

Report on the
Implementation of the
**Charter for the Protection
of Children and Young People**



2011 Annual Report

Findings and Recommendations

APRIL 2012

Report on the Implementation of the Charter for the Protection of Children and Young People

SECRETARIAT OF CHILD AND
YOUTH PROTECTION

•

NATIONAL
REVIEW BOARD

•

UNITED STATES
CONFERENCE OF
CATHOLIC BISHOPS

United States Conference of Catholic Bishops

Washington, DC

The *2011 Annual Report on the Implementation of the “Charter for the Protection of Children and Young People”* was prepared by the Secretariat of Child and Youth Protection for the National Review Board and the United States Conference of Catholic Bishops (USCCB). It was reviewed by the USCCB President, Cardinal Timothy M. Dolan, and has been authorized for publication by the undersigned.

Msgr. Ronny E. Jenkins, JCD
General Secretary, USCCB

The findings and recommendations in this *2011 Annual Report on the Implementation of the “Charter for the Protection of Children and Young People”* are based on the information provided by the dioceses and eparchies.

First Printing, April 2012

Copyright © 2012, United States Conference of Catholic Bishops, Washington, DC. All rights reserved. No part of this work may be reproduced or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic or mechanical, including photocopying, recording, or by any information storage and retrieval system, without permission in writing from the copyright holder.

Contents

Preface by Cardinal Timothy M. Dolan	v
<i>President, United States Conference of Catholic Bishops</i>	

Letter from Mr. Al J. Notzon, III	vi
<i>Chair, National Review Board</i>	

Letter from Deacon Bernie Nojadera	viii
<i>Executive Director, Secretariat of Child and Youth Protection</i>	

Letter from James I. Marasco	ix
<i>Director, StoneBridge Business Partners</i>	

Letter from Fr. Thomas P. Gaunt, SJ	xi
<i>Executive Director, Center for Applied Research in the Apostolate</i>	

SECTION I

CHAPTER 1—INTRODUCTION	3
------------------------------	---

CHAPTER 2—2011 METHODOLOGY AND LIMITATIONS	5
--	---

CHAPTER 3—AUDIT FINDINGS	9
--------------------------------	---

SECTION II

CHAPTER 4—2011 CARA SURVEY OF ALLEGATIONS AND COSTS: A SUMMARY REPORT	31
--	----

SECTION III

CHAPTER 5—STATUS OF 2010 RECOMMENDATIONS	57
--	----

CHAPTER 6—RECOMMENDATIONS FROM THE 2011 AUDIT PERIOD	59
--	----

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A	63
<i>2011 Charter for the Protection of Children and Young People</i>	

APPENDIX B	70
<i>CARA Questionnaire for Dioceses and Eparchies</i>	

APPENDIX C	72
<i>CARA Questionnaire for Religious Institutes</i>	



Office of the President

3211 FOURTH STREET NE • WASHINGTON, DC 20017-1194 • 202-541-3100 • FAX 202-541-3166

Cardinal Timothy M. Dolan
President, United States Conference of Catholic Bishops

Preface

The ninth consecutive external audit of the dioceses and eparchies of the Catholic Church in the United States has been completed by StoneBridge Business Partners. The purpose of the audits is to ascertain diocesan and eparchial compliance with the *Charter for the Protection of Children and Young People*. This Annual Report includes the findings of the audits and associated recommendations.

In June the bishops of the United States Conference of Catholic bishops approved revisions to strengthen and clarify the *Charter*, reaffirming our commitment to reach out pastorally to the victims/survivors in a sincere effort to promote healing and reconciliation. We know that we, as a whole, are rightly judged by how each one of us lives up to this commitment. We renew our commitment to protect the children and young people entrusted to our care. And we renew our promise to strive to the fullest to end the societal scourge of child sexual abuse.

I again wish to acknowledge the millions of clergy, employees, and volunteers who work tirelessly to create safe environments and to heal those most harmed by abuse. Their admirable dedication and integrity serve as a forceful witness to the ongoing efforts to address and eradicate the sexual abuse of minors.

While this report supports the conclusion of both studies done by the *John Jay College of Criminal Justice*—that the majority of allegations are way in the past—the Church must continue to be vigilant. The Church must do all she can never to let abuse happen again. And we must all continue to work with full resolve toward the healing and reconciliation of the victims/survivors.

As we continue this important mission in the service of the Church, may our work be a sure sign of what can be accomplished, with the grace and mercy of Jesus, when we continue to make the issue of child sexual abuse our common priority.



National Review Board for the Protection of Children and Young People

3211 FOURTH STREET NE • WASHINGTON, DC 20017-1194 • 202-541-5413 • FAX 202-541-5410

March 2012

Cardinal Timothy M. Dolan
President
United States Conference of Catholic Bishops

Dear Cardinal Dolan,

On behalf of the National Review Board and its Audit Committee and in conjunction with the Secretariat for the Protection of Children and Young People, I am pleased to provide you with the 9th Annual Report of the results of this past year's compliance audit. As you know, this extensive process is a critical accountability tool. It serves, for you as the nation's bishops, to demonstrate to each other and to all of the faithful the seriousness with which you take the promises made in the *Charter for the Protection of Children and Young People*. The new auditors are looking at both the *Charter* and compliance with a fresh look. It is my hope that dioceses/eparchies will view this audit as an opportunity to improve their practices, and all have received Recommendations which can provide some of the opportunities for improvement. In my experience, compliance audit recommendations have been an invaluable tool in improving my organization.

As this report demonstrates, the vast majority of the bishops in our country continue to comply and cooperate with this important audit process. Unfortunately, there remain two dioceses and six eparchies that do not yet comply. They are:

- Diocese of Baker
- Diocese of Lincoln
- Eparchy of Saint Peter the Apostle for Chaldeans
- Eparchy of Newton for Melkites
- Eparchy of Our Lady of Nareg in New York for Armenian Catholics
- Eparchy of St. Josaphat of Parma for Ukrainians
- Eparchy of Our Lady of Deliverance of Newark for Syriacs
- Ukrainian Catholic Eparchy of Stamford

Based on that refusal, they are all found not to be in compliance with the *Charter*.

It is my hope and prayer that, with time and persistence, one day the bishops in the United States will have 100% compliance with the audit process. For the sake of our young people, their well-being, their safety and their faith, we can do no less.

I also want to take this opportunity to draw your attention especially to the Recommendations made in this report. I highlight the importance of good record-keeping regarding background checks and participation in safe environment training. I also highlight the great significance of involving parishes in the audit process; the parish is where our children learn and live their young, growing faith. Parish participation in the audit process thus "makes the *Charter* real" for individual parishes and, most importantly, for the participating families and children.

In concluding, I thank you for your own commitment to the safety and well-being of our children. Their spiritual, physical and mental health are what we are protecting and we owe it to them and to their trust in us as adults in their lives to do our very best to keep them safe and protected in our care.

Very Truly Yours,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Al J. Notzon, III". The signature is written in a cursive style with a large, stylized initial "A".

Mr. Al J. Notzon, III
Chairman



Secretariat of Child and Youth Protection

3211 FOURTH STREET NE • WASHINGTON, DC 20017-1194 • 202-541-5413 • FAX 202-541-5410

March 2012

Cardinal Timothy M. Dolan
President
United States Conference of Catholic Bishops

Mr. Al Notzon, III
Chair
National Review Board

Your Eminence and Chairman Notzon,

This Annual Report of the external compliance audit of the *Charter for the Protection of Children and Young People* demonstrates the continued endeavors of the Catholic Church in the United States. This report highlights the ways in which the promise to protect and pledge to heal is being carried out and integrated into the life of the Church.

Ten years ago, the bishops created a charter with the hopes of being able to address and deal with the issue of child sexual abuse and clergy. Because of the *Charter*, the Church realizes that this mission is ongoing, that accountability will be supported by a credible audit, and that trust and credibility may be attained with the goal of 100% diocesan/eparchial participation. Could you imagine the message received if we were fully compliant because every diocese and eparchy was involved?

The commitment of the Secretariat of Child and Youth Protection stands. We are ready to assist any diocese at any time with *Charter* compliance. We will travel to any diocese, at no expense to that diocese and brief, help train or retrain, meet and greet—whatever it takes to ensure that safe environment programs are in place, that background investigations are carried out, that there is communication between the bishop and superiors of religious orders. We are offering to provide safe environment training to dioceses and eparchies that are having difficulties paying for safe environment programs. The SCYP is passionate and motivated to be instruments and conduits for healing, reconciliation, forgiveness, and in helping the church move forward by not forgetting its past, but by learning from it and vowing for this tragedy to never happen again.

The year 2012 will unfold a number of events that will highlight our history and point out our milestones. Our mission is clear and we are prepared to carry out the promise made to protect and the pledge made to heal. We are aware that we are dealing with the darkness of humanity and are assured that with your leadership, support, and service we will bring light to this area.

Sincerely in Christ,

Deacon Bernie Nojadera
Executive Director



March 2012

Cardinal Timothy M. Dolan, President
United States Conference of Catholic Bishops

Mr. Al J. Notzon, III, Chair
National Review Board for the Protection of Children and Young People

Your Eminence and Mr. Notzon,

This was the inaugural year for StoneBridge Business Partners being granted the opportunity to serve the United States Conference of Catholic Bishops. We conducted audits of dioceses and eparchies to determine compliance with the *Charter for the Protection of Children and Young People* for 2011. Prior to the commencement of these audits, StoneBridge worked with National Review Board and the Secretariat of Child and Youth Protection (SCYP) to update the audit program and make revisions to the related charts. Together, we hosted workshops around the country to educate safe environment coordinators and other diocesan/eparchial representatives on the preparation of the revised documents, as well as field any questions or concerns they had prior to the commencement of the audits. In addition, representatives from the SCYP presented at an auditor training conference held at StoneBridge's Rochester, New York headquarters in June 2011. During this training, we emphasized the importance of a thorough, uniform audit process to be consistently applied to all dioceses/eparchies.

There were two types of audits conducted for the period ended June 30, 2011. On-site audits were conducted for one-third of the dioceses in the United States. Auditors traveled to the chancery or pastoral center, and sometimes individual parishes, of each of these dioceses and eparchies to assess compliance with the *Charter*. Data collection audits were conducted for the other two-thirds of dioceses and eparchies in the United States. Auditors reviewed documentation provided by these dioceses and eparchies to ensure compliance with the data collection requirements. The information gathered by both the on-site and data collection audits was compiled, and the resultant findings are presented in this report. During this process, we strived for consistency in the audit approach applied, the suggestions made and the management letter comments issued.

The progress made by the Catholic Church in the United States since the adoption of the *Charter* is remarkable. As with any policy or regulation, constant updates must be made in order for those rules to remain relevant. In our management letters, we reminded the bishops that the *Charter* was updated for 2012 to include child pornography and abuse against vulnerable adults. It is important for everyone in the dioceses and eparchies to be made aware of these changes so that safe environment programs can be modified accordingly. The ability to remain fluid and open to suggestion are key attributes in building and maintaining a strong system. Participation in the audit process is also crucial for the continued success of these invaluable programs. With

your assistance this year, we have retooled the audit process which we believe will be instrumental in keeping this valuable program at the forefront of keeping children safe. Thank you for your guidance and leadership in this worthwhile endeavor.

As we were introduced to the various dioceses/eparchies around the country this year, we were impressed by the dedication of the safe environment coordinators and other diocesan and eparchial representatives who oversee the implementation of the *Charter* on a daily basis. We are appreciative of their time and assistance during our audits and are grateful for the opportunity to support the Catholic Church's commitment to protecting children through the *Charter*. It is our hope that with our help, the Catholic Church in the United States may continue to restore the trust of the faithful and heal the wounds caused by abuse.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "J. Marasco", with a stylized flourish extending to the right.

James I. Marasco, Director
StoneBridge Business Partners



Center for Applied Research in the Apostolate

GEORGETOWN UNIVERSITY • <http://cara.georgetown.edu>

2300 WISCONSIN AVENUE, NW • SUITE 400 • WASHINGTON, DC 20007

March 2012

His Eminence Timothy Cardinal Dolan, President
United States Conference of Catholic Bishops

Mr. Al J. Notzon, III, Chair
National Review Board for the Protection of Children and Young People

Dear Cardinal Dolan and Mr. Notzon,

In November 2004, the United States Conference of Catholic Bishops commissioned the Center for Applied Research in the Apostolate (CARA) at Georgetown University to design and conduct an annual survey of all dioceses and eparchies whose bishops and eparchs are members of the USCCB. The purpose of this survey is to collect information on new allegations of sexual abuse of minors and the clergy against whom these allegations were made. The survey also gathers information on the amount of money dioceses and eparchies have expended as a result of allegations as well as the amount they have paid for child protection efforts. The national level aggregate results from this survey for each calendar year are reported in the *Annual Report of the Implementation of the "Charter for the Protection of Children and Young People."*

The questionnaire for the *2011 Annual Survey of Allegations and Costs* was designed by CARA in consultation with the Secretariat of Child and Youth Protection and was only slightly different from the versions used for the 2004 through 2010 *Annual Surveys*. As in previous years, CARA prepared an online version of the survey and provided bishops and eparchs with information about the process for completing it for their diocese or eparchy. In collaboration with the Conference of Major Superiors of Men, major superiors of clerical and mixed religious institutes were also invited to complete a similar survey for their congregations, provinces, or monasteries.


Data collection for 2011 took place between December 2011 and February 2012. CARA received responses from 193 of the 195 dioceses and eparchies of the USCCB and 165 of the 213 clerical and mixed religious institutes of CMSM, for response rates of 99 percent and 77 percent, respectively. CARA then prepared the national level summary tables and graphs of the findings for 2011, with comparisons to 2004 through 2010, which are presented in this *Annual Report*.

We are grateful for the cooperation of the bishops, eparchs, and major superiors and their representatives in completing the survey for 2011.

Sincerely,

Fr. Thomas P. Gaunt, SJ
Executive Director

Phone: 202-687-8080 • Fax: 202-687-8083 • E-mail: CARA@georgetown.edu



Section I

CHAPTER ONE

Introduction

This is the ninth Annual Report of the results of the *Charter for the Protection of Children and Young People* (*Charter*) audits. This year the audits were conducted by StoneBridge Business Partners and compiled by the United States Conference of Catholic Bishops (USCCB) Secretariat of Child and Youth Protection (SCYP). Article 9 of the *Charter* states, “The Secretariat is to produce an annual public report on the progress made in implementing and maintaining the standards in this *Charter*. The report is to be based on an annual audit process whose method, scope, and cost are to be approved by the Administrative Committee on the recommendation of the Committee on the Protection of Children and Young People. This public report is to include the names of those dioceses/eparchies which the audit shows are not in compliance with the provisions and expectations of the *Charter*.”


The 2011 audits began a new three-year cycle of auditing dioceses/eparchies, which had been approved in 2008 by the Administrative Committee on the recommendation of the Committee on the Protection of Children and Young People (CPCYP) and National Review Board (NRB). This cycle called for one-third of the dioceses and eparchies (the Eastern Catholic equivalent of dioceses) to receive full, on-site audits and the remaining two-thirds of the dioceses/eparchies to participate in a data collection audit. This data is collected and reviewed by StoneBridge Business Partners, who were newly selected to perform the audits after a national search was conducted by the Administrative Committee and NRB. This year 59 dioceses/eparchies participated in full, on-site audits, and 128 dioceses/eparchies participated in data collection audits. Eight dioceses/eparchies refused to be audited for a variety of reasons. Those dioceses/eparchies are identified in the Limitations and Methodology Section.

Fifty-eight of the dioceses/eparchies that participated in the 2011 on-site audit process were found to be fully compliant with the *Charter*, while one diocese

was found noncompliant with Article 2. This year the auditors provided recommendations to all dioceses or eparchies that participated in an on-site audit. These recommendations were, in the opinion of the auditors, areas in which the diocese or eparchy could strengthen or streamline their current practices.


Parish audits are another area that the NRB strongly advocates, since it is at the parish level that the implementation of the *Charter* truly makes a difference. The number of dioceses/eparchies consenting to have auditors conduct parish audits remained at twenty-four in 2011. The parish audits allow the dioceses/eparchies to ascertain the extent to which its parishes are following diocesan/eparchial procedures. The parishes are selected by the auditors. Demographics considered include the location of the parish and whether the parish includes a school. Parish interviews were conducted in person, on-site at the parish or school.

In the 2011 audit period, dioceses/eparchies provided outreach for the first time to 453 people who came forward during the 2011 adult year seeking assistance with healing and/or reconciliation. An additional 1,750 people who had come forth in years past continued to be served by outreach by dioceses/eparchies.



Three percent of allegations made during the 2011 audit period were by current minors. (See chart above.) Of the twenty-one allegations made by minors, seven were considered credible by law

enforcement; three were determined to be false, five were determined to be boundary violations, and three are still under investigation.



During the 2011 audit period, 683 adults who were victims/survivors of abuse in the past came forward to report an allegation for the first time. Allegations were made against 551 priests and seven deacons. Of the accused clerics, 253 are deceased, 58 had already been laicized, 184 have been removed from ministry, and 281 had been named in previous audits. (See chart above.) Dioceses/eparchies continue to do a tremendous job of creating safe environments by

offering safe environment training and evaluating the backgrounds of its clerics, employees, and volunteers who work with children. Over 99 percent of clerics were trained and over 96 percent of employees and volunteers. In addition, over 4.8 million children received safe environment training. Background evaluations were conducted on over 99 percent of clerics; 99 percent of educators; 96 percent of employees; and 96 percent of volunteers. This level of training and background evaluations strengthen the hedge of protection surrounding our children.

The *Charter* compliance audits determine which dioceses/eparchies are doing what the bishops pledged to do in 2002. The audits, with the exception of the eight dioceses/eparchies that refused to be audited, make it clear that the bishops are upholding their Promise to Protect and their Pledge to Heal.

The Catholic faithful can be proud of the progress the Church has been making in this area. A tremendous amount of resources are employed to ensure the continued safety of children within the care of the Church.

CHAPTER TWO

2011 Methodology and Limitations

METHODOLOGY

Audit

The 2011 audit cycle was the beginning of the three-year audit cycle (2011-2013). Each diocese/eparchy is to receive at least one full on-site audit every three years.

The Diocese of Baker, the Diocese of Lincoln, the Eparchy of St. Peter the Apostle for Chaldeans, the Eparchy of Newton for Melkites, the Eparchy of Our Lady of Nareg in New York for Armenian Catholics, the Eparchy of St. Josaphat of Parma for Ukrainians, the Ukrainian Catholic Eparchy of Stamford, and the Eparchy of Our Lady of Deliverance of Newark for Syriacs refused to participate in the 2011 audits. Based on that refusal, they are all found not to be in compliance with the *Charter*.

As in past years, approximately two weeks before the scheduled on-site audit visits, the full set of audit documents were to be submitted electronically by the diocese/eparchy to the auditors, who reviewed them for completeness and consistency with prior audit materials.

The audit documents for the 2011 on-site audits were as follows:

- Audit Instructions
- Audit Instrument
- Chart A/B (a summarization of Victims/Accused)
- Chart C/D (a summarization of Safe Environment Training/Background Evaluations)
- Chart E (Parish Audit Guidelines)
- Additional Actions for the Protection of Children Form

Any omissions or inconsistencies identified during that review were brought to the attention of the diocese/eparchy and resolved by telephone or by e-mail prior to the on-site visit. During the on-site audit, the auditors verified the responses through personal

interviews with the responsible diocesan/eparchial employees and reviewed supporting documentation furnished by the diocese/eparchy. Some of the audits included on-site visits to parishes and schools where the auditors met with parish priests and other personnel to verify that the diocesan/eparchial procedures were being implemented at the parish level.

The audit documents for the 2011 data collection audits were as follows:

- Audit Instructions
- Chart A/B (a summarization of Victims/Accused)
- Chart C/D (a summarization of Safe Environment Training/Background Evaluations)
- Additional Actions for the Protection of Children Form

Those dioceses/eparchies undergoing data collection audits were instructed to submit completed Chart A/B, Chart C/D, and the Additional Actions forms electronically to the auditors by September 1, 2011. Any omissions or inconsistencies identified during that review were brought to the attention of the diocese/eparchy and resolved by telephone or by e-mail. If clarification was deemed necessary, the auditors then requested the supporting documentation or attempted to resolve discrepancies by telephone.

For both types of audits, the auditors completed their review, documented their findings, and generated compliance and Management Letters, which were then reviewed by the special audit coordinator. The special audit coordinator provided quality control to ensure completeness and uniformity of information requested and consistency in both the audit and reporting process. Once the special audit coordinator completed this review, the documents were electronically forwarded to the SCYP for its review. This detailed process provided the SCYP with an opportunity to review the entire audit procedure, including information initially provided by the diocese/eparchy,

as well as the clarifications and analyses at every level of review.

Parish Participation

Twenty-four dioceses agreed to have the auditors conduct detailed interviews in parishes to determine *Charter* understanding and compliance at the parish level. The parishes were selected by the auditors prior to the audit. Demographics considered include the location of the parish and whether the parish includes a school. Parish interviews were conducted in person. Those having parish audits included the following:

Archdiocese of Anchorage
Diocese of Arlington
Diocese of Austin
Diocese of Bismarck
Archdiocese of Boston
Diocese of Burlington
Archdiocese of Cincinnati
Diocese of Crookston
Archdiocese of Detroit
Diocese of Duluth
Diocese of Fort Worth
Archdiocese of Hartford
Diocese of Jefferson City
Diocese of Joliet
Archdiocese of Milwaukee
Diocese of Pittsburgh
Diocese of Portland, Maine
Diocese of Rockville Centre
Diocese of Salt Lake City
Diocese of Shreveport
Diocese of Spokane
Diocese of Springfield, Illinois
Diocese of St. Petersburg
Diocese of Syracuse

Workshops

Six workshops were held for diocesan employees who would be responsible for completing the audit instruments. They were held in different parts of the country to make them cost effective for those dioceses and eparchies attending. Mr. Jim Marasco of StoneBridge Business Partners distributed workshop manuals and

reviewed the contents with the participants. The materials included the *Charter*, the *Essential Norms for Diocesan/Eparchial Policies Dealing with Allegations of Sexual Abuse of Minors by Priests of Deacons (Essential Norms)*, the updated audit instrument, and the accompanying charts. In addition, during the workshops, diocesan staff were introduced to the new auditing firm and informed of changes to the process.

Format

The 2011 audit documents followed the 2010 format with minor modifications made to them. The auditors utilized a secure file transfer portal to exchange information with the dioceses/eparchies. All audit documents were transferred to and from the dioceses/eparchies in this manner.

Training

In June 2011, StoneBridge Business Partners held a training conference for their auditing staff. The audit approach, program, and related documents were discussed in detail, including parameters of what was to be considered compliant and noncompliant for each article. Suggestions for identifying and resolving issues were discussed. The executive director and associate director of the SCYP also participated and provided an overall national perspective of the audit process as well as discussed the concerns of the CPCYP regarding consistency in the application of the compliance criteria. The safe environment coordinator of a local diocese also participated to give a diocesan perspective and to answer questions. In addition, a local psychologist also presented to the group, offering insight and background concerning sexual abuse victims and abusers.

Reporting

As in past years, in order to reach a conclusion of compliance or non-compliance, both types of audits relied on the completeness and accuracy of the information provided to the auditors by the diocesan/eparchial personnel. For those audits performed on-site, the auditors did not examine personnel files or other confidential materials; rather, the auditors were provided with certain documents from these files related to the audit of the *Charter*. As a result, the

compliance letters issued to the dioceses/eparchies from StoneBridge Business Partners stated, “The conclusions reached as to the compliance of (diocese name) are based upon our inquiry, observation and the review of specifically requested documentation furnished to StoneBridge Business Partners during the course of this audit.”

With regard to ascertaining compliance or non-compliance for those dioceses/eparchies participating in the data collection audits, it had been decided that this determination would not be made solely based on the review of limited data. In these cases, the compliance letters from StoneBridge Business Partners stated, “The diocese is in compliance with the data collection requirements for the 2010/2011 *Charter* audit period.” The next time the diocese/eparchy receives a full on-site audit, the issue of compliance with the *Charter* itself will be addressed in detail.

LIMITATIONS/PROBLEMS ENCOUNTERED

Parish Audits

Although the *Charter* is silent on how records are to be kept, parish audits found inconsistencies in certain dioceses on where and how records are maintained. This resulted in confusion between the parish and chancery personnel and had an impact on the accuracy of the numbers provided to the auditors. This year, representatives from the diocese/eparchy accompanied the auditors on the parish audits. In several instances, this resulted in better communication between the parishes and the diocesan/eparchial representatives on matters of policies and procedures. Additionally, the staff at the SCYP worked closely with a number of dioceses, helping them improve their record-keeping systems. This assistance sometimes included a visit by an SCYP staff member to a diocese to help work through the record-keeping challenges with their personnel.

Standard for Compliance on Article 12 (Safe Environment Training)

As in the previous audits, dioceses/eparchies were asked whether the safe environment program(s)

being utilized had been approved by the bishop/eparch. This question is critical in those instances where no diocesan/eparchial safe environment training is offered to children/youth attending religious education classes because the diocese/eparchy relies solely on the training provided by the public school systems. However in some cases, especially where safe environment training was not mandated by the state, the auditors determined that the public schools did not provide any training, but the dioceses/eparchies still counted those children enrolled in religious education as trained. In addition, as noted in the overview of Article 12, a number of dioceses/eparchies received Management Letters based on unsatisfactory responses to requests for pastoral certification that safe environment training materials had been received and the training program had been implemented. The retention of such documentation was a requirement set by Bishop Gregory Aymond in his memo to all bishops in 2006.

Statistics

The dates of the uniform audit period were designed to give an optimum opportunity to ensure that all persons included under Articles 12 and 13 (i.e., those whose duties include ongoing, unsupervised contact with minors) have been trained and have had background evaluations completed. While the dioceses/eparchies were instructed to identify a “snapshot in time” (i.e., on or around the end of the audit period of June 30, 2011) and to use those statistics for Chart C/D, there continued to be some confusion.

Because of the way in which dioceses/eparchies track their numbers, particularly those of children and youth, these numbers remain, at best, estimates. It was determined that the only manner in which these inconsistencies could be resolved was to develop a record-keeping system that tracked individuals by name. During the 2011 audit, there were numerous instances of the numbers of individuals in certain categories (particularly children and volunteers) significantly increasing or decreasing from prior audit periods, which was the result of more refined record-keeping systems being employed for the 2011 audit. Many of the decreases in the numbers of individuals

in all categories were also attributed to the closing of schools and parishes.

Timeliness

The dioceses/eparchies that participated in the two-thirds data collection audits were instructed to submit the completed audit documents to the auditor by September 1, 2011. As in prior audit periods, that deadline was not met by some of the dioceses/eparchies. To complicate matters, requests for clarification by the auditors were often not addressed by diocesan personnel in a timely manner.

Cross-Referencing Allegations

Allegations that involve multiple dioceses/eparchies created reporting confusion. The auditors found it

difficult to cross-check allegations when minimal information was provided. This could result in either the double counting of allegations on Chart A/B or some allegations not being reported by either party.

Personnel Turnover

Turnover in diocesan/eparchial personnel assigned to the implementation of the *Charter* or to the submission of related audit documents to StoneBridge Business Partners sometimes resulted in incomplete and/or incorrectly completed forms. The resolution of these issues required additional time and effort on the part of many additional personnel within the diocese/eparchy as well as StoneBridge Business Partners and the SCYP.

CHAPTER THREE

Audit Findings

TO PROMOTE HEALING AND RECONCILIATION WITH VICTIMS/SURVIVORS OF SEXUAL ABUSE OF MINORS

Article 1. Dioceses/eparchies are to reach out to victims/survivors and their families and demonstrate a sincere commitment to their spiritual and emotional well-being. The first obligation of the Church with regard to the victims is for healing and reconciliation. Each diocese/eparchy is to continue its outreach to every person who has been the victim of sexual abuse* as a minor by anyone in church service, whether the abuse was recent or occurred many years in the past. This outreach may include provision of counseling, spiritual assistance, support groups, and other social services agreed upon by the victim and the diocese/eparchy.

Through pastoral outreach to victims and their families, the diocesan/eparchial bishop or his representative is to offer to meet with them, to listen with patience and compassion to their experiences and concerns, and to share the “profound sense of solidarity and concern” expressed by His Holiness, Pope John Paul II, in his Address to the Cardinals of the United States and Conference Officers (April 23, 2002). Pope Benedict XVI, too, in his address to the U.S. bishops in 2008 said of the clergy sexual abuse crisis, “It is your God-given responsibility as pastors to bind up the wounds caused by every breach of trust, to foster healing, to promote reconciliation and to reach out with loving concern to those so seriously wronged.”

We bishops and eparchs commit ourselves to work as one with our brother priests and deacons to foster reconciliation among all people in our dioceses/eparchies. We especially commit ourselves to work with those individuals who were themselves abused and the communities that have suffered because of the sexual abuse of minors that occurred in their midst.

* For purposes of this *Charter*, the offense of sexual abuse of a minor will be understood in accord with the provisions of *Sacramentorum sanctitatis tutela* (SST), article 6, which reads:

§1. The more grave delicts against morals which are reserved to the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith are:

1° the delict against the sixth commandment of the Decalogue committed by a cleric with a minor below the age of

eighteen years; in this case, a person who habitually lacks the use of reason is to be considered equivalent to a minor.

2° the acquisition, possession, or distribution by a cleric of pornographic images of minors under the age of fourteen, for purposes of sexual gratification, by whatever means or using whatever technology;

§2. A cleric who commits the delicts mentioned above in §1 is to be punished according to the gravity of his crime, not excluding dismissal or deposition.

In view of the Circular Letter from the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith, dated May 3, 2011, which calls for “mak[ing] allowance for the legislation of the country where the Conference is located,” Section III(g), we will apply the federal legal age for defining child pornography, which includes pornographic images of minors under the age of eighteen, for assessing a cleric’s suitability for ministry and for complying with civil reporting statutes.

If there is any doubt whether a specific act qualifies as an external, objectively grave violation, the writings of recognized moral theologians should be consulted, and the opinions of recognized experts should be appropriately obtained (*Canonical Delicts Involving Sexual Misconduct and Dismissal from the Clerical State*, 1995, p. 6). Ultimately, it is the responsibility of the diocesan bishop/eparch, with the advice of a qualified review board, to determine the gravity of the alleged act.

All dioceses/eparchies that participated in the 2011 on-site compliance audits were in compliance with Article 1. StoneBridge issued three management letter comments related to this article.

The very first article of the *Charter* focuses on the outreach to the victims/survivors and their families by the dioceses/eparchies to demonstrate a sincere commitment to their spiritual and emotional well-being. The bishop or his representative is to offer to meet with victims and to listen with compassion to their experiences. Putting victim/survivor outreach first is a strong statement of commitment by the bishops to righting the wrongs of the past and making sure victims/survivors are listened to and treated compassionately. One cannot overemphasize the healing power of listening.

The outreach extended to victims/survivors takes a variety of forms depending on their needs as well as the circumstances of the dioceses/eparchies. This

outreach includes spiritual help such as healing Masses, healing novenas, days of prayer, retreats, and evenings with the bishop. Therapeutic mental health services, such as counseling and social services in the form of case management, are also provided to victims/survivors. Outreach may even include financial help for victims/survivors in need of such assistance. Dioceses/eparchies have oftentimes developed lists of service providers to make it easier for victims/survivors to find appropriate mental health professionals. In an additional effort to reach out and restore trust, some bishops have written and promulgated letters of apology to the faithful.

This year 704 victims/survivors came forward for the first time to report abuse to dioceses/eparchies; 683 of those abuse allegations occurred years ago, and victims/survivors are just now finding the courage to report it. Dioceses/eparchies reported providing outreach to 453 victims/survivors and related family members who came forward this year. Another 1,750 who reported abuse in prior years are still receiving support.

The Church can never forget the harm done to victims/survivors of clergy sexual abuse. Healing those wounds must remain a top priority for the Church. Our work is finished only when all victims are comforted and healed.

Article 2. Dioceses/eparchies are to have policies and procedures in place to respond promptly to any allegation where there is reason to believe that sexual abuse of a minor has occurred. Dioceses/eparchies are to have a competent person or persons to coordinate assistance for the immediate pastoral care of persons who report having been sexually abused as minors by clergy or other church personnel. The procedures for those making a complaint are to be readily available in printed form in the principal languages in which the liturgy is celebrated in the diocese/eparchy and be the subject of public announcements at least annually.

Dioceses/eparchies are also to have a review board that functions as a confidential consultative body to the bishop/eparch. The majority of its members are to be lay persons not in the employ of the diocese/eparchy (see Norm 5 in *Essential Norms for Diocesan/Eparchial Policies Dealing with Allegations of Sexual Abuse of Minors by Priests or Deacons*, 2006). This board is to advise the diocesan/eparchial bishop

in his assessment of allegations of sexual abuse of minors and in his determination of a cleric's suitability for ministry. It is regularly to review diocesan/eparchial policies and procedures for dealing with sexual abuse of minors. Also, the board can review these matters both retrospectively and prospectively and give advice on all aspects of responses in connection with these cases.

All dioceses/eparchies that participated in the 2011 on-site compliance audits were in compliance with Article 2, with the exception of one. StoneBridge issued fifty-one management letter comments related to this article.

Article 2 requires dioceses/eparchies to have policies and procedures on how to promptly respond to allegations of sexual abuse. This includes dioceses/eparchies having competent individuals to coordinate the pastoral care of people who report allegations of sexual abuse.

Procedures on how to report are to be readily available in the principal languages spoken in the diocese and are to be the subject of announcements at least annually. Thirteen dioceses/eparchies received comments on this topic. Article 2 also requires that the diocese/eparchy maintain a review board that serves as a consultative body to the bishop and meets regularly, which in the past audit cycles has meant at least yearly. These requirements constitute building blocks to help victims/survivors heal. Without them, the trust that has been lost will never be regained, and the impact of this lack of trust will continue to be felt throughout the Church. Most comments made to the dioceses/eparchies on the topic of the review board related to documentation and frequency of review board meetings, and the number and/or diversity of members. The Diocese of Shreveport was found noncompliant because their review board had not met in two years. When this was brought to their attention, they immediately convened a meeting to discuss reviewing and updating diocesan policies and procedures involving the protection of children, etc. They have not experienced any *Charter*-related allegations in at least four years.

Dioceses/eparchies continue to maintain and update the policies and procedures related to creating and maintaining a safe environment. These policies and

procedures are usually outlined on diocesan/eparchial websites where they can be viewed by the public. Dioceses/eparchies also use diocesan newspapers, brochures, and bulletin inserts to communicate information about procedures to report allegations. At the parish level, this can also be promoted by using the parish bulletins and parish websites. It is important to communicate (in the principal languages spoken within the parish) the contact information for the diocesan/eparchial victim assistance coordinator (VAC) so that the VAC may be involved in the healing process for those who suffer in the shadows.

Often the victim assistance coordinators are mental health professionals experienced in dealing with victims/survivors of abuse and/or trauma. There is also movement by dioceses/eparchies to place this position within the local Catholic Charities office. Both show seriousness on the part of the Church in dealing with this problem, which can only be improved by providing ease in reaching these persons.

Currently, to evaluate access to VACs, auditors look for the VAC contact number, note whether it is easy to find, and then place a call to ascertain how the call is answered and how long it takes for the VAC to return a call. With few exceptions, VACs are easily accessible and responsive. Additionally, staff of the SCYP also periodically call the listed VAC number to verify that the number is still correct and to ascertain the promptness of the response.

In full on-site audits of dioceses/eparchies, it was found that the diocesan review boards (DRBs) are still in place and for the most part are active and being used as confidential, consultative bodies to the bishops. However as the number of allegations decreases, the frequency of the DRB meetings decreases as well. So as not to lose this *Charter*-focused talent, the SCYP has suggested to dioceses/eparchies that the bishops consider having their DRBs continue to meet frequently *and consistently* to ensure that the *Charter* implementation in a diocese/eparchy stays strong and does not become diluted. To ensure the dioceses/eparchies' commitment to quality *Charter* implementation, it is suggested that at each meeting, as time allows, the DRB should review a section of the *Charter* and note how the specific *Charter* articles are being implemented in the diocese/eparchy.

As part of the Management Letter communication, StoneBridge suggested that diocese/eparchies review current changes in the *Charter* and use their DRBs to determine what policies or procedures may be affected and require modification. The changes in the *Charter* expand the definition of sexual abuse of a minor to include (1) abuse of a person who habitually lacks the use of reason and (2) the use of child pornography.

Article 3. Dioceses/eparchies are not to enter into settlements which bind the parties to confidentiality unless the victim/survivor requests confidentiality and this request is noted in the text of the agreement.

All dioceses/eparchies that participated in the 2011 on-site compliance audits were in compliance with Article 3. No management letter comments were issued by StoneBridge related to this article.

No diocese/eparchy that received an on-site audit had entered into settlements that bound the parties to confidentiality, unless the victim/survivor requested it. While several dioceses/eparchies did enter into confidentiality agreements, in all cases they were requested by the victim/survivor to protect their identity. These requests were noted in the settlement agreements themselves.

Transparency on this issue is fundamental to the pledge of openness promised by the bishops. The faithful need to know the bishops are keeping their promise to work openly with victims/survivors of sexual abuse, and that the silence of the victims/survivors of clergy sexual abuse is not being bought.

TO GUARANTEE AN EFFECTIVE RESPONSE TO ALLEGATIONS OF SEXUAL ABUSE OF MINORS

Article 4. Dioceses/eparchies are to report an allegation of sexual abuse of a person who is a minor to the public authorities. Dioceses/eparchies are to comply with all applicable civil laws with respect to the reporting of allegations of sexual abuse of minors to civil authorities and cooperate in their investigation in accord with the law of the jurisdiction in question.

Dioceses/eparchies are to cooperate with public authorities about reporting cases even when the person is no longer a minor.

In every instance, dioceses/eparchies are to advise victims of their right to make a report to public authorities and support this right.

All dioceses/eparchies that participated in the 2011 on-site compliance audits were in compliance with Article 4. No management letter comments were issued by StoneBridge related to this article.

This Article requires dioceses/eparchies to report all allegations of sexual abuse of minors to public authorities. They are to comply with all civil laws and to cooperate with public authorities in these cases. This Article addresses allegations involving current minors, which comprise a small portion of the total allegations currently being reported to the dioceses/eparchies. The majority of allegations are historical in nature.


During the 2011 audit cycle, twenty-one allegations of sexual abuse of current minors were reported to dioceses/eparchies. To be specific, these are those allegations brought to the attention of the dioceses/eparchies in which the victim/survivor is still a minor. All were reported to civil authorities as required by law and by the *Charter*. This important requirement solidifies the pledge to be open and transparent, and to promptly and properly address all allegations of sexual abuse of minors. Compliance with the Article continues to send the message to the faithful that the Church acknowledges its responsibility to protect children and young people.

With regard to the status of the allegations received during the audit period, by June 30, 2011, some had already been proven true, some were proven false, and some were still under investigation. The following table summarizes the status of these allegations at the time of the audit.

Credible allegations:	7
Allegations unable to be determined:	3
Allegations under investigation:	3
False allegations:	3
Boundary violations, not abuse:	5
Allegations made by males:	8
Allegations made by females:	11
Gender unknown:	2
Allegations naming international priests: 1 (Nigeria)	
Number of dioceses with allegations:	19
Number of eparchies with allegations:	0

Boundary violations continue to be reported to diocese/eparchies. This may be a result of the increased awareness brought about by the safe environment training conducted in the dioceses/eparchies (see Article 12). In all cases civil authorities were called, and an investigation was conducted.

Allegations of sexual abuse of a minor were made against one international priest serving in the United States. This priest was from Nigeria, and the allegation was unable to be substantiated, because the victim did not come forward personally and therefore could not provide adequate information to begin an investigation.



Article 5. We affirm the words of His Holiness, Pope John Paul II, in his Address to the Cardinals of the United States and Conference Officers: “There is no place in the priesthood or religious life for those who would harm the young.”

Sexual abuse of a minor by a cleric is a crime in the universal law of the Church (CIC, c. 1395 §2; CCEO, c. 1453 §1). Because of the seriousness of this matter, jurisdiction has been reserved to the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith (*Motu proprio Sacramentorum sanctitatis tutela*, AAS 93, 2001). Sexual abuse of a minor is also a crime in all civil jurisdictions in the United States.

Diocesan/eparchial policy is to provide that for even a single act of sexual abuse of a minor*—when- ever it occurred—which is admitted or established after an appropriate process in accord with canon law, the offending priest or deacon is to be permanently removed from ministry and, if warranted, dismissed from the clerical state. In keeping with the stated purpose of this *Charter*, an offending priest or deacon is to be offered therapeutic professional assistance both for the purpose of prevention and also for his own healing and well-being.

The diocesan/eparchial bishop is to exercise his power of governance, within the parameters of the universal law of the Church, to ensure that any priest or deacon subject to his governance who has committed even one act of sexual abuse of a minor as described below (see note) shall not continue in ministry.

A priest or deacon who is accused of sexual abuse of a minor is to be accorded the presumption of innocence during the investigation of the allegation and all appropriate steps are to be taken to protect his reputation. He is to be encouraged to retain the assistance of civil and canonical counsel. If the allegation is deemed not substantiated, every step possible

is to be taken to restore his good name, should it have been harmed.

In fulfilling this article, dioceses/eparchies are to follow the requirements of the universal law of the Church and of the *Essential Norms* approved for the United States.

All dioceses/eparchies that participated in the 2011 on-site compliance audits were in compliance with Article 5. StoneBridge issued two management letter comments related to this article.

This Article continues the requirement that dioceses/eparchies are to have effective responses to allegations of sexual abuse by clergy. Those responses are to include policies and procedures that

- Include removing the cleric from ministry
- Offer therapeutic assistance to the accused
- Encourage the accused to retain civil and canonical counsel
- Restore the good name of the accused if the allegation is not proven

Dioceses/eparchies received a total of 704 allegations of sexual abuse by members of the clergy during the audit period. Of those allegations, 683 were historical allegations, meaning they were reported for the first time in 2011 but occurred when the person was a minor in years past (often decades ago). As mentioned in Article 4, twenty-one allegations involving current minors were reported during the 2011 audit year.

The breakdown of accused for all allegations (historical and current) is as follows:

Accused Priests:	551	Status of Accused Clergy:	
Diocesan priests:	422	Deceased clerics accused:	253
Religious priests:	78	Laicized clerics accused:	58
Extern priests:	51	Accused clerics removed from or allowed restricted ministry:	184
		Accused clerics with allegations that were unfounded or unable to be proven:	127
Accused Deacons:	7	Accused clerics with prior allegations:	281
Diocesan deacons:	6		
Religious deacons:	1	Unknown Clerics Accused:	55

This year's reports of allegations continue the trend seen in all previous audits: the number of historical allegations far surpasses the reports of current abuse. This does not mean the allegations of abuse coming to the attention of the Church today are not important. Victims/survivors of clergy sexual abuse are encouraged to come forward, no matter how long ago the abuse occurred. While civil authorities may not be able to prosecute the abuser, the bishops want victims/survivors to come forward to find healing. In many instances, the cleric has already been removed from ministry or is deceased.

As with some of the other Articles, this Article is reinforced with a Norm, in this case Norm 8, which makes compliance with the Article compliance with the law of the Church. The Article reflects a quote from His Holiness Pope John Paul II in his Address to the Cardinals of the United States and Conference Officers: "There is no place in the priesthood or religious life for those who would harm the young." This Article, as well as Norm 8, makes it very clear that diocesan/eparchial policy is to provide that for even a single act of sexual abuse of a minor, whenever it occurred, which is admitted or established after an appropriate process in accord with canon law, the offending priest or deacon is to be permanently removed from ministry and, if warranted, dismissed from the clerical state. Therefore, if a member of the clergy sexually abuses a minor, he must be permanently removed from ministry.

Dioceses/eparchies need to continue all their safe environment practices implemented as a result of the *Charter* to ensure that children in the care of the Church are not harmed.

This Article also requires offering therapeutic assistance to the accused, encouraging the accused to retain civil and canonical counsel, and restoring his good name if the allegation is not proven. While much of the focus of the *Charter* is helping victims/survivors heal and protecting children, the care of the accused should never be overlooked or diluted. As Catholics, the life and dignity of all people should be considered whenever faced with adversity and challenging situations like these.

Article 6. There are to be clear and well-publicized diocesan/eparchial standards of ministerial behavior and appropriate boundaries for clergy and for any other paid personnel and volunteers of the Church in positions of trust who have regular contact with children and young people.

All dioceses/eparchies that participated in the 2011 on-site compliance audits were in compliance with Article 6. StoneBridge issued four management letter comments related to this article.

Dioceses/eparchies are to have clear and well-publicized codes of conduct for clergy and others with positions of trust in the Church that have regular contact with children. The bishops do not want anyone to have any misunderstanding as to behavioral expectations of adults around children. Along with these clear codes of conduct are consequences for not adhering to them. Granting access to children who are in the care of the Church is a huge responsibility. One way to ensure those who are granted access to children behave properly is to have well-articulated, well-understood and well-publicized codes of conduct.

Codes of conduct serve several purposes; most importantly, they let people know what is and is not acceptable behavior. A code of conduct should also provide a process for which others can report unacceptable behavior that they may have observed. Additionally, all codes of conduct should spell out the consequences of not adhering to the code.

Dioceses/eparchies are constantly updating their codes of conduct to better reflect the changing environment. These updates include a multitude of behaviors to include the use of technology, social media sites, and smart phones.

Promulgating codes of conduct is important, and for the most part, dioceses/eparchies demonstrate that they understand that importance by the ways the codes are publicized. Though diocesan/eparchial compliance with this Article is sufficient, this is one area in which the publication of such codes cannot be overemphasized or over-publicized, especially at

the parish level. Well-publicized codes of conduct not only help adults identify acceptable behavior, but they also help educate children in this information and help develop a set of appropriate boundaries. The auditors noted that a stronger effort can be made by the dioceses/eparchies to encourage the publication of the codes of conduct and related information by schools and parishes.

Many dioceses/eparchies require that clerics, employees, and volunteers who work with children not only read the diocesan/eparchial code of conduct but also sign an acknowledgement that they have read and understood its contents. This method is encouraged as a means to help integrate this Article into the fabric of the diocese/eparchy's way of being, which is a worthy goal for all *Charter* Articles.

Article 7. Dioceses/eparchies are to be open and transparent in communicating with the public about sexual abuse of minors by clergy within the confines of respect for the privacy and the reputation of the individuals involved. This is especially so with regard to informing parish and other church communities directly affected by sexual abuse of a minor.

All dioceses/eparchies that participated in the 2011 on-site compliance audits were in compliance with Article 7. StoneBridge issued two management letter comments related to this article.

This Article requires dioceses/eparchies to communicate in an open and transparent way with the public about the sexual abuse of minors. It requires the bishops also to communicate forthrightly with parishes and other church communities that have been directly affected by ministerial misconduct involving minors.

In the past, the perception that bishops were not communicating openly with regard to how allegations of sexual abuse by clergy were handled in a diocese/eparchy greatly contributed to the sense of betrayal felt by both the faithful and the general public. Thus, compliance with this Article and integrating its letter and spirit into the culture of the Church is critical to restoring the laity's trust of bishops.

To restore that trust, the faithful must know that their bishop and pastor are being truthful with them involving cases of abuse at their parish. The parish community should hear the facts of the abuse from their Church leaders while respecting the privacy of the individuals involved. When Church leaders are honest and open about all confirmed cases of abuse, other victims find it easier to reveal their abuse. People often find it easier to forgive the abusers than to forgive those who shielded them from any repercussions or did not try to stop them from abusing.

Dioceses/eparchies have a variety of ways of notifying the faithful of past and current abuse allegations. Most elect to visit the affected parish and directly inform the congregation about the circumstances. Others may rely on diocesan/eparchial newspapers and local media. As a result, it is important for dioceses/eparchies to maintain a working relationship with the local media.

Furthermore, the bishops can rebuild trust by being forthright and truthful regarding sexual abuse allegations and how they are handling them. Dioceses/eparchies will gain credibility by reporting all cases as openly and transparently as possible.

TO ENSURE THE ACCOUNTABILITY OF OUR PROCEDURES

Article 8. By the authority of the United States Conference of Catholic Bishops, the mandate of the Ad Hoc Committee on Sexual Abuse is renewed, and it is now constituted the Committee on the Protection of Children and Young People. It becomes a standing committee of the Conference. Its membership is to include representation from all the episcopal regions of the country, with new appointments staggered to maintain continuity in the effort to protect children and youth.

The Committee is to advise the USCCB on all matters related to child and youth protection and is to oversee the development of the plans, programs, and budget of the Secretariat of Child and Youth Protection. It is to provide the USCCB with comprehensive planning and recommendations concerning child and youth protection by coordinating the efforts of the Secretariat and the National Review Board.

Membership of the CPCYP July 1, 2010, to June 30, 2011, included the following bishops, shown with the number of the region they represented:

Bishop Blase J. Cupich, Chair
Term began in November 2008/expired November 2011

Bishop Richard J. Malone (I)
Term expired November 2011

Bishop Dennis J. Sullivan (II)
Term expires November 2013

Bishop Timothy Senior (III)
Term expires November 2012

Bishop Mitchell T. Rozanski (IV)
Term expires November 2013

Bishop Richard Stika (V)
Term expires November 2013

Bishop Bernard A. Hebda (VI)
Term expires November 2012

Bishop Edward K. Braxton (VII)
Term expires November 2012

Bishop John M. LeVoir (VIII)
Term expires November 2012

Bishop Michael O. Jackels (IX)
Term expired November 2011

Bishop Patrick J. Zurek (X)
Term expired November 2011

Bishop Clarence Silva (XI)
Term expires November 2013

Bishop Michael W. Warfel (XII)
Term expired November 2011

Bishop Paul Etienne (XIII)
Term expired November 2011

Bishop John G. Noonan (XIV)
Term expired November 2011

Bishop Gerald N. Dino (XV)
Term expires November 2012

In November of 2010, the terms of four members expired:

Bishop Robert J. Cunningham (II)
Bishop Ronald W. Gainer (V)
Bishop George J. Lucas (VII)
Bishop Gerald E. Wilkerson (XI)

The following bishops were elected by the members of their regions to serve on the CPCYP:

Bishop R. Daniel Conlon, Chair Elect
Term as Chair started in November 2011

Bishop Dennis J. Sullivan (II)
Term expires November 2013

Bishop Richard Stika (V)
Term expires November 2013

Bishop Edward K. Braxton (VII)
Term expires November 2012

Bishop Clarence Silva (XI)
Term expires November 2013

The CPCYP was also assisted by the following consultants:

Rev. Msgr. Ronny Jenkins, Associate General Secretary of the USCCB

Rev. Paul Lininger, OFM Conv, Executive Director of the Conference of Major Superiors of Men

Rev. Thomas Cassidy, SCJ, President of the Conference of Major Superiors of Men

Mrs. Helen Osman, Secretary of Communications for the USCCB

Mr. Anthony Picarello, General Counsel for the USCCB

Rev. Shawn McKnight, Executive Director of the USCCB Secretariat of Clergy, Consecrated Life and Vocations

Sr. Mary Ann Walsh, RSM, Director of the USCCB Office of Media Relations

The CPCYP meets during the months of March, June, September, and November. At two of those meetings, June and November, the CPCYP meets jointly with the NRB.

The 2011 Anglophone Conference

Bishop Blase J. Cupich with Ms. Diane Knight, chair of the NRB, and Ms. Teresa Kettelkamp, executive director of the SCYP, attended the thirteenth Anglophone Conference in Rome, Italy, in February 2011.

The 2012 Anglophone Conference will convene in Rome with the theme “Safeguarding of Children, Young People and Vulnerable Adults.”

Charter Review

The CPCYP, along with members of the NRB and three consultants, has been engaged in a formal review of the *Charter*, which was scheduled for presentation to the body of bishops at the November 2010 meeting in Baltimore. However, in light of the publication of the new *Norms Concerning the Most Serious Crimes* by the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith on July 15, 2010, Bishop Cupich requested that the Committee on Canonical Affairs and Church Governance formally review these new *Norms* and identify any implications they might have for the *Charter* and the 2005 *Essential Norms*. This caused the delay of the presentation of the *Charter* until the June 2011 meeting in Seattle, WA. After such a review was completed, the necessary changes were identified as additions to the footnote. After following the process for formal review by the body of bishops, the *Charter* was approved at the June 2011 meeting.

New Bishops' Charter Orientation

The CPCYP has been asked to assist all bishops and eparchs, especially those appointed since the *Charter* was adopted and revised in 2002 and 2005, to understand the obligations required of them by the *Charter*. In response, the CPCYP prepared a program designed to address questions new bishops and eparchs may have regarding the *Charter* or the annual compliance audits. This orientation was held during the bishops' General Meeting in November 2010 and has become an annual event, since it is critical to share with the new bishops not only the genesis of the wording of the *Charter* but also the spirit behind the commitments made in the *Charter*.

Article 9. The Secretariat of Child and Youth Protection, established by the Conference of Catholic Bishops, is to staff the Committee on the Protection of Children and Young People and be a resource for dioceses/eparchies for the implementation of “safe environment” programs and for suggested training and development of diocesan personnel responsible for child and youth protection programs, taking into account the financial and other resources, as well as the population, area, and demographics of the diocese/eparchy.

The Secretariat is to produce an annual public report on the progress made in implementing and maintaining the standards in this *Charter*. The report is to be based on an annual audit process whose method, scope, and cost are to be approved by the Administrative Committee on the recommendation of the Committee on the Protection of Children and Young People. This public report is to include the names of those dioceses/eparchies which the audit shows are not in compliance with the provisions and expectations of the *Charter*.

As a member of the Conference staff, the Executive Director of the Secretariat is appointed by and reports to the General Secretary. The Executive Director is to provide the Committee on the Protection of Children and Young People and the National Review Board with regular reports of the Secretariat's activities.

The *Charter* specifically created the SCYP and assigned to it three central tasks:

- To assist each diocese and eparchy in implementing safe environment programs designed to ensure necessary safety and security for all children as they participate in church and religious activities
- To develop an appropriate compliance audit mechanism to assist the bishops and eparchs in adhering to the responsibilities set forth in the *Charter*
- To prepare a public, annual report describing the compliance of each diocese/eparchy with the *Charter's* provisions

Taking into account the financial and other resources, as well as the population and demographics of the

diocese/eparchy, the SCYP is a resource for dioceses/eparchies for implementing safe environment programs and for suggesting training and development of diocesan personnel responsible for child and youth protection programs.

StoneBridge Business Partners was awarded a three-year contract to conduct the audits. The SCYP worked closely with them to ensure an appropriate audit mechanism to determine the compliance of the responsibilities set forth in the Charter. The instrument used in the 2011 audit resembled the instrument used in the past. Minor changes were made to update the instrument.

The SCYP's support of the dioceses includes sponsoring e-mail lists to assist the missions of victim assistance coordinators, safe environment coordinators, and diocesan review boards; preparing resource materials extracted from the audits; creating materials to assist in both healing and *Charter* compliance; and providing resources for Child Abuse Prevention Month in April. On a limited basis and as needed, the staff of the SCYP provides support to victims/survivors and referrals resources that can aid them in their healing. When invited, the SCYP staff will visit dioceses/eparchies and offer assistance.

The SCYP provides staff support for the CPCYP, the NRB, and the NRB committees. The SCYP provides monthly reports to the members of CPCYP and NRB. These reports reflect the administrative efforts of the SCYP within the USCCB, the external support by the SCYP to the dioceses/eparchies on *Charter*-related matters, and the work of the CPCYP and NRB as supported and facilitated by the SCYP.

At the beginning of the audit period, July 1, 2010, the SCYP consisted of the following four staff members: Executive Director Teresa Kettelkamp, Associate Director Mary Jane Doerr, Executive Assistant Margaret Sienko, and Staff Assistant Cortney Kerns. Ms. Sienko left the Secretariat in December 2010; her duties were assumed by Laura Garner. Ms. Kettelkamp left the Secretariat in June 2011. Deacon Bernie Nojadera began as executive director in August 2011.

Teresa M. Kettelkamp, Executive Director, retired from Illinois State Police (ISP) after twenty-nine years, where she was the first female to attain the rank of colonel. Ms. Kettelkamp began her law enforcement career investigating white collar and public corruption cases. During her career she was also responsible for the functional supervision of twenty-eight specially trained agents who conducted statewide investigations involving missing and/or sexually exploited children. Ms. Kettelkamp headed the ISP's Division of Forensic Services, which is the third-largest forensic system in the world. Prior to that position, Ms. Kettelkamp headed the ISP's Division of Internal Investigation, which was responsible for the investigation of allegations of misconduct within the ISP as well as under the executive branch of government. Ms. Kettelkamp retired from the ISP for the purpose of working for The Gavin Group, Inc. in conducting the first annual compliance audits of the *Charter for the Protection of Children and Young People*. Ms. Kettelkamp is a lifelong Catholic and a graduate of Quincy College in Quincy, Illinois, where she obtained a degree in political science. She is the mother of two adult children.

Deacon Bernie Nojadera, Executive Director, served as director of the Office for the Protection of Children and Vulnerable Adults with the Diocese of San Jose, California, from 2002-2011. He was a pastoral associate at St. Mary Parish in Gilroy, California (1987-2002). He was awarded a BA from St. Joseph College in Mountain View, California, in 1984; an MSW degree specializing in health and mental health services from San Jose State University in 1991; and an MA in theology from St. Patrick's Seminary and University in Menlo Park, California, in 2002. He was ordained a permanent deacon in 2008. He has been a member of the Diocese of San Jose Safe Environment Task Force and involved with the San Jose Police Department's Internet Crimes Against Children Task Force, the County of Santa Clara Interfaith Clergy Task Force on the Prevention of Elder Abuse, and the County of Santa Clara Task Force on Suicide Prevention. He has worked as a clinical social worker for Santa Clara County Mental Health (1991-2000) and he is a military veteran. He is married and has two children.

Mary Jane Doerr, Associate Director, holds a BA in behavioral sciences from Nazareth College, Kalamazoo, and an MA in educational leadership from Western Michigan University. She has more than twenty years of experience as an educator in the following roles: as a classroom teacher, an elementary school principal, and a college instructor. She joined the Diocese of Kalamazoo in 1994, where she worked in stewardship and development. In 2003 she was appointed the safe environment coordinator for the diocese and in 2006 was promoted to the director of the Safe Environment Office. This role included coordinating victim assistance and overseeing all compliance issues related to the implementation of the *Charter for the Protection of Children and Young People*. She assumed the role of associate director in the Secretariat of Child and Youth Protection in July 2008. She is the mother of two adult children.

Margaret A. Sienko, Executive Assistant, joined the staff of the Secretariat of Child and Youth Protection in May 2006. Previously, Ms. Sienko served as a staff assistant in the Offices of the Ministries Group comprised of Priestly Life and Ministry, Vocations and Priestly Formation, and Diaconate.

Laura Garner, Executive Assistant, joined the staff of the Secretariat of Child and Youth Protection on January 3, 2011. Previously, Ms. Garner served as a staff assistant in the Office of the General Counsel with the USCCB since 2008. Ms. Garner holds a BA in psychology from Loyola College and an MA in art therapy from George Washington University. Before joining the USCCB, she worked at home as a medical transcriptionist while raising four children. Other employment includes bank teller, paraprofessional, computer educator, and receptionist.

Cortney Kerns, Staff Assistant, is from Hagerstown, Maryland, and attended Mount St. Mary's University in Emmitsburg, MD. She graduated cum laude in 2008 with a degree in chemistry. She joined the Secretariat of Child and Youth Protection in July 2008.

Additional information on the SCYP can be found at www.usccb.org/about/child-and-youth-protection/who-we-are.cfm.

Article 10. The whole Church, especially the laity, at both the diocesan and national levels, needs to be engaged in maintaining safe environments in the Church for children and young people.

The Committee on the Protection of Children and Young People is to be assisted by the National Review Board, a consultative body established in 2002 by the USCCB. The Board will review the annual report of the Secretariat of Child and Youth Protection on the implementation of this *Charter* in each diocese/eparchy and any recommendations that emerge from it, and offer its own assessment regarding its approval and publication to the Conference President.

The Board will also advise the Conference President on future members. The Board members are appointed by the Conference President in consultation with the Administrative Committee and are accountable to him and to the USCCB Executive Committee. Before a candidate is contacted, the Conference President is to seek and obtain, in writing, the endorsement of the candidate's diocesan bishop. The Board is to operate in accord with the statutes and bylaws of the USCCB and within procedural guidelines to be developed by the Board in consultation with the Committee on the Protection of Children and Young People and approved by the USCCB Administrative Committee. These guidelines are to set forth such matters as the Board's purpose and responsibility, officers, terms of office, and frequency of reports to the Conference President on its activities.

The Board will offer its advice as it collaborates with the Committee on the Protection of Children and Young People on matters of child and youth protection, specifically on policies and best practices. The Board and Committee on the Protection of Children and Young People will meet jointly several times a year.

The Board will review the work of the Secretariat of Child and Youth Protection and make recommendations to the Director. It will assist the Director in the development of resources for dioceses.

The Board will offer its assessment of the *Causes and Context* study to the Conference, along with any recommendations suggested by the study.

The USCCB established the NRB during their meeting in June 2002. The functions of the NRB were revised slightly and reconfirmed in June 2005 when the *Charter* was revised. The purpose of the NRB is to collaborate with the USCCB in preventing the

sexual abuse of minors by persons in the service of the Church in the United States.

The membership of the NRB during the audit period was as follows:

Ms. Diane M. Knight, Chair
Term expired June 2011
Dr. Ana Maria Catanzaro
Term expires June 2012
Mr. Michael J. Clark
Term expires June 2013
Dr. Ruben Gallegos
Term expires June 2012
Dr. Antoine Garibaldi
Term expires June 2013
Dr. Charles Handel
Term expires June 2013
Dr. Emmet M. Kenny Jr.
Term expired June 2011
Justice Robert C. Kohm
Term expired June 2011
Judge Anna Moran
Term expires June 2013
Mr. Al Notzon III
Term expires June 2013, appointed January 2011
Dr. Thomas G. Plante
Term expires June 2012
Judge Geraldine Rivera
Term expires June 2012
Dr. Susan Steibe-Pasalich
Term expired June 2011
Mr. Stephen A. Zappala Jr.
Term expires June 2014

The chair is appointed by the USCCB president from persons nominated by the NRB. In January 2009, Cardinal George named Ms. Diane M. Knight to be chair for a two-year term expiring in June 2011. The other officers are elected by the NRB, and committee chairs are appointed by the NRB chair.

The NRB officers and committees were as follows:

Chair: Ms. Diane M. Knight
Vice Chair: Dr. Thomas G. Plante
Secretary: Dr. Ana Maria Catanzaro

Its five committees:

The **Audit Committee**, chaired by Justice Robert C. Kohm, continued its work of keeping the audit process updated and effective. The **Best Practices Committee**, chaired by Judge Geraldine Rivera, looked at ways to measure the effectiveness of safe environment training for children and adults. The **Communications Committee**, chaired by Mr. Mike Clark, focused on the release of the *Causes and Context Study*. The **Research Committee**, chaired by Dr. Susan Steibe-Pasalich, saw the release of the John Jay College of Criminal Justice *Report on the Causes and Context of the Sexual Abuse of Minors by Catholic Priests in the United States, 1950-2010*. The **Nominations Committee**, chaired by Mr. Al Notzon III, elicited nominations of potential NRB candidates for terms beginning in 2011. Those members whose term began in June 2011 are:

Mrs. Coleen Kelly Mast
Term expires June 2015
Dr. Angelo Giardino
Term expires June 2015
Ms. Susan King
Term expires June 2015

In January 2011, Archbishop Dolan appointed Mr. Al Notzon III chairman of the NRB for a two-year term. Mr. Notzon III assumed the office at the end of the June 2011 meeting.

Additional information concerning the NRB can be found at www.usccb.org/about/child-and-youth-protection/the-national-review-board.cfm.

Article II. The President of the Conference is to inform the Holy See of this revised *Charter* to indicate the manner in which we, the Catholic bishops, together with the entire Church in the United States, intend to continue our commitment to the protection of children and young people. The President is also to share with the Holy See the annual reports on the implementation of the *Charter*.

President of the United States Conference of Catholic Bishops, Cardinal Timothy Dolan, has shared a copy of this Annual Report with the Holy See.

TO PROTECT THE FAITHFUL IN THE FUTURE

Article 12. Dioceses/eparchies are to maintain “safe environment” programs which the diocesan/eparchial bishop deems to be in accord with Catholic moral principles. They are to be conducted cooperatively with parents, civil authorities, educators, and community organizations to provide education and training for children, youth, parents, ministers, educators, volunteers, and others about ways to make and maintain a safe environment for children and young people. Dioceses/eparchies are to make clear to clergy and all members of the community the standards of conduct for clergy and other persons in positions of trust with regard to children.

All dioceses/eparchies that participated in the 2011 on-site compliance audits were in compliance with Article 12. StoneBridge issued sixty-five management letter comments related to this article.

Article 12 requires dioceses/eparchies to have safe environment programs for clerics, employees, and volunteers who work with children, as well as for the children themselves. Compliance with this article necessitates the maintenance of a system to verify attendance/participation for each category.

Dioceses/eparchies use a variety of training methods and programs to fulfill this article. Commercial vendors and self-created programs are used for both adult and children’s training. Adult training programs may be live, internet-based, or a combination of both. The *Charter* is silent concerning the actual programs that can be used. At this time, these programs do not have to be approved by the SCYP. As a result, the programs reviewed this year varied considerably. Some were found far more comprehensive and thorough than others.

While the *Charter* is also silent on how often training is to occur, most dioceses/eparchies have an initial

training session and subsequent refreshers. Children’s training programs are as varied as the adult programs. Some are self-generated by the diocese/eparchy, while others are commercial programs. Parents, being the primary teachers of their children, have the option to remove their children from the safe environment training offered by the diocese/eparchy. In addition to the children, training is also mandatory for all individuals working within the Church who have ongoing unsupervised contact with minors.

Thirty dioceses/eparchies received management letter comments regarding this article. Reasons for the comments include parishes or schools failing to offer the classes to children, new pastors or directors of religious education failing to understand diocesan/eparchial requirements to train students, accepting parent training as parish training, or simply counting absent students as opt-outs. Several dioceses/eparchies could not produce written verification from pastors stating that training had taken place, which has been a documentation requirement since 2006.

Challenges

It is clear that record keeping, on both a diocesan and parish level, remains an issue for dioceses/eparchies. Accurate record keeping requires safe environment offices to have a method of obtaining participant data from the parishes and aggregating it for the audit. Without a reliable record-keeping system, it is difficult, if not impossible, to determine who has been trained. This can result in people going untrained in the parishes and schools. While training alone does not make people safer to children, children are safer when all the adults around them are trained in how to recognize grooming behaviors and signs of abuse and how to report such information, all of which adds up to protecting children from being harmed.

The problem of accurate record keeping can be complicated depending on where the safe environment training is offered. For example, attendance in safe environment training programs for students in Catholic schools is typically higher than the attendance of students of parish religious education programs. Keeping track of student training remains difficult in both parishes and schools. Another factor

complicating children’s training includes how often it is offered. If only one lesson a year is offered, a child missing that class is considered untrained. This is a common occurrence in the parish religious education programs. As expected, the more lessons provided per year, the greater the chances of a child being in attendance for at least one of the lessons.

Another issue the audits revealed was the turnover of staff in the dioceses/eparchies. Some new pastors, principals, or directors of religious education programs were not aware of diocesan policies requiring the training of children, which in some cases involved entire parishes or grade levels not being trained during the audit year. Management letter comments were issued to these dioceses/eparchies, with the expectation that these issues would be resolved quickly.

In quite a few states, the teaching of safe environment is mandated as part of the public school curriculum. A growing number of dioceses/eparchies rely on the local public school’s training without confirming that the local public school actually teaches safe environment in their curriculum. In addition, some of these programs have not been reviewed by the local ordinary to determine whether they are in accord with Catholic

moral teaching. For those dioceses/eparchies to which these circumstances applied, the issue was addressed in their respective Management Letters.

One of the greatest challenges facing safe environment training is complacency. If training programs are not updated and are allowed to grow stale, educators and children will become uninterested, and participation will wane. Dioceses/eparchies must continue to impress upon their staff the importance of this program.

Successes

The good news is that most clerics, employees, and volunteers who work with children, as well as children themselves, are being or have been trained. Even as the problems of record keeping are noted, so too are the efforts of dioceses/eparchies to provide the necessary training for their people. The prevention of child sexual abuse is becoming part of parish life.

More and more dioceses/eparchies are auditing their parishes to measure the level of compliance with their own policies. This is a critical part of ensuring compliance, not only with Article 12, but with all aspects of the *Charter*.

Safe Environment Training

Category	Total to Be Trained	Number Trained	Percentage
Priests	38,374	38,150	99.4%
Deacons	15,342	15,259	99.5%
Candidates for Ordination	6,474	6,385	98.6%
Educators	159,689	158,390	99.2%
Employees	249,133	240,180	96.4%
Volunteers	1,850,149	1,781,849	96.3%
Children	5,143,426	4,847,942	94.3%
Children Opted Out by Parents	62,054		1.2%

Safe environment training is powerful for adults as well as children. This training provides, to children in particular, critical, life-forming messages about the skills necessary to protect themselves from the harm of child sexual abuse.

Article 13. Dioceses/eparchies are to evaluate the background of all incardinated and non-incardinated priests and deacons who are engaged in ecclesiastical ministry in the diocese/eparchy and of all diocesan/eparchial and parish/school or other paid personnel and volunteers whose duties include ongoing, unsupervised contact with minors. Specifically, they are to utilize the resources of law enforcement and other community agencies. In addition, they are to employ adequate screening and evaluative techniques in deciding the fitness of candidates for ordination (cf. United States Conference of Catholic Bishops, *Program of Priestly Formation* [Fifth Edition], 2006, no. 39).

All dioceses/eparchies that participated in the 2011 on-site compliance audits were found in compliance with Article 13. Stonebridge issued thirty management letter comments related to this article.

Article 13 requires dioceses/eparchies to evaluate the background of clerics, employees, and volunteers whose duties include ongoing, unsupervised contact with minors. It also requires that candidates for ordination be carefully screened to determine their fitness for either the priesthood or the permanent diaconate.

During the audit process, the auditors used a combination of inquiry, observation, and direct testing to measure compliance with this article. Inquiries were made as to how dioceses/eparchies are conducting background evaluations, on whom they are conducting them, and what screening techniques are employed to determine the fitness of candidates for ordination. Auditors tested compliance by ensuring that individuals working around children underwent

background evaluations and that dioceses/eparchies had systems to accurately record that information.

Background evaluations are another tool by which the Church can build a hedge of protection around children. Screening those whose past behavior reflects behavior that would endanger a child is an important component to every safe environment program. Dioceses/eparchies search criminal history records to determine whether someone should be allowed access to children. In conducting these evaluations, the *Charter* states that diocese/eparchies “are to utilize the resources of law enforcement and other community agencies.” These agencies provide reference checks, including FBI fingerprint records, county law enforcement records, and state and national sex offender registries. It is common for dioceses/eparchies to use a vendor to facilitate this process. Additionally, some states provide direct access to criminal history records at a reduced cost for dioceses/eparchies.

Dioceses/eparchies are doing a thorough job of screening applicants for both the priesthood and the permanent diaconate. Typical screening tools include comprehensive psychological and personality tests, personal interviews with the bishop and/or his committee, letters of recommendation, educational transcripts, employment history, physical exams, and a criminal history record search.

Challenges

This Article requires a tremendous amount of resources, both human and monetary. During the audits, dioceses and eparchies were doing a great job of performing background evaluations on their staff and volunteers; however, enhancements can be made to the process. Examples of management letter comments were: background evaluations are not renewed within some dioceses/eparchies, some do not perform checks outside their geographic area, and there were some inconsistencies noted between diocesan/eparchial policy and parish implementation.

Background Evaluations

Category	Total to be Checked	Number Checked	Percentage
Priests	38,374	38,129	99.36%
Deacons	15,342	15,291	99.67%
Candidates for Ordination	6,474	6,386	98.64%
Educators	159,689	158,855	99.48%
Employees	249,133	241,063	96.76%
Volunteers	1,850,149	1,790,178	96.76%

Article 14. Transfers of clergy who have committed an act of sexual abuse against a minor for residence, including retirement, shall be as in accord with Norm 12 of the Essential Norms. (Cf. *Proposed Guidelines on the Transfer or Assignment of Clergy and Religious*, adopted by the USCCB, the Conference of Major Superiors of Men [CMSM], the Leadership Conference of Women Religious [LCWR], and the Council of Major Superiors of Women Religious [CMSWR] in 1993.)

All dioceses/eparchies that participated in the 2011 on-site compliance audits were found in compliance with Article 14. Stonebridge issued thirteen management letter comments related to this article.

Article 14 states that a cleric who has committed an act of sexual abuse of a minor is not to be transferred to another assignment, either within the same diocese/eparchy or in another diocese/eparchy. This article is further enhanced, because its compliance is dependent on conformance with Norm 12.

All dioceses/eparchies audited are in compliance with this Article as it concerns the transfer of a cleric who has committed an act of sexual abuse. The *Charter* calls for all dioceses/eparchies to have policies and procedures in place directing visiting priests to present information verifying their good standing/status in their diocese/eparchy.

One of the major causes of the anger and disillusionment of the faithful was the transferring of clerics after bishops had information concerning the clerics sexually abusing children. While in the past the bishops may have been acting on the advice of mental health professionals, today there is no circumstance

in which such a transfer is allowed or should be occurring.

As stated in Norm 8, when an act of sexual abuse of a minor has been admitted or established after an appropriate process in accord with canon law, the offending cleric is to be removed permanently from ecclesiastical ministry, not excluding dismissal from the clerical state if the case so warrants. He may not be transferred to another parish or diocese.

Norm 12 further states that

- “Every bishop/eparch who receives a priest or deacon from outside his jurisdiction will obtain the necessary information regarding any past act of sexual abuse of a minor by the priest or deacon in question.
- Before such a diocesan/eparchial priest or deacon can be transferred for residence to another diocese/eparchy, his diocesan/eparchial bishop shall forward, in a confidential manner, to the bishop of the proposed place of residence any and all information concerning any act of sexual abuse of a minor and any other information indicating that he has been or may be a danger to children or young people.
- In the case of the assignment for residence of such a clerical member of an institute or a society into a local community within a diocese/eparchy, the major superior shall inform the diocesan/eparchial bishop and share with him in a manner respecting the limitations of confidentiality found in canon and civil law all information concerning any act of sexual abuse of a minor and any other information indicating that he has been or may be a danger to children or

young people so that the bishop/eparch can make an informed judgment that suitable safeguards are in place for the protection of children or young people. This will be done with due recognition of the legitimate authority of the bishop/eparch.”

The auditors inquired and observed whether dioceses/eparchies were performing adequate background evaluations and requiring letters of good standing (suitability letters) for new priests ministering in a diocese/eparchy. Diocesan/eparchial policies and procedures were reviewed and interviews were also conducted to determine whether the actual practices aligned to the policies. Comments were made to those dioceses/eparchies whose policies were found inconsistent with the practices of their various parishes.

To a great extent parishes are instrumental in the compliance of this Article. Pastors and their employees need to know the diocesan/eparchial policies and procedures when visiting priests minister in the parish. This includes all clerics who are requested or are invited to officiate at weddings, funerals, or baptisms of family members or friend’s children; give retreats; or lend a hand while on vacation. In eleven of the dioceses/eparchies visited this year, the auditors noted a lack of communication between the diocese/eparchy and the parishes regarding the responsibility of requesting and retaining letters of suitability for visiting priests. The policies and procedures of the diocese/eparchy need to be followed in all instances for visiting clerics regardless of the reason for the visit.

This is another promise by the bishops that is a key building block to restoring the trust of the faithful. The faithful must believe the bishops understand their frustration and that they are committed to the idea that only men of integrity are allowed to present themselves as clerics in the Catholic Church.

Article 15. To ensure continuing collaboration and mutuality of effort in the protection of children and young people on the part of the bishops and religious ordinaries, two representatives of the Conference of Major Superiors of Men are to serve as consultants to the Committee on the Protection of Children and Young People. At the invitation of the Major Superiors, the Committee will designate two of its members

to consult with its counterpart at CMSM. Diocesan/eparchial bishops and major superiors of clerical institutes or their delegates are to meet periodically to coordinate their roles concerning the issue of allegations made against a cleric member of a religious institute ministering in a diocese/eparchy.

All dioceses/eparchies that participated in the 2011 on-site compliance audits were found in compliance with Article 15. Stonebridge issued six management letter comments related to this article.

This Article requires that two representatives from the Conference of Major Superiors of Men (CMSM) serve as consultants to the bishops’ CPCYP and that, at the invitation of the CMSM, the CPCYP will designate two of its members to consult with its counterpart at CMSM. This Article also requires periodic meetings between major superiors and bishops for the purpose of coordinating their roles in response to any allegation made against a cleric member of a religious community.

The president of CMSM, Fr. Tom Cassidy, SCJ, and its executive director, Fr. Paul Lininger, OFM Conv, serve as consultants to the CPCYP. They present reports to the bishops at the quarterly meetings of the CPCYP and are part of discussions on all agenda items. Fr. Lininger also serves as consultant to the *Charter* Review Committee, which is made up of members of the CPCYP and the NRB as well as other consultants.

Bishop Cupich, chair of the CPCYP, attended the annual CMSM executive board meeting in February 2010. Due to calendar issues and travel complications of other members, he was the only CPCYP member to attend the 2010 meeting. This meeting provided an opportunity for a bishops’ representative to meet with this executive board to discuss issues of mutual interest as related to the implementation of the *Charter*. Having a forum to discuss these and other issues helps prevent misunderstandings and enhances the strength of the implementation of the *Charter*, with both diocesan and religious clerics working in unison for the healing of victims/survivors and the safety of children in the Church’s care.

Communication between individual bishops and major superiors who have clerics ministering within the diocese is vital. The time to discuss the procedures for handling any allegation concerning a religious order member is prior to an allegation being received.

According to this Article, “Diocesan/eparchial bishops and major superiors of clerical institutes or their delegates are to meet periodically to coordinate their roles concerning the issue of allegations made against a cleric member of a religious institute ministering in a diocese/eparchy.” In the early years of the *Charter*, this meeting/dialogue was frequent, but as the years go by, it is becoming less and less frequent. The *Charter* does not define “periodically,” and though all dioceses/eparchies were found to be compliant, there is growing complacency about this Article developing on the part of both bishops and major superiors. This concern was mentioned in last year’s Annual Report as well.

Bishops and major superiors may not see the need to meet regularly if there have been no personnel changes and no allegations. However, regular communication between all parties can prevent misunderstandings about a myriad of *Charter*-related issues, such as Letters of Suitability, the residence of a removed religious order priest, or the Church response should an allegation be made against a member of a religious order.

Article 16. Given the extent of the problem of the sexual abuse of minors in our society, we are willing to cooperate with other churches and ecclesial communities, other religious bodies, institutions of learning, and other interested organizations in conducting research in this area.

All dioceses/eparchies that participated in the 2011 on-site compliance audits were found in compliance with Article 16. Stonebridge issued no management letter comments related to this article.

Article 16 requires dioceses/eparchies to cooperate with other institutions conducting research in this area. In 2011, 194 out of 195 dioceses/eparchies participated in the CARA Annual Survey, the Diocese

of Lincoln being the only diocese to decline. Most dioceses/eparchies cooperated with the John Jay researchers as they requested information for the Causes and Context study—the retroactive study of clergy sexual abuse commissioned by the bishops and overseen by the NRB. In addition to this research study, dioceses/eparchies worked with a number of agencies outside the Church in the area of child abuse prevention, as they have in the past. The variety of agencies is impressive: Boy Scouts, local child abuse prevention agencies, state and national child welfare agencies, Drug Abuse Resistance Education (D.A.R.E.) programs, and i-SAFE, a leading publisher of media literacy and digital citizenship education materials and programming with worldwide distribution channels. Dioceses also participate in and/or coordinate children’s health fairs, and the national Child Abuse Prevention month of April is used to highlight a variety of diocesan child safety initiatives.

Dioceses/eparchies are more aware today of the countless types of potential harms that threaten a child’s safety, and as a result they are providing information and resources in areas such as internet safety, domestic abuse, pornography, and in one instance even homelessness. This involvement is seen as evidence that child safety is becoming integrated into the Catholic Church culture consistent with the Church’s other efforts to protect the life and dignity of the human person.

Bishop Blase J. Cupich, chair of the CPCYP, with Bishop Conlon, chair elect, Ms. Diane Knight, chair of the NRB, and Ms. Teresa Kettelkamp, executive director of the SCYP, attended the twelfth Anglophone Conference in Rome, Italy, at the end of May and the beginning of June 2011. There were several countries represented for the first time, with many representatives attending from Africa and Asia. The attending countries are eager to learn from other countries and avoid mistakes already made. A bishop from Africa discussed the cultural issue in Africa in regards to the subject of child sexual abuse. In a centuries-old patriarchal society, children are not allowed to say no to adult males. One country makes it clear that if a priest is accused of sexual abuse, he is on his own, as the diocese will neither protect nor hide him. A presentation of the Causes and Context

study by Dr. Karen Terry went well. Msgr. Scicluna of the Congregation for the Doctrine of Faith held a meeting with the U.S. participants about the Causes and Context study. He is supportive and concerned about these issues.

Article 17. We commit ourselves to work individually in our dioceses/eparchies and together as a Conference, through the appropriate committees, to strengthen our programs both for initial priestly formation and for the ongoing formation of priests. With renewed urgency, we will promote programs of human formation for chastity and celibacy for both seminarians and priests based upon the criteria found in *Pastores Dabo Vobis*, the *Program of Priestly Formation*, the *Basic Plan for the Ongoing Formation of Priests*, and the results of the Apostolic Visitation. We will continue to assist priests, deacons, and seminarians in living out their vocation in faithful and integral ways.

All dioceses/eparchies that participated in the 2011 on-site compliance audits were found in compliance with Article 17. Stonebridge issued two management letter comments related to this article.

Article 17 requires cooperation with the apostolic visitation of the seminaries and the strengthening of programs for ongoing formation for seminarians, deacons, and priests. This visitation was completed in the summer of 2006, with the report dated December 15, 2008. The bishops also commit themselves to work to foster reconciliation among all people in their dioceses/eparchies, especially those individuals who were themselves abused and the communities that have suffered because of the sexual abuse of minors that occurred in their midst.

There are many instances of dioceses/eparchies providing outstanding formation programs for their seminarians and clerics. Programs range from spiritual


growth to psychological health. Reinforcement of the four pillars or dimensions of formation (spiritual, pastoral, intellectual, and human) is also a common theme for ongoing formation programs.

Priests and seminarians in the Catholic Church promise to lead chaste and celibate lives. To do that in a healthy, committed manner requires ongoing formation. It is a testament to the sincerity of the bishops and clerics that both time and resources are allotted to the fulfillment of the Article. All dioceses sponsor formation programs for priests, seminarians, and deacons to address these issues. Many have annual conferences dedicated to ongoing formation. In addition, retreats, days of reflection, clergy newsletters, continuing education workshops, etc., may be offered to implement this Article.

Reconciliation among all people of the dioceses/eparchies will always be an ongoing process, especially with individuals and parish communities where abuse has occurred. A new report of a historical allegation can reopen painful wounds in a community. Attention to those communities is an important component of the healing process.

Many bishops continue to respond by offering apologies, presiding over healing Masses, and sponsoring retreats for those harmed by abuse. Victims/survivors who encounter more of a legalistic response by the diocese/eparchy rather than a pastoral one find it more difficult to obtain closure, and the healing process can be prolonged. Dioceses/eparchies then find themselves in long, drawn-out dealings that become more contentious. Both Articles 1 and 17 call for a pastoral approach to outreach and reconciliation.

Strengthening programs for ongoing formation for seminarians, deacons, and priests, and always prioritizing pastoral outreach to victims/survivors are two important components in addressing the Church's past weaknesses to ensure the foundation for the future is well grounded.



Section II

CHAPTER FOUR

2011 Survey of Allegations and Costs

A Summary Report for the Secretariat of Child and Youth Protection United States Conference of Catholic Bishops

February 2012

Center for Applied Research in the Apostolate
Georgetown University
Washington, D.C.

INTRODUCTION

At their Fall General Assembly in November 2004, the United States Conference of Catholic Bishops (USCCB) commissioned the Center for Applied Research in the Apostolate (CARA) at Georgetown University to design and conduct an annual survey of all the dioceses and eparchies whose bishops or eparchs are members of the USCCB. The purpose of this survey is to collect information on new allegations of sexual abuse of minors and the clergy against whom these allegations were made. The survey also gathers information on the amount of money dioceses and eparchies have expended as a result of allegations as well as the amount they have paid for child protection efforts. The national level aggregate results from this survey for each calendar year are prepared for the USCCB and reported in its *Annual Report of the Implementation of the "Charter for the Protection of Children and Young People."*

The questionnaire for the *2011 Annual Survey of Allegations and Costs* was designed by CARA in consultation with the Secretariat of Child and Youth Protection and was nearly identical to the versions used from 2004 to 2010. As in previous years, CARA prepared an online version of the survey and

hosted it on the CARA website. Bishops and eparchs received information about the process for completing the survey in their early-November correspondence from the USCCB and were asked to provide the name of the contact person who would complete the survey. The Conference of Major Superiors of Men (CMSM) also invited major superiors of clerical and mixed religious institutes to complete a similar survey for their congregations, provinces, or monasteries.

CARA completed data collection for the 2011 annual survey on February 6, 2012. All but one of the 195 dioceses and eparchies of the USCCB completed the survey, for a response rate of 99.5 percent. The Diocese of Lincoln once again declined to participate. A total of 165 of the 213 clerical and mixed religious institutes that belong to CMSM responded to the survey, for a response rate of 77 percent. The overall response rate for dioceses, eparchies, and religious institutes was 88 percent, about the same response rate as in previous years for this survey. CARA then prepared the national level summary tables and graphs of the findings for calendar year 2011, with tables comparing allegations and costs from 2004-2011, which are presented in this report.

DIOCESES AND EPARCHIES

The Data Collection Process

Dioceses and eparchies began submitting their data for the 2011 survey in late November 2011. CARA and the Secretariat contacted every diocese or eparchy that had not sent in a contact name by mid-December 2011 to obtain the name of a contact person to complete the survey. CARA and the Secretariat sent multiple e-mail and phone reminders to these contact persons to encourage a high response rate.

By February 6, 2011, all but one of the 195 dioceses and eparchies of the USCCB had responded to the survey, for a response rate of 99.5 percent. The Diocese of Lincoln once again declined to participate. The participation rate among dioceses and eparchies has been nearly unanimous each year of this survey; starting at 93 percent in 2004 and 94 percent in 2005, and has remained at 99 percent since 2006.

A copy of the survey instrument for dioceses and eparchies is included in this report at Appendix B.

Credible Allegations Received by Dioceses and Eparchies in 2011

The responding dioceses and eparchies reported that between January 1 and December 31, 2011, they received 495 new credible allegations of sexual abuse of a minor by a diocesan or eparchial priest or deacon. These allegations were made by 489 individuals against 406 priests or deacons. As Table 1 shows, this is an increase from 2010 in the numbers of victims, allegations, and offenders reported, but less than the numbers reported each year from 2004 through 2008.

Compared to 2010, new reports of allegations increased by 16 percent (from 428 new credible allegations in 2010 to 495 new credible allegations in 2011). The number of alleged offenders increased by nearly one-fifth, from 345 alleged offenders reported in 2010 to 406 alleged offenders reported in 2011.

Of the 495 new allegations reported in 2011, some twenty-one allegations (4 percent), involved children under the age of eighteen in 2010 or 2011. The remaining 474 allegations were made by adults who are alleging abuse when they were minors. By comparison, seven allegations in 2010 (2 percent

Table 1. New Credible Allegations Reported by Dioceses and Eparchies.

	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	Change (+/-) 2010-2011	Percentage Change
Victims	889	690	632	598	620	398	426	489	63	15%
Allegations	898	695	635	599	625	398	428	495	67	16%
Offenders	622	463	394	415	423	286	345	406	61	18%

Sources: Annual Survey of Allegations and Costs, 2004-2011


of all new allegations in 2010), eight allegations in 2009 (2 percent of all new allegations in 2009), ten allegations in 2008 (2 percent of all new allegations received in 2008), four allegations in 2007 (less than 1 percent of all new allegations received in 2007), fourteen allegations in 2006 (2 percent of all new allegations received in 2006), nine allegations in 2005 (1 percent of all new allegations received in 2005), and twenty-two allegations in 2004 (2 percent of new allegations received in 2004) involved children under the age of eighteen in each of those years.

Figure 1 illustrates the way in which allegations were reported to the dioceses or eparchies in 2011. More than half of all new allegations (54 percent) were reported by the victim, and one-quarter (25 percent) were reported by an attorney.

Compared to 2010, there are few differences in who reported the allegations:

- Allegations reported by attorneys decreased slightly, from 28 percent in 2010 to 25 percent in 2011.
- A bishop of another diocese reported 2 percent of allegations in 2011, compared to 4 percent in 2010.
- Six percent of all allegations were reported by someone other than the victim, an attorney, a family member, a friend, law enforcement, or a bishop from another diocese, compared to 3 percent in 2010. Some of these other persons reporting allegations include other priests, parishioners, parish secretary, a former spouse, school principal, counselors or therapists, the media, and the diocesan review board.

Figure 1. Method of Reporting Allegations of Abuse: Dioceses and Eparchies.



Source: 2011 Survey of Allegations and Costs

Figure 2 presents the percentage of all new allegations of abuse that were cases involving solely child pornography. Of the 495 total allegations, six allegations involved only child pornography, compared to two reported in 2010.


Victims, Offenses, and Offenders in 2011

The sex of eight of the 489 alleged victims reported in 2011 was not identified in the allegation. Among those for whom the sex of the victim was reported, 82 percent (395 victims) were male and 18 percent (86 victims) were female. This proportion is illustrated in Figure 3.

The proportion of male and female victims is identical to that reported in 2010 (82 percent males and 18 percent females).


Half of the victims (50 percent) were between the ages of ten and fourteen when the alleged abuse began. An equal proportion of the victims (16 percent each) were between the ages of fifteen and seventeen or under age ten. The age could not be determined for almost one-fifth of victims (19 percent). Figure 4 presents the distribution of victims by age at the time the alleged abuse began.

Figure 2. Percentage of Allegations Involving Only Child Pornography: Dioceses and Eparchies.




Source: 2011 Survey of Allegations and Costs

Figure 3. Sex of Abuse Victim: Dioceses and Eparchies.



Source: 2011 Survey of Allegations and Costs

Figure 4. Age of Victim When Abuse Began: Dioceses and Eparchies.



Source: 2011 Survey of Allegations and Costs

Figure 5 shows the years in which the abuse reported in 2011 was alleged to have occurred or begun. Two-thirds of new allegations (68 percent) occurred or began between 1960 and 1984. The most common time period for allegations reported in 2011 was 1975-1979. This is approximately the same time pattern that has been reported in previous years, with most allegations reportedly occurring or beginning between the mid-1960s and the mid-1980s. For thirty-three new allegations reported in 2011 (7 percent), no time frame for the alleged abuse could be determined by the allegation.


Of the 406 diocesan or eparchial priests or deacons who were identified in new allegations in 2011, nearly all (88 percent) had been ordained for the diocese or eparchy in which the abuse was alleged to have occurred. At the time of the alleged abuse, 3 percent of alleged perpetrators were priests or deacons who were incardinated into that diocese or eparchy, and 2 percent were extern priests who were serving in the diocese temporarily. Five of the alleged perpetrators (1 percent) identified in new allegations

in 2011 were permanent deacons. Three percent of alleged perpetrators were classified as “other,” most commonly because they were either unnamed in the allegation or their name was unknown to the diocese or eparchy. Figure 6 displays the ecclesial status of offenders at the time of the alleged offense.

Almost two in three (64 percent) of the 406 priests and deacons identified as alleged offenders in 2011 had already been identified in prior allegations. In 2010, that proportion was 58 percent. Figure 7 depicts the percentage with prior allegations in 2011, compared to previous years.


Three-quarters of alleged offenders (75 percent) identified in 2011 are deceased, already removed from ministry, already laicized, or missing. Another twenty-one priests or deacons (5 percent) were permanently removed from ministry in 2011. In addition to the twenty-one offenders identified in 2011 and permanently removed from ministry in 2010, another eighteen priests or deacons who had been identified in allegations of abuse *before* 2011 were permanently removed from ministry in 2011.

Figure 5. Year Alleged Offense Occurred or Began: Dioceses and Eparchies.




Source: 2011 Survey of Allegations and Costs

Figure 6. Ecclesial Status of Alleged Perpetrator: Dioceses and Eparchies.



Source: 2011 Survey of Allegations and Costs

Figure 7. Percentage of Alleged Perpetrators with Prior Allegations: Dioceses and Eparchies.



Sources: Annual Survey of Allegations and Costs, 2006-2011

Twenty-five priests or deacons were returned to ministry in 2011 based on the resolution of an allegation made during or prior to 2011 (eleven who were identified in 2011 and fourteen who were identified before 2011). In addition, 127 priests or deacons (fifty-five who were identified in 2011 and seventy-two who were identified before 2011) have been temporarily removed from ministry pending completion of an investigation. Notwithstanding the year in which the abuse was reported, twelve diocesan and eparchial clergy remain in active ministry pending a preliminary investigation of an allegation (eight who were identified in 2011 and four who were identified prior to 2011). Figure 8 shows the current status of alleged offenders.


Of the 495 new credible allegations reported in 2011, fifty-four new allegations (11 percent) were unsubstantiated or determined to be false by December 31, 2011. In addition, twenty-three allegations received prior to 2011 were unsubstantiated or determined to be false during 2011. Figure 9 presents the percentage of all new credible allegations received in 2011 that were unsubstantiated or determined to be false in 2011, compared to previous years.

Costs to Dioceses and Eparchies in 2011

Dioceses and eparchies that responded to the survey and reported costs related to allegations paid out \$107,814,410 in 2011. This includes payments in 2011 for allegations reported in previous years. Thirty-four responding dioceses and eparchies reported no expenditures in 2010 related to allegations of sexual abuse of a minor. Table 2 compares payments by dioceses and eparchies from 2004 through 2011 across several categories of allegation-related expenses. The total costs reported by dioceses and eparchies in 2011 are \$9,451,263 more than those reported in 2010.


Almost half of the payments by dioceses and eparchies in 2011 (46 percent) were for settlements to victims. Attorneys' fees constituted an additional third (34 percent) of the total cost (\$36,737,366).¹ Support for offenders (including therapy, living expenses, legal expenses, etc.) amounted to another 9 percent of allegation-related costs (\$9,862,110).² An additional 5 percent of the total cost was for payments for therapy for victims (if not already included in the settlement). Payments for settlements and therapy for victims as well as support for offenders decreased, while payments

Figure 8. Current Status of Alleged Perpetrators: Dioceses and Eparchies.



Source: 2011 Survey of Allegations and Costs

Figure 9. New Allegations Unsubstantiated or Determined to Be False: Dioceses and Eparchies.



Sources: Annual Survey of Allegations and Costs, 2006-2011

Table 2. Costs Related to Allegations by Dioceses and Eparchies.

	Settlements	Therapy for Victims	Support for Offenders	Attorneys' Fees	Other Costs	GRAND TOTAL
2004	\$93,364,172	\$6,613,283	\$1,413,093	\$32,706,598	\$5,485,011	\$139,582,157
2005	\$386,010,171	\$7,648,226	\$11,831,028	\$36,467,516	\$3,729,607	\$445,686,548
2006	\$220,099,188	\$9,731,815	\$30,362,609	\$69,780,366	\$2,996,581	\$332,970,559
2007	\$420,385,135	\$7,243,663	\$13,347,981	\$53,394,074	\$4,308,005	\$498,678,858
2008	\$324,181,740	\$7,114,697	\$11,605,914	\$29,572,948	\$3,766,432	\$376,241,731
2009	\$55,048,006	\$6,536,109	\$10,894,368	\$28,705,402	\$3,255,744	\$104,439,629
2010	\$70,375,228	\$6,423,099	\$9,931,727	\$33,895,944	\$3,077,435	\$123,703,433
2011	\$50,374,648	\$6,142,810	\$9,862,110	\$36,737,366	\$5,562,772	\$108,679,706
Change (+/-)						
2010-2011	-\$20,000,580	-\$280,289	-\$69,617	\$2,841,422	\$2,485,337	-\$15,023,727

Sources: Annual Survey of Allegations and Costs, 2004-2011

for attorneys’ fees and other costs both increased over those reported in 2010.

Among the “other” costs reported by dioceses and eparchies (\$5,562,772) are payments for items such as investigations of allegations, medical costs and other support for victims or survivors, costs for mediation, travel expenses for victims, therapy and other support for family members of victims, costs for victim hotlines, clergy misconduct review boards, monitoring services for offenders, advertising, insurance premiums, and USCCB compliance audit costs.


Figure 10 displays the costs paid by dioceses and eparchies for settlements and for attorneys’ fees from 2004 through 2011.

Compared to 2010, amounts paid for settlements in 2011 decreased by 28 percent, and the amount paid in attorneys’ fees increased by 8 percent. Amounts paid for therapy for victims and support for offenders declined between 1 and 4 percent, while the amount paid for other costs increased by 81 percent during that time.

Figure 11 illustrates the total allegation-related costs paid by dioceses and eparchies and the approximate proportion of those costs that were covered by diocesan insurance. Diocesan insurance payments covered just over one-quarter (27 percent) of the total allegation-related costs paid by dioceses and eparchies in 2011. By comparison, insurance paid for 28 percent of the total allegation-related costs paid by dioceses and eparchies in 2010, just over one-third (34 percent) in 2009, 38 percent in 2008, just over one-third (34 percent) in 2007, just over one-quarter (27 percent) in 2006, nearly half (49 percent) in 2005, and one-third (32 percent) in 2004.


In addition to allegation-related expenditures, at least \$30,129,584 was spent by dioceses and eparchies for child protection efforts such as safe environment coordinators, training programs, and background checks, an increase of 44 percent above the \$20,054,405 reported for those expenses in 2010. Figure 12 compares the allegation-related costs to child protection expenditures paid by dioceses and eparchies from 2004 through 2011.

Figure 10. Payments for Settlements and Attorneys’ Fees: Dioceses and Eparchies.




Sources: Annual Survey of Allegations and Costs, 2004-2011

Figure 11. Proportion of Total Allegation-Related Costs Paid by Insurance: Dioceses and Eparchies.



Sources: Annual Survey of Allegations and Costs, 2004-2011

Figure 12. Costs for Settlements and Child Protection Efforts: Dioceses and Eparchies.



Sources: Annual Survey of Allegations and Costs, 2004-2011

CLERICAL AND MIXED RELIGIOUS INSTITUTES

The Conference of Major Superiors of Men (CMSM) also encouraged the major superiors of clerical and mixed religious institutes to complete a survey for their congregations, provinces, or monasteries. This survey was nearly identical to the survey for dioceses and eparchies and was also available online at the same site as the survey for dioceses and eparchies. CMSM sent a letter and a copy of the survey to all member major superiors in mid-November 2011, requesting their participation. CARA and CMSM also sent several e-mail and fax reminders to major superiors to encourage them to respond. By February 6, 2012, CARA received responses from 165 of the 213 clerical and mixed religious institutes that belong to CMSM, for a response rate of 77 percent. This is the highest response rate so far to this survey, surpassing each of the previous years of the survey (72 percent in 2010, 73 percent in 2009, 2008, and 2007, 68 percent in 2006, 67 percent in 2005, and 71 percent in 2004).

A copy of the survey instrument for religious institutes is included at Appendix C.

Credible Allegations Received by Clerical and Mixed Religious Institutes in 2011

The responding clerical and mixed religious institutes reported that between January 1 and December 31, 2011, they received ninety-nine new credible allegations of sexual abuse of a minor committed by a priest

or deacon of the community. These allegations were made against fifty-five individuals who were priest or deacon members of the community at the time the offense was alleged to have occurred. Table 3 presents these numbers and the comparable numbers reported from 2004 through 2010. New reports of allegations increased by 29 percent from 2010, and the number of alleged offenders decreased by 5 percent.

Two of the new allegations reported by religious institutes in 2011 involved children under the age of eighteen in 2010 or 2011. The other ninety-seven allegations were made by adults who are alleging abuse as minors in previous years. By comparison, no new allegations in 2010 or 2009, three allegations in 2008 (2 percent of new allegations received in 2008) one allegation in 2007 (1 percent), three allegations in 2006 (4 percent), no allegations in 2005, and one allegation in 2004 involved children under the age of eighteen in each of those years.

Figure 13 displays the way in which allegations were reported to the religious institutes in 2011. More than half of the allegations (54 percent) were reported by the victim. One in five (21 percent) were reported by an attorney. A bishop or eparch, most typically from the diocese or eparchy in which the accused offender was serving at the time the alleged abuse occurred, reported 14 percent of allegations. Five percent of allegations were reported by a family member, 4 percent by law enforcement, and 2 percent were reported by someone else.

Table 3. New Credible Allegations Reported by Religious Institutes.


	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	Change (+/-) 2010-2011	Percentage Change
Victims	194	87	78	91	176	115	75	99	24	32%
Allegations	194	88	79	92	178	115	77	99	22	29%
Offenders	134	69	54	76	95	60	60	55	-5	-8%

Sources: Annual Survey of Allegations and Costs, 2004-2011

Compared to 2010, the proportion of all allegations that were reported by a victim increased, and the proportion reported by a bishop/eparch decreased. These percentage changes, however, are the result of small differences in the number of allegations within the categories, because the total number of allegations reported by religious institutes (99) is much smaller than the total number reported by dioceses and eparchies (495). Some of the differences in reporting in recent years include:

- Victims reported 54 percent of allegations in 2011, compared to 39 percent in 2010, 15 percent in 2009, 23 percent in 2008, and 38 percent in 2007.
- A bishop or eparch reported 14 percent of allegations in 2011, compared to 32 percent in 2010, 9 percent in 2009, 10 percent in 2008, and 30 percent in 2007.
- Attorneys reported 21 percent of allegations in 2011, identical to the proportion reported by attorneys in 2010, compared to 68 percent in 2009, 60 percent in 2008, and 16 percent in 2007.
- Family members reported 5 percent of allegations in 2011 and 2010, compared to 7 percent in 2009 and 3 percent in 2008 and 2007.
- Two percent of new credible allegations in 2011 were reported by “Other,” compared to 3 percent in 2010, 1 percent in 2009, 1 percent in 2008, and 10 percent in 2007.

Figure 13. Method of Reporting Allegations of Abuse: Religious Institutes.



Source: 2011 Survey of Allegations and Costs

None of the ninety-nine new allegations of abuse were cases solely involving child pornography, as is shown in Figure 14. Similarly, none of the allegations in 2010 or 2009, two allegations in 2008, one allegation each in 2007, 2006, 2005, and none in 2004 involved child pornography alone.

Victims, Offenses, and Offenders in 2011


Nearly all the alleged victims reported in 2011 were male (94 percent); 6 percent were female. By comparison, in 2010 the ratio was 77 percent male and 23 percent female; in 2009 religious institutes reported that eight in ten alleged victims were male and fewer than one in five were female. The proportion male and female is displayed in Figure 15.

Close to half of victims (46 percent) were ages fifteen to seventeen when the alleged abuse began, and

nearly as many (43 percent) were between ten and fourteen. One in twenty (6 percent) was under age ten, and the age of the victim could not be determined for two of the new allegations (2 percent). Figure 16 presents the distribution of victims by age at the time the alleged abuse began.


One-third of the new allegations reported in 2011 (33 percent) are alleged to have occurred or begun before 1960, and another four in ten were between 1960 and 1980. Religious institutes reported that 1955-1959 was the most common time period for the alleged occurrences, earlier than the mid-1970s time frame that was most commonly reported in prior years. Just four of the new allegations reported in 2011 are alleged to have occurred or begun since 1989. Figure 17 illustrates the years when the allegations reported in 2011 were said to have occurred or begun.

Figure 14. Percentage of Allegations Involving Only Child Pornography: Religious Institutes.




Source: 2011 Survey of Allegations and Costs

Figure 15. Sex of Abuse Victim: Religious Institutes.



Source: 2011 Survey of Allegations and Costs

Figure 16. Age of Victim When Abuse Began: Religious Institutes.



Source: 2011 Survey of Allegations and Costs


Of the fifty-five religious priests against whom new allegations were made in 2011, most (79 percent) were priests of a U.S. province or community, serving in the United States at the time the abuse was alleged to have occurred. None of those identified in new allegations in 2011 were deacons. Figure 18 displays the ecclesial status of offenders at the time of the alleged abuse.

A little more than one in ten alleged offenders (14 percent) were priests who were members of the province at the time of the alleged abuse but who are no longer a member of the religious institute. Another 2 percent were priests of the province who were assigned outside of the United States at the time of

the alleged abuse, and 3 percent were priests who were members of another province at the time of the alleged abuse.


Just over one-third (36 percent) of the religious priests against whom new allegations were made in 2011 had no prior allegations. Two-thirds (64 percent) had already been the subject of previous allegations in prior years. This is similar to the pattern reported in 2006, but the reverse of the pattern from 2010 through 2007, when the majority of the alleged perpetrators had no previous allegations against them. Figure 19 presents the proportions for 2011 compared to previous years.

Figure 17. Year Alleged Offense Occurred or Began: Religious Institutes.




Source: 2011 Survey of Allegations and Costs

Figure 18. Ecclesial Status of Alleged Perpetrator: Religious Institutes.




Source: 2011 Survey of Allegations and Costs

Figure 19. Percentage of Alleged Perpetrators with Prior Allegations: Religious Institutes.




Sources: Annual Survey of Allegations and Costs, 2006-2011

Figure 20. Current Status of Alleged Perpetrators: Religious Institutes.



Source: 2011 Survey of Allegations and Costs

Figure 21. New Allegations Unsubstantiated or Determined to Be False: Religious Institutes.



Sources: Annual Survey of Allegations and Costs, 2006-2011

Seven in ten of the alleged offenders identified in 2011 (thirty-eight priests) were deceased, had already been removed from ministry, or had already left the religious institute at the time the allegation was reported. Another 7 percent of alleged offenders identified in 2011 were permanently removed from ministry in 2011. Figure 20 displays the current status of alleged offenders.

In addition to the offenders identified in 2011 and permanently removed from ministry in 2011, another eleven priests who had been identified in allegations of abuse *before* 2011 were permanently removed from ministry in 2011.

Four priests were returned to ministry in 2011 based on the resolution of an allegation made in 2010 or earlier. In addition, twenty religious priests (seven who were identified in 2011 and thirteen who were identified before 2011) were temporarily removed pending completion of an investigation. No priests are reported to be in active ministry pending a preliminary investigation of an allegation, notwithstanding the year in which the abuse was reported.

Of the ninety-nine new allegations reported to religious institutes in 2011, 8 percent (eight new

allegations) were determined to be unsubstantiated by December 31, 2011. In addition, eight allegations received prior to 2011 were determined to be unsubstantiated during 2011. Figure 21 presents the percentage of all new allegations received in 2011 that were determined to be unsubstantiated in 2011 and compares it with the same data for previous years.

Costs to Clerical and Mixed Religious Institutes in 2011

The responding clerical and mixed religious institutes reported \$35,372,010 paid out in 2011 for costs related to allegations. This includes costs paid in 2011 for allegations reported in previous years. Table 4 compares the payments by religious institutes from 2004 through 2011 across several categories of allegation-related expenses. The total reported allegation-related costs to clerical and mixed religious institutes is nearly \$10 million more in 2011 than in 2010.

Two-thirds of the payments by religious institutes in 2011 (66 percent) were for settlements to victims. Attorneys' fees were an additional \$4,654,670 (13 percent of all costs related to allegations reported by religious institutes). Support for offenders (including therapy, living expenses, legal expenses, etc.)

Table 4. Costs Related to Allegations by Religious Institutes.

	Settlements	Therapy for Victims	Support for Offenders	Attorneys' Fees	Other Costs	GRAND TOTAL
2004	\$12,877,637	\$793,053	\$456,237	\$3,544,847	\$548,880	\$18,220,654
2005	\$13,027,285	\$755,971	\$1,838,110	\$4,784,124	\$841,434	\$21,246,924
2006	\$57,114,232	\$913,924	\$1,905,534	\$5,374,850	\$318,595	\$65,627,135
2007	\$105,841,148	\$691,775	\$2,097,993	\$7,073,540	\$781,375	\$116,485,831
2008	\$50,226,814	\$792,426	\$2,620,194	\$5,856,003	\$406,029	\$59,901,466
2009	\$8,527,837	\$754,744	\$1,632,585	\$4,291,209	\$441,992	\$15,648,367
2010	\$18,361,845	\$543,821	\$1,842,696	\$4,844,435	\$327,950	\$25,920,747
2011	\$23,307,134	\$804,175	\$2,083,899	\$4,654,670	\$4,522,132	\$35,372,010
Change (+/-)						
2010-2011	\$4,945,289	\$260,354	\$241,203	-\$189,765	\$4,194,182	\$9,451,263

Sources: Annual Survey of Allegations and Costs, 2004-2011

amounted to \$2,083,899 (6 percent).³ An additional \$804,175 (2 percent) was for payments for therapy for victims (if not included in the settlement).


Payments designated as “other costs” reported by religious institutes (\$4,522,132) included victim outreach and assistance programs, support for victims and their families, travel expenses, consultants and investigators, external review board, and Praesidium expenses. Extraordinary expense at one institute accounted for more than 80 percent of this total.

Figure 22 illustrates the settlement-related costs and attorneys’ fees paid by religious institutes from 2004 through 2011. Settlement costs in 2011 are higher than those paid out in 2004, 2005, 2009, and 2010 but lower than settlements paid in 2006-2008. Four religious institutes with relatively large settlements in 2007 accounted for 70 percent of the settlement costs in that year. Attorneys’ fees have remained relatively stable between 2004 and 2011.

Figure 23 displays the total allegation-related costs paid by religious institutes from 2004 through 2011 and the proportion of those costs that were covered by insurance. Very little (3 percent) of the total allegation-related costs paid by religious institutes in 2011 was covered by insurance, almost identical to the 4 percent that was covered by insurance in 2010. By comparison, 7 percent of the total allegation-related costs in 2009, 19 percent in 2008, 34 percent in 2007, 23 percent in 2006, 13 percent in 2005, and 12 percent in 2004 were covered by insurance.


In addition to allegation-related expenditures, religious institutes spent more than two and a half million dollars (\$2,595,927) for child protection efforts, such as training programs and background checks. This is approximately a million dollars more than the amount paid by religious institutes in 2010, and surpasses the amount paid in any previous year for child protection efforts. Figure 24 compares the settlement-related costs and child protection expenditures paid by religious institutes in 2004 through 2011.

Figure 22. Payments for Settlements and Attorneys’ Fees: Religious Institutes.




Sources: Annual Survey of Allegations and Costs, 2004-2011

Figure 23. Approximate Percentage of Total Paid by Insurance: Religious Institutes.



Sources: Annual Survey of Allegations and Costs, 2004-2011

Figure 24. Costs for Settlements and Child Protection Efforts: Religious Institutes.



Sources: Annual Survey of Allegations and Costs, 2004-2011

TOTAL RESPONSES OF DIOCESES, EPARCHIES, AND CLERICAL AND MIXED RELIGIOUS INSTITUTES

Tables 5, 6, and 7 present the combined total responses of dioceses, eparchies, and clerical and mixed religious institutes. These tables depict the total number of allegations, victims, offenders, and costs as reported by these groups in 2011. In addition, the tables also show the same combined figures for 2004 through 2010 to compare the totals across years.

As Table 5 shows, the total number of new allegations and victims decreased each year from 2004 through 2007, increased in 2008, and decreased to their lowest level in 2010. The total number of new allegations and victims reported in 2011 is slightly higher than in 2010, increasing by 17 and 18 percent, respectively.

By comparison, the total number of alleged offenders decreased each year between 2004 and 2006, increased in 2007 and 2008, and decreased again in 2009. The total number of alleged offenders increased again in 2010 and 2011, though. Compared to 2010, the number of alleged offenders increased by 14 percent.

Table 6 displays the combined total costs for payments related to allegations, as reported each year from 2004 to 2011.

- The total costs related to allegations decreased by 4 percent between 2010 and 2011. These total costs had increased nearly every year between 2004 and 2007, but have been decreasing since then.
- The amount paid in settlements in 2007 was unusually large, while the amount paid for therapy for victims, support for offenders, and attorneys’ fees was highest in 2006.
- The overall trend across the categories is one of generally increasing costs related to allegations each year from 2004 to 2006 or 2007 and then decreasing costs in 2008 and 2009. Nearly all the increase in 2010 is attributable to settlements and attorneys’ fees.
- In 2011, attorney’s fees and other costs increased, while the amount paid in settlements decreased by 17 percent from that paid in 2010. Costs related to therapy for victims and support for offenders remained stable.

Table 7 compares the total costs for allegation-related expenses and the amount expended for child protection efforts from 2004 through 2011. The total amount spent for allegation-related expenses decreased by 4 percent between 2010 and 2011, while the total amount reported for child protection efforts increased by 45 percent during the same period.

Table 5. New Credible Allegations Reported: Combined Totals.

	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	Change (+/-)	Percentage Change
Victims	1083	777	710	689	796	513	501	588	87	17%
Allegations	1092	783	714	691	803	513	505	594	89	18%
Offenders	756	532	448	491	518	346	405	461	56	14%

Sources: Annual Survey of Allegations and Costs, 2004-2011

Table 6. Costs Related to Allegations: Combined Totals.

	Settlements	Therapy for Victims	Support for Offenders	Attorneys' Fees	Other Costs	GRAND TOTAL
2004	\$106,241,809	\$7,406,336	\$1,869,330	\$36,251,445	\$6,033,891	\$157,802,811
2005	\$399,037,456	\$8,404,197	\$13,669,138	\$41,251,640	\$4,571,041	\$466,933,472
2006	\$277,213,420	\$10,645,739	\$32,268,143	\$75,155,216	\$3,315,176	\$398,597,694
2007	\$526,226,283	\$7,935,438	\$15,445,974	\$60,467,614	\$5,089,380	\$615,164,689
2008	\$374,408,554	\$7,907,123	\$14,226,108	\$35,428,951	\$4,172,461	\$436,143,197
2009	\$63,575,843	\$7,290,853	\$12,526,953	\$32,996,611	\$3,697,736	\$120,087,996
2010	\$88,737,073	\$6,966,920	\$11,774,423	\$38,740,379	\$3,405,385	\$149,624,180
2011	\$73,681,782	\$6,946,985	\$11,946,009	\$41,392,036	\$10,084,904	\$144,051,716
Change (+/-)						
2010-2011	-\$15,055,291	-\$19,935	\$171,586	\$2,651,657	\$6,679,519	-\$5,572,464

Sources: Annual Survey of Allegations and Costs, 2004-2011


Table 7. Costs for Settlements and Child Protection: Combined Totals.

	Settlement- related Costs	Child Protection Efforts
2004	\$157,802,811	\$20,199,409
2005	\$466,933,472	\$20,054,984
2006	\$398,597,694	\$27,001,731
2007	\$615,164,689	\$22,153,145
2008	\$436,143,197	\$24,558,498
2009	\$120,087,996	\$22,223,022
2010	\$149,624,180	\$22,545,999
2011	\$144,051,716	\$32,725,511
Change (+/-)		
2010-2011	-\$5,572,464	\$10,179,512

Sources: Annual Survey of Allegations and Costs, 2004-2011

Notes

- 1 Attorneys' fees include all costs for attorneys paid by dioceses and eparchies in 2011 as the result of allegations of sexual abuse of a minor.
- 2 This reported cost increased substantially after 2004, largely due to a change in question wording. In 2005, the question was changed from "Payments for therapy for offenders" to "Payments for support for offenders (including living expenses, legal expenses, therapy, etc.)" to more accurately capture the full costs to dioceses and eparchies for support of alleged offenders.
- 3 The difference in cost here between 2004 and later years is largely attributable to a change in question wording in 2005. See the explanation in the previous footnote.



Section III

CHAPTER FIVE

Status of the Recommendations from the 2010 Audit Period

I. RECORD KEEPING

Record keeping within the safe environment training area can still be improved in many dioceses/eparchies, based upon our examination. However, record-keeping practices surrounding background evaluations appeared sufficient this year.

2. PARISH ACCOUNTABILITY

Parish accountability remains a critical component in implementing the *Charter*. As a result of our audits, the auditors continue to observe that pastors do not consistently follow diocesan/eparchial policies. The auditors have found that dioceses that audit their own parishes have stricter adherence to safe environment policies. Unfortunately, many of the dioceses/eparchies observed are not consistently auditing their parishes.

3. OUTCOME CATEGORIES OF THE INVESTIGATION OF ALLEGATIONS

Although dioceses/eparchies may define the status of allegations differently, the auditors did not find this

impeded their ability to interpret the allegations presented in the 2011 audits.

4. CHARTER DRIFT

As the number of allegations continues to drop in most dioceses/eparchies, complacency will continue to be a challenge and is further described in this report.

5. MANAGEMENT LETTER ACCOUNTABILITY

This particular issue was addressed during the 2011 audit process. Dioceses/eparchies were required to sign and acknowledge Management Letters, and many have offered written responses in reply.

6. ROLE OF SCYP/NRB AND CHARTER AUDIT RECOMMENDATIONS

This charge was communicated to the new auditing firm upon being retained, and their comments and recommendations were instrumental in developing the 2011 audit program used by the auditors.

CHAPTER SIX

Recommendations from the 2011 Audit Period

PROMULGATION LETTERS

The auditors have noted that, to meet the *Charter* requirements, dioceses/eparchies are increasingly relying on the public school systems to train and educate the children who are enrolled in religious education programs. In accordance with Bishop Aymond's 2006 memo, bishops/eparchs must sign letters promulgating each public school program within the diocese/eparchy and state that each program is in accordance with Catholic moral principles.

PARISH ACCOUNTABILITY

To continue to drive parish accountability, parish audits should be performed by diocesan/eparchial personnel on a regular basis and become a required component of the on-site *Charter* audit process.

SUITABILITY LETTERS

Suitability Letters or Letters of Good Standing are a vital part of the process to validate a visiting or transferring priest into the diocese/eparchy. It is the responsibility of the diocese/eparchy to ensure that the records and policies governing this area are being maintained to achieve compliance. Responsibilities of both the dioceses/eparchies and their parishes should be clearly defined.

COMPLACENCY

The audits in 2011 revealed a growing complacency in areas of frequency of diocesan review board meetings, safe environment training programs, and revising related policies and procedures. Training programs

and policies need constant refreshing to meet the demands of an ever-changing society.

RECORD KEEPING


A tremendous disconnect exists among parishes within most dioceses/eparchies as to how they account for their employees and volunteers. This also bodes true among dioceses/eparchies. While some have implemented advanced database systems, others are still using manual paper files, which can hinder diocesan oversight. A concerted effort should be made by dioceses to identify strong programs currently being used by some of their parishes and standardize them throughout.

RELIGIOUS ORDERS

A significant amount of the allegations involve priests from various religious orders who are granted permission to minister in the dioceses. Many dioceses accept safe environment training provided by the orders for these priests. To meet the requirements of diocesan policy, diocesan safe environment training should be provided to these priests upon their arrival, or the orders themselves should be subject to audit.

MONITORING OF "CHARTERED" PRIESTS

During the audits, numerous dioceses communicated their current challenges in being able to monitor priests who have been "chartered"—are on safety plans or are living a life of prayer and penance. The facilities and resources needed for these programs are beyond the capabilities of most dioceses. This issue needs to be addressed by the bishops.



Appendices

APPENDIX A

2011 Charter for the Protection of Children and Young People

PREAMBLE

Since 2002, the Church in the United States has experienced a crisis without precedent in our times. The sexual abuse of children and young people by some deacons, priests, and bishops, and the ways in which these crimes and sins were addressed, have caused enormous pain, anger, and confusion. As bishops, we have acknowledged our mistakes and our roles in that suffering, and we apologize and take responsibility again for too often failing victims and the Catholic people in the past. From the depths of our hearts, we bishops express great sorrow and profound regret for what the Catholic people have endured.

Again, with this 2011 revision of the *Charter for the Protection of Children and Young People*, we reaffirm our deep commitment to creating a safe environment within the Church for children and youth. We have listened to the profound pain and suffering of those victimized by sexual abuse and will continue to respond to their cries. We have agonized over the sinfulness, the criminality, and the breach of trust perpetrated by some members of the clergy. We have determined as best we can the extent of the problem of this abuse of minors by clergy in our country, as well as commissioned a study of the causes and context of this problem.

We continue to have a special care for and a commitment to reaching out to the victims of sexual abuse and their families. The damage caused by sexual abuse of minors is devastating and long-lasting. We apologize to them for the grave harm that has been inflicted on them, and we offer our help for the future. The loss of trust that is often the consequence of such abuse becomes even more tragic when it leads to a loss of the faith that we have a sacred duty to foster. We make our own the words of His Holiness, Pope John Paul II: that the sexual abuse of young people is “by every standard wrong and rightly considered a crime by society; it is also an appalling sin in the eyes of God” (Address to the Cardinals of the United States and Conference Officers, April 23, 2002).

Along with the victims and their families, the entire Catholic community in this country has suffered because of this scandal and its consequences. In the last nine years, the intense public scrutiny of the minority of the ordained who have betrayed their calling has caused the vast majority of faithful priests and deacons to experience enormous vulnerability to being misunderstood in their ministry and even to the possibility of false accusations. We share with them a firm commitment to renewing the image of the vocation to Holy Orders so that it will continue to be perceived as a life of service to others after the example of Christ our Lord.

We, who have been given the responsibility of shepherding God’s people, will, with his help and in full collaboration with all the faithful, continue to work to restore the bonds of trust that unite us. Words alone cannot accomplish this goal. It will begin with the actions we take in our General Assembly and at home in our dioceses and eparchies.

We feel a particular responsibility for “the ministry of reconciliation” (2 Cor 5:18) which God, who reconciled us to himself through Christ, has given us. The love of Christ impels us to ask forgiveness for our own faults but also to appeal to all—to those who have been victimized, to those who have offended, and to all who have felt the wound of this scandal—to be reconciled to God and one another.

Perhaps in a way never before experienced, we have felt the power of sin touch our entire Church family in this country; but as St. Paul boldly says, God made Christ “to be sin who did not know sin, so that we might become the righteousness of God in him” (2 Cor 5:21). May we who have known sin experience as well, through a spirit of reconciliation, God’s own righteousness.

We know that after such profound hurt, healing and reconciliation are beyond human capacity alone. It is God’s grace and mercy that will lead us forward, trusting Christ’s promise: “for God all things are possible” (Mt 19:26).

In working toward fulfilling this responsibility, we have relied first of all on Almighty God to sustain us in faith and in the discernment of the right course to take.

We have received fraternal guidance and support from the Holy See that has sustained us in this time of trial.

We have relied on the Catholic faithful of the United States. Nationally and in each diocese, the wisdom and expertise of clergy, religious, and laity have contributed immensely to confronting the effects of the crisis and have taken steps to resolve it. We are filled with gratitude for their great faith, for their generosity, and for the spiritual and moral support that we have received from them.

We acknowledge and affirm the faithful service of the vast majority of our priests and deacons and the love that their people have for them. They deservedly have our esteem and that of the Catholic people for their good work. It is regrettable that their committed ministerial witness has been overshadowed by this crisis.

In a special way, we acknowledge those victims of clergy sexual abuse and their families who have trusted us enough to share their stories and to help us appreciate more fully the consequences of this reprehensible violation of sacred trust.

Let there now be no doubt or confusion on anyone's part: For us, your bishops, our obligation to protect children and young people and to prevent sexual abuse flows from the mission and example given to us by Jesus Christ himself, in whose name we serve.

As we work to restore trust, we are reminded how Jesus showed constant care for the vulnerable. He inaugurated his ministry with these words of the Prophet Isaiah:

The Spirit of the Lord is upon me,
because he has anointed me
to bring glad tidings to the poor.
He has sent me to proclaim liberty to captives
and recovery of sight to the blind,
to let the oppressed go free,
and to proclaim a year acceptable to the Lord.
(Lk 4:18-19)

In Matthew 25, the Lord, in his commission to his apostles and disciples, told them that whenever they show mercy and compassion to the least ones, they show it to him.

Jesus extended this care in a tender and urgent way to children, rebuking his disciples for keeping them away from him: "Let the children come to me" (Mt 19:14). And he uttered a grave warning that for anyone who would lead the little ones astray, it would be better for such a person "to have a great millstone hung around his neck and to be drowned in the depths of the sea" (Mt 18:6).

We hear these words of the Lord as prophetic for this moment. With a firm determination to restore the bonds of trust, we bishops recommit ourselves to a continual pastoral outreach to repair the breach with those who have suffered sexual abuse and with all the people of the Church.

In this spirit, over the last nine years, the principles and procedures of the *Charter* have been integrated into church life.

- The Secretariat of Child and Youth Protection provides the focus for a consistent, ongoing, and comprehensive approach to creating a secure environment for young people throughout the Church in the United States.
- The Secretariat also provides the means for us to be accountable for achieving the goals of the *Charter*, as demonstrated by its annual reports on the implementation of the *Charter* based on independent compliance audits.
- The National Review Board is carrying on its responsibility to assist in the assessment of diocesan compliance with the *Charter for the Protection of Children and Young People*.
- The descriptive study of the nature and scope of sexual abuse of minors by Catholic clergy in the United States, commissioned by the National Review Board, has been completed. The resulting study, examining the historical period 1950-2002, by the John Jay College of Criminal Justice provides us with a powerful tool not only to examine our past but also to secure our future against such misconduct.
- The U.S. bishops charged the National Review Board to oversee the completion of the *Causes and Context* study.
- Victims' assistance coordinators are in place throughout our nation to assist dioceses in responding to the pastoral needs of those who have been injured by abuse.

- Diocesan/eparchial bishops in every diocese are advised and greatly assisted by diocesan review boards as the bishops make the decisions needed to fulfill the *Charter*.
- Safe environment programs are in place to assist parents and children—and those who work with children—in preventing harm to young people. These programs continually seek to incorporate the most useful developments in the field of child protection.

Through these steps and many others, we remain committed to the safety of our children and young people.

While it seems that the scope of this disturbing problem of sexual abuse of minors by clergy has been reduced over the last decade, the harmful effects of this abuse continue to be experienced both by victims and dioceses.

Thus it is with a vivid sense of the effort which is still needed to confront the effects of this crisis fully and with the wisdom gained by the experience of the last six years that we have reviewed and revised the *Charter for the Protection of Children and Young People*. We now re-affirm that we will assist in the healing of those who have been injured, will do all in our power to protect children and young people, and will work with our clergy, religious, and laity to restore trust and harmony in our faith communities, as we pray for God's kingdom to come, here on earth, as it is in heaven.

To make effective our goals of a safe environment within the Church for children and young people and of preventing sexual abuse of minors by clergy in the future, we, the members of the United States Conference of Catholic Bishops, have outlined in this *Charter* a series of practical and pastoral steps, and we commit ourselves to taking them in our dioceses and eparchies.

TO PROMOTE HEALING AND RECONCILIATION WITH VICTIMS/ SURVIVORS OF SEXUAL ABUSE OF MINORS

ARTICLE 1. Dioceses/eparchies are to reach out to victims/survivors and their families and demonstrate a

sincere commitment to their spiritual and emotional well-being. The first obligation of the Church with regard to the victims is for healing and reconciliation. Each diocese/eparchy is to continue its outreach to every person who has been the victim of sexual abuse* as a minor by anyone in church service, whether the abuse was recent or occurred many years in the past. This outreach may include provision of counseling, spiritual assistance, support groups, and other social services agreed upon by the victim and the diocese/eparchy.

Through pastoral outreach to victims and their families, the diocesan/eparchial bishop or his representative is to offer to meet with them, to listen with patience and compassion to their experiences and concerns, and to share the “profound sense of solidarity and concern” expressed by His Holiness, Pope John Paul II, in his Address to the Cardinals of the United States and Conference Officers (April 23, 2002). Pope Benedict XVI, too, in his address to the U.S. bishops in 2008 said of the clergy sexual abuse crisis, “It is your God-given responsibility as pastors to bind up the wounds caused by every breach of trust, to foster healing, to promote reconciliation and to reach out with loving concern to those so seriously wronged.”

We bishops and eparchs commit ourselves to work as one with our brother priests and deacons to foster reconciliation among all people in our dioceses/eparchies. We especially commit ourselves to work with those individuals who were themselves abused and the communities that have suffered because of the sexual abuse of minors that occurred in their midst.

ARTICLE 2. Dioceses/eparchies are to have policies and procedures in place to respond promptly to any allegation where there is reason to believe that sexual abuse of a minor has occurred. Dioceses/eparchies are to have a competent person or persons to coordinate assistance for the immediate pastoral care of persons who report having been sexually abused as minors by clergy or other church personnel. The procedures for those making a complaint are to be readily available in printed form in the principal languages in which the liturgy is celebrated in the diocese/eparchy and be the subject of public announcements at least annually.

Dioceses/eparchies are also to have a review board that functions as a confidential consultative body to the bishop/eparch. The majority of its members are to be lay persons not in the employ of the diocese/eparchy (see Norm 5 in *Essential Norms for Diocesan/Eparchial Policies Dealing with Allegations of Sexual Abuse of Minors by Priests or Deacons*, 2006). This board is to advise the diocesan/eparchial bishop in his assessment of allegations of sexual abuse of minors and in his determination of a cleric's suitability for ministry. It is regularly to review diocesan/eparchial policies and procedures for dealing with sexual abuse of minors. Also, the board can review these matters both retrospectively and prospectively and give advice on all aspects of responses in connection with these cases.

ARTICLE 3. Dioceses/eparchies are not to enter into settlements which bind the parties to confidentiality unless the victim/survivor requests confidentiality and this request is noted in the text of the agreement.

TO GUARANTEE AN EFFECTIVE RESPONSE TO ALLEGATIONS OF SEXUAL ABUSE OF MINORS

ARTICLE 4. Dioceses/eparchies are to report an allegation of sexual abuse of a person who is a minor to the public authorities. Dioceses/eparchies are to comply with all applicable civil laws with respect to the reporting of allegations of sexual abuse of minors to civil authorities and cooperate in their investigation in accord with the law of the jurisdiction in question.

Dioceses/eparchies are to cooperate with public authorities about reporting cases even when the person is no longer a minor.

In every instance, dioceses/eparchies are to advise victims of their right to make a report to public authorities and support this right.

ARTICLE 5. We affirm the words of His Holiness, Pope John Paul II, in his Address to the Cardinals of the United States and Conference Officers: "There is no place in the priesthood or religious life for those who would harm the young."

Sexual abuse of a minor by a cleric is a crime in the universal law of the Church (CIC, c. 1395

§2; CCEO, c. 1453 §1). Because of the seriousness of this matter, jurisdiction has been reserved to the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith (*Motu proprio Sacramentorum sanctitatis tutela*, AAS 93, 2001). Sexual abuse of a minor is also a crime in all civil jurisdictions in the United States.

Diocesan/eparchial policy is to provide that for even a single act of sexual abuse of a minor*—when ever it occurred—which is admitted or established after an appropriate process in accord with canon law, the offending priest or deacon is to be permanently removed from ministry and, if warranted, dismissed from the clerical state. In keeping with the stated purpose of this *Charter*, an offending priest or deacon is to be offered therapeutic professional assistance both for the purpose of prevention and also for his own healing and well-being.

The diocesan/eparchial bishop is to exercise his power of governance, within the parameters of the universal law of the Church, to ensure that any priest or deacon subject to his governance who has committed even one act of sexual abuse of a minor as described below (see note) shall not continue in ministry.

A priest or deacon who is accused of sexual abuse of a minor is to be accorded the presumption of innocence during the investigation of the allegation and all appropriate steps are to be taken to protect his reputation. He is to be encouraged to retain the assistance of civil and canonical counsel. If the allegation is deemed not substantiated, every step possible is to be taken to restore his good name, should it have been harmed.

In fulfilling this article, dioceses/eparchies are to follow the requirements of the universal law of the Church and of the *Essential Norms* approved for the United States.

ARTICLE 6. There are to be clear and well-publicized diocesan/eparchial standards of ministerial behavior and appropriate boundaries for clergy and for any other paid personnel and volunteers of the Church in positions of trust who have regular contact with children and young people.

ARTICLE 7. Dioceses/eparchies are to be open and transparent in communicating with the public about sexual abuse of minors by clergy within the confines of respect for the privacy and the reputation of the individuals involved. This is especially so with regard

to informing parish and other church communities directly affected by sexual abuse of a minor.

TO ENSURE THE ACCOUNTABILITY OF OUR PROCEDURES

ARTICLE 8. By the authority of the United States Conference of Catholic Bishops, the mandate of the Ad Hoc Committee on Sexual Abuse is renewed, and it is now constituted the Committee on the Protection of Children and Young People. It becomes a standing committee of the Conference. Its membership is to include representation from all the episcopal regions of the country, with new appointments staggered to maintain continuity in the effort to protect children and youth.

The Committee is to advise the USCCB on all matters related to child and youth protection and is to oversee the development of the plans, programs, and budget of the Secretariat of Child and Youth Protection. It is to provide the USCCB with comprehensive planning and recommendations concerning child and youth protection by coordinating the efforts of the Secretariat and the National Review Board.

ARTICLE 9. The Secretariat of Child and Youth Protection, established by the Conference of Catholic Bishops, is to staff the Committee on the Protection of Children and Young People and be a resource for dioceses/eparchies for the implementation of “safe environment” programs and for suggested training and development of diocesan personnel responsible for child and youth protection programs, taking into account the financial and other resources, as well as the population, area, and demographics of the diocese/eparchy.

The Secretariat is to produce an annual public report on the progress made in implementing and maintaining the standards in this *Charter*. The report is to be based on an annual audit process whose method, scope, and cost are to be approved by the Administrative Committee on the recommendation of the Committee on the Protection of Children and Young People. This public report is to include the names of those dioceses/eparchies which the audit shows are not in compliance with the provisions and expectations of the *Charter*.

As a member of the Conference staff, the Executive Director of the Secretariat is appointed by and reports to the General Secretary. The Executive Director is to provide the Committee on the Protection of Children and Young People and the National Review Board with regular reports of the Secretariat’s activities.

ARTICLE 10. The whole Church, especially the laity, at both the diocesan and national levels, needs to be engaged in maintaining safe environments in the Church for children and young people.

The Committee on the Protection of Children and Young People is to be assisted by the National Review Board, a consultative body established in 2002 by the USCCB. The Board will review the annual report of the Secretariat of Child and Youth Protection on the implementation of this *Charter* in each diocese/eparchy and any recommendations that emerge from it, and offer its own assessment regarding its approval and publication to the Conference President.

The Board will also advise the Conference President on future members. The Board members are appointed by the Conference President in consultation with the Administrative Committee and are accountable to him and to the USCCB Executive Committee. Before a candidate is contacted, the Conference President is to seek and obtain, in writing, the endorsement of the candidate’s diocesan bishop. The Board is to operate in accord with the statutes and bylaws of the USCCB and within procedural guidelines to be developed by the Board in consultation with the Committee on the Protection of Children and Young People and approved by the USCCB Administrative Committee. These guidelines are to set forth such matters as the Board’s purpose and responsibility, officers, terms of office, and frequency of reports to the Conference President on its activities.

The Board will offer its advice as it collaborates with the Committee on the Protection of Children and Young People on matters of child and youth protection, specifically on policies and best practices. The Board and Committee on the Protection of Children and Young People will meet jointly several times a year.

The Board will review the work of the Secretariat of Child and Youth Protection and make

recommendations to the Director. It will assist the Director in the development of resources for dioceses.

The Board will offer its assessment of the Causes and Context study to the Conference, along with any recommendations suggested by the study.

ARTICLE 11. The President of the Conference is to inform the Holy See of this revised *Charter* to indicate the manner in which we, the Catholic bishops, together with the entire Church in the United States, intend to continue our commitment to the protection of children and young people. The President is also to share with the Holy See the annual reports on the implementation of the *Charter*.

TO PROTECT THE FAITHFUL IN THE FUTURE

ARTICLE 12. Dioceses/eparchies are to maintain “safe environment” programs which the diocesan/eparchial bishop deems to be in accord with Catholic moral principles. They are to be conducted cooperatively with parents, civil authorities, educators, and community organizations to provide education and training for children, youth, parents, ministers, educators, volunteers, and others about ways to make and maintain a safe environment for children and young people. Dioceses/eparchies are to make clear to clergy and all members of the community the standards of conduct for clergy and other persons in positions of trust with regard to children.

ARTICLE 13. Dioceses/eparchies are to evaluate the background of all incardinated and non-incardinated priests and deacons who are engaged in ecclesiastical ministry in the diocese/eparchy and of all diocesan/eparchial and parish/school or other paid personnel and volunteers whose duties include ongoing, unsupervised contact with minors. Specifically, they are to utilize the resources of law enforcement and other community agencies. In addition, they are to employ adequate screening and evaluative techniques in deciding the fitness of candidates for ordination (cf. United States Conference of Catholic Bishops, *Program of Priestly Formation* [Fifth Edition], 2006, no. 39).

ARTICLE 14. Transfers of clergy who have committed an act of sexual abuse against a minor for residence, including retirement, shall be as in accord with Norm 12 of the Essential Norms. (Cf. *Proposed Guidelines on the Transfer or Assignment of Clergy and Religious*, adopted by the USCCB, the Conference of Major Superiors of Men [CMSM], the Leadership Conference of Women Religious [LCWR], and the Council of Major Superiors of Women Religious [CMSWR] in 1993.)

ARTICLE 15. To ensure continuing collaboration and mutuality of effort in the protection of children and young people on the part of the bishops and religious ordinaries, two representatives of the Conference of Major Superiors of Men are to serve as consultants to the Committee on the Protection of Children and Young People. At the invitation of the Major Superiors, the Committee will designate two of its members to consult with its counterpart at CMSM. Diocesan/eparchial bishops and major superiors of clerical institutes or their delegates are to meet periodically to coordinate their roles concerning the issue of allegations made against a cleric member of a religious institute ministering in a diocese/eparchy.

ARTICLE 16. Given the extent of the problem of the sexual abuse of minors in our society, we are willing to cooperate with other churches and ecclesial communities, other religious bodies, institutions of learning, and other interested organizations in conducting research in this area.

ARTICLE 17. We commit ourselves to work individually in our dioceses/eparchies and together as a Conference, through the appropriate committees, to strengthen our programs both for initial priestly formation and for the ongoing formation of priests. With renewed urgency, we will promote programs of human formation for chastity and celibacy for both seminarians and priests based upon the criteria found in *Pastores Dabo Vobis*, the *Program of Priestly Formation*, the *Basic Plan for the Ongoing Formation of Priests*, and the results of the Apostolic Visitation. We will continue to assist priests, deacons, and seminarians in living out their vocation in faithful and integral ways.

CONCLUSION

As we wrote in 2002, “It is within this context of the essential soundness of the priesthood and of the deep faith of our brothers and sisters in the Church that we know that we can meet and resolve this crisis for now and the future.”

We wish to re-affirm once again that the vast majority of priests and deacons serve their people faithfully and that they have the esteem and affection of their people. They also have our love and esteem and our commitment to their good names and well-being.

An essential means of dealing with the crisis is prayer for healing and reconciliation, and acts of reparation for the grave offense to God and the deep wound inflicted upon his holy people. Closely connected to prayer and acts of reparation is the call to holiness of life and the care of the diocesan/eparchial bishop to ensure that he and his priests avail themselves of the proven ways of avoiding sin and growing in holiness of life.

It is with reliance on prayer and penance that we renew the pledges which we made in the original *Charter*:

We pledge most solemnly to one another and to you, God’s people, that we will work to our utmost for the protection of children and youth.

We pledge that we will devote to this goal the resources and personnel necessary to accomplish it.

We pledge that we will do our best to ordain to the priesthood and put into positions of trust only those who share this commitment to protecting children and youth.

We pledge that we will work toward healing and reconciliation for those sexually abused by clerics.

Much has been done to honor these pledges. We devoutly pray that God who has begun this good work in us will bring it to fulfillment.

This *Charter* is published for the dioceses/eparchies of the United States. It is to be reviewed again after two years by the Committee on the Protection of Children and Young People with the advice of the National Review Board. The results of this review are to be presented to the full Conference of Bishops for confirmation.

NOTE

* For purposes of this *Charter*, the offense of sexual abuse of a minor will be understood in accord with the provisions of *Sacramentorum sanctitatis tutela* (SST), article 6, which reads:

§1. The more grave delicts against morals which are reserved to the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith are:

1° the delict against the sixth commandment of the Decalogue committed by a cleric with a minor below the age of eighteen years; in this case, a person who habitually lacks the use of reason is to be considered equivalent to a minor.

2° the acquisition, possession, or distribution by a cleric of pornographic images of minors under the age of fourteen, for purposes of sexual gratification, by whatever means or using whatever technology;

§2. A cleric who commits the delicts mentioned above in §1 is to be punished according to the gravity of his crime, not excluding dismissal or deposition.

In view of the Circular Letter from the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith, dated May 3, 2011, which calls for “mak[ing] allowance for the legislation of the country where the Conference is located,” Section III(g), we will apply the federal legal age for defining child pornography, which includes pornographic images of minors under the age of eighteen, for assessing a cleric’s suitability for ministry and for complying with civil reporting statutes.

If there is any doubt whether a specific act qualifies as an external, objectively grave violation, the writings of recognized moral theologians should be consulted, and the opinions of recognized experts should be appropriately obtained (*Canonical Delicts Involving Sexual Misconduct and Dismissal from the Clerical State*, 1995, p. 6). Ultimately, it is the responsibility of the diocesan bishop/eparch, with the advice of a qualified review board, to determine the gravity of the alleged act.

APPENDIX B



Center for Applied Research in the Apostolate 2011 Annual Survey of Allegations and Costs

This questionnaire is designed to survey dioceses and eparchies about credible accusations of abuse and the costs in dealing with these allegations. The results will be used to demonstrate progress in implementing the Charter for the Protection of Children and Young People and reducing the incidence of sexual abuse within the Church.

All data collected here are entirely confidential. Only national aggregate results will be reported.

**ALL DATA REPORTED HERE REFER TO THE PRECEDING CALENDAR YEAR –
JANUARY 1-DECEMBER 31, 2011.**

ALLEGATIONS

NOTE: An allegation is defined as one victim alleging an act or acts of abuse by one alleged perpetrator. Only credible allegations (those that are admitted or established after an appropriate process in accord with canon law) are appropriate for inclusion in this survey.

 495 1. Total number of new credible allegations of sexual abuse of a minor reported against a priest or deacon in the diocese between January 1 and December 31, 2011. (Do not include clergy that are members of religious institutes as they will be reported by their religious institutes).

 6 2. Of the total number in item 1, the number of allegations that involved only child pornography.

Of the total number in item 1, the number that were first reported to the diocese/eparchy by:

Choose only one category for each allegation. (The sum of items 3-9 should equal item 1).

<u> 267 </u> 3. Victim.	<u> 12 </u> 7. Law enforcement.
<u> 49 </u> 4. Family member of the victim.	<u> 9 </u> 8. Bishop or official from another diocese.
<u> 8 </u> 5. Friend of the victim.	<u> 29 </u> 9. Other: _____.
<u> 123 </u> 6. Attorney.	

Of the total number in item 1 (excluding the solely child pornography cases), the number of alleged victims that are:

 395 10. Male.
 86 11. Female.

Of the total number in item 1 (excluding the solely child pornography cases), the number of alleged victims in each age category when the alleged abuse began: (Choose only one category for each allegation).

 76 12. 0-9.
 244 13. 10-14.
 76 14. 15-17.
 92 15. Age unknown.

Of the total number in item 1, the number that are alleged to have begun in:

Choose only one category for each allegation. (The sum of items 16-29 should equal item 1).

<u> 29 </u> 16. 1954 or earlier.	<u> 88 </u> 21. 1975-1979.	<u> 1 </u> 26. 2000-2004.
<u> 20 </u> 17. 1955-1959.	<u> 57 </u> 22. 1980-1984.	<u> 4 </u> 27. 2005-2009.
<u> 48 </u> 18. 1960-1964.	<u> 31 </u> 23. 1985-1989.	<u> 21 </u> 28. 2010-2011.
<u> 75 </u> 19. 1965-1969.	<u> 15 </u> 24. 1990-1994.	<u> 33 </u> 29. Time period unknown.
<u> 65 </u> 20. 1970-1974.	<u> 8 </u> 25. 1995-1999.	

 54 30a. Total number of new credible allegations received between January 1 and December 31, 2011 that were unsubstantiated or determined to be false by December 31, 2011.

 23 30b. Total number of credible allegations received prior to January 1, 2011 that were unsubstantiated or determined to be false between January 1 and December 31, 2011.

ALLEGED PERPETRATORS

NOTE: Include any perpetrators who are or were ordained members of the clergy legitimately serving in or assigned to the diocese or eparchy at the time the credible allegation(s) was alleged to have occurred. Do not include clergy that are members of religious institutes as they will be reported by their religious institutes.

406 31. Total number of priests or deacons against whom new credible allegations of sexual abuse of a minor have been reported between January 1 and December 31, 2011.

Of the total number in item 31, how many were in each category below at the time of the alleged abuse?

Choose only one category for each alleged perpetrator. (The sum of items 32-37 should equal item 31).

359 32. Diocesan priests ordained for this diocese or eparchy.

13 33. Diocesan priests incardinated later in this diocese or eparchy.

8 34. Extern diocesan priests from another U.S. diocese serving in this diocese or eparchy.

7 35. Extern diocesan priests from a diocese outside the United States serving in this diocese or eparchy.

5 36. Permanent deacons.

14 37. Other: _____.

Of the total number in item 31, the number that:

259 38. Have had one or more previous allegations reported against them prior to January 1, 2011.

303 39. Are deceased, already removed from ministry, already laicized, or missing.

21 40. Have been permanently removed or retired from ministry between January 1 and December 31, 2011 based on allegations of abuse.

11 41. Have been returned to ministry between January 1 and December 31, 2011 based on the resolution of allegations of abuse.

55 42. Remain temporarily removed from ministry pending investigation of allegations (as of December 31, 2011).

8 43. Remain in active ministry pending investigation of allegations (as of December 31, 2011).

*Indicate the total number of alleged perpetrators identified **prior to January 1, 2011** that:*

18 44. Were permanently removed or retired from ministry between January 1 and December 31, 2011 based on allegations of abuse.

14 45. Were returned to ministry between January 1 and December 31, 2011 based on the resolution of allegations of abuse.

72 46. Remain temporarily removed from ministry pending investigation of allegations (as of December 31, 2011).

4 47. Remain in active ministry pending investigation of allegations (as of December 31, 2011).

COSTS

Indicate the approximate total amount of funds expended by the diocese between January 1 and December 31, 2011 for payments as the result of allegations of sexual abuse of a minor (notwithstanding the year in which the allegation was received):

\$ 50,374,648 48. All settlements paid to victims.

\$ 6,142,810 49. Payments for therapy for victims (if separate from settlements).

\$ 9,862,810 50. Payments for support for offenders (including living expenses, legal expenses, therapy, etc.).

\$ 36,737,366 51. Payments for attorneys' fees.

\$ 5,562,772 52. Other (Please include SEC/VAC expenses in item 54): _____.

AVG=27 % 53. Approximate percentage of the amount in items 48-52 that was covered by diocesan insurance.

\$ 30,129,584 54. Total amount paid for all child protection efforts (training programs, background checks, etc.).

In the event it is necessary for clarification about the data reported here, please supply the following information:

Name and title of person completing this form: _____

Arch/Diocese: _____ Phone: _____

Thank you for completing this survey.

Center for Applied Research in the Apostolate (CARA), 2300 Wisconsin Ave NW, Suite 400, Washington, DC 20007

Phone: 202-687-8080 Fax: 202-687-8083 E-mail CARA@georgetown.edu

©CARA 2011, All rights reserved.

APPENDIX C



Center for Applied Research in the Apostolate 2011 Annual Survey of Allegations and Costs

This questionnaire is designed to survey religious institutes, societies of apostolic life or the separate provinces thereof and will be used to demonstrate progress in implementing the Charter for the Protection of Children and Young People and reducing the incidence of sexual abuse within the Church.

All data collected here are entirely confidential. Only national aggregate results will be reported.

***ALL DATA REPORTED HERE REFER TO THE PRECEDING CALENDAR YEAR –
JANUARY 1-DECEMBER 31, 2011.***

ALLEGATIONS

NOTE: An allegation is defined as one victim alleging an act or acts of abuse by one alleged perpetrator. Only credible allegations (those that are admitted or established after an appropriate process in accord with canon law) are appropriate for inclusion in this survey.

__99__ 1. Total number of new credible allegations of sexual abuse of a minor reported against a priest or deacon in the religious institute between January 1 and December 31, 2011. **(Only include members of the religious institute who are clergy.** Allegations against religious brothers should **NOT** be reported).

___0__ 2. Of the total number in item 1, the number of allegations that involved only child pornography.

Of the total number in item 1, the number that were first reported to the religious institute by:

Choose only one category for each allegation. (The sum of items 3-9 should equal item 1).

__53__	3. Victim.	___4__	7. Law enforcement.
__5__	4. Family member of the victim.	__14__	8. Bishop or other official from a diocese.
__0__	5. Friend of the victim.	___2__	9. Other: _____.
__21__	6. Attorney.		

Of the total number in item 1 (excluding the solely child pornography cases), the number of alleged victims that are:

__93__ 10. Male.
__6__ 11. Female.

Of the total number in item 1 (excluding the solely child pornography cases), the number of alleged victims in each age category when the alleged abuse began: (Choose only one category for each allegation).

__6__ 12. 0-9.
__43__ 13. 10-14.
__46__ 14. 15-17.
__2__ 15. Age unknown.

Of the total number in item 1, the number that are alleged to have begun in:

Choose only one category for each allegation. (The sum of items 16-29 should equal item 1).

__10__	16. 1954 or earlier.	__13__	21. 1975-1979.	__1__	26. 2000-2004.
__23__	17. 1955-1959.	__10__	22. 1980-1984.	__0__	27. 2005-2009.
__9__	18. 1960-1964.	__10__	23. 1985-1989.	__2__	28. 2010-2011.
__5__	19. 1965-1969.	__1__	24. 1990-1994.	__4__	29. Time period unknown.
__11__	20. 1970-1974.	__0__	25. 1995-1999.		

__8__ 30a. Total number of new credible allegations received between January 1 and December 31, 2011 that were unsubstantiated or determined to be false by December 31, 2011.

__8__ 30b. Total number of credible allegations received prior to January 1, 2011 that were unsubstantiated or determined to be false between January 1 and December 31, 2011.

ALLEGED PERPETRATORS

*NOTE: Include any perpetrators who are or were ordained members of the religious clergy legitimately serving in or assigned to a diocese or eparchy or within the religious institute at the time the credible allegation(s) was alleged to have occurred. Include **only clergy (NOT RELIGIOUS BROTHERS)** that are members of religious institutes.*

 55 31. Total number of priests or deacons against whom new credible allegations of sexual abuse of a minor have been reported between January 1 and December 31, 2011.

Of the total number in item 31, how many were in each category below at the time of the alleged abuse?

Choose only one category for each alleged perpetrator. (The sum of items 32-37 should equal item 31).

- 46 32. Religious priests of this province assigned within the United States.
 1 33. Religious priests of this province assigned outside of the United States.
 8 34. Religious priests formerly of this province but no longer a member of the religious institute.
 2 35. Religious priests not of this province but serving in this province of the religious institute.
 0 36. Deacon members of the religious institute.
 1 37. Other: _____.

Of the total number in item 31, the number that:

- 35 38. Have had one or more previous allegations reported against them prior to January 1, 2011.
 38 39. Are deceased, already removed from ministry, already laicized, or missing.
 4 40. Have been permanently removed or retired from ministry between January 1 and December 31, 2011 based on allegations of abuse.
 0 41. Have been returned to ministry between January 1 and December 31, 2011 based on the resolution of allegations of abuse.
 7 42. Remain temporarily removed from ministry pending investigation of allegations (as of December 31, 2011).
 0 43. Remain in active ministry pending investigation of allegations (as of December 31, 2011).

*Indicate the total number of alleged perpetrators identified **prior to January 1, 2011** that:*

- 11 44. Were permanently removed or retired from ministry between January 1 and December 31, 2011 based on allegations of abuse.
 4 45. Were returned to ministry between January 1 and December 31, 2011 based on the resolution of allegations of abuse.
 13 46. Remain temporarily removed from ministry pending investigation of allegations (as of December 31, 2011).
 0 47. Remain in active ministry pending investigation of allegations (as of December 31, 2011).

COSTS

Indicate the approximate total amount of funds expended by the religious institute between January 1 and December 31, 2011 for payments as the result of allegations of sexual abuse of a minor (notwithstanding the year in which the allegation was received):

- \$ 23,307,134 48. All settlements paid to victims.
 \$ 804,175 49. Payments for therapy for victims (if separate from settlements).
 \$ 2,083,899 50. Payments for support for offenders (including living expenses, legal expenses, therapy, etc.).
 \$ 4,654,670 51. Payments for attorneys' fees.
 \$ 4,522,132 52. Other: _____
 3 AVG= 3 % 53. Approximate percentage of the amount in items 48-52 that was covered by insurance of the religious institute.
 \$ 2,595,927 54. Total amount paid for all child protection efforts (training programs, background checks, etc.).

In the event it is necessary for clarification about the data reported here, please supply the following information:

Name and title of person completing this form: _____
 Institute: _____ Phone: _____

Thank you for completing this survey.

Center for Applied Research in the Apostolate (CARA), 2300 Wisconsin Ave NW, Suite 400, Washington, DC 20007

Phone: 202-687-8080 Fax: 202-687-8083 E-mail CARA@georgetown.edu


©CARA 2011, All rights reserved.

PROMISE TO

Protect

PLEDGE TO

Heal



A PRAYER FOR

Healing

Victims of Abuse

God of endless love,
ever caring, ever strong,
always present, always just:
You gave your only Son
to save us by the blood of his cross.

Gentle Jesus, shepherd of peace,
join to your own suffering
the pain of all who have been hurt
in body, mind, and spirit
by those who betrayed the trust placed in them.

Hear our cries as we agonize
over the harm done to our brothers and sisters.
Breathe wisdom into our prayers,
soothe restless hearts with hope,
steady shaken spirits with faith:
Show us the way to justice and wholeness,
enlightened by truth and enfolded in your mercy.


Holy Spirit, comforter of hearts,
heal your people's wounds
and transform our brokenness.
Grant us courage and wisdom, humility and grace,
so that we may act with justice
and find peace in you.
We ask this through Christ, our Lord. Amen.

PROMESA DE

Proteger

COMPROMISO
PARA

Sanar



ORACIÓN PARA

Sanar

Victimas de Abuso

Dios de amor infinito,
siempre bondadoso, siempre fuerte,
siempre presente, siempre justo:
Tú diste a tu único Hijo
para salvarnos por la sangre de su cruz.

Jesús Bueno, pastor de paz,
une a tu propio sufrimiento
el dolor de todos quienes han sido heridos
en cuerpo, mente y espíritu
por aquellos quienes traicionaron
la confianza puesta en ellos.

Oye nuestro llanto mientras sufrimos
por el daño causado a nuestros hermanos y hermanas.
Infunde sabiduría en nuestras oraciones,
alivia nuestros corazones intranquilos con la esperanza,
enderezza los espíritus tambaleantes con fe:
Muéstranos el camino hacia la justicia y la entereza,
danos la luz de la verdad y cúbrenos con tu misericordia.

Espíritu Santo, consolador de corazones,
cura las heridas de tu pueblo
y rescátanos de nuestra dispersión.
Danos valentía y sabiduría, humildad y gracia
para que así actuemos con justicia
y encontremos paz en ti.
Te lo pedimos por Cristo, Nuestro Señor. Amén.