

**TERRY D. CHILDERS, LCSW**  
**Community Corrections Consultant**

March 7, 2006

**REPORT ON THE ARCHDIOCESE OF CHICAGO**  
**ACCUSED PRIEST ABUSER MONITORING SYSTEM**

**INTRODUCTION**

This report details the review and assessment of the monitoring system currently in place and used by the Archdiocese of Chicago to monitor priests who have been removed from public ministry because there was reason to suspect that they engaged in sexually abusive behavior with minors, or priests against whom such activity has been alleged. For the purposes of this report, all of the priests being monitored are referred to as “accused priest abusers.” That moniker is for descriptive purposes only, and does not imply that any judgments or conclusions about the alleged behavior have been made.

Part One of this report details the findings based upon on-site visits to residences where the accused priest abusers live, as well as interviews with monitors, treatment providers, and Archdiocesan officials.

Part Two of this report lists recommendations detailing ways in which the monitoring program can be improved, making it more effective in reducing the likelihood of further sexual victimization by the accused priest abusers.

**PART I: FINDINGS**

MONITORING SYSTEM

The Archdiocese of Chicago has assumed moral responsibility for monitoring priests who have been removed from public ministry because there was reason to suspect that they engaged in sexually abusive behavior with minors, or priests against whom such activity has been alleged. An effective monitoring system geared toward reducing the further sexual victimization perpetrated by accused priest abusers does not exist. Instead, there exists an “honor system” wherein the accused priest abusers are presumed to be truthful, live in relative anonymity in unrestricted environments, enjoy unlimited and unrestricted movement, and suffer little if any consequences for failing to comply with Archdiocesan monitoring protocols.

The monitoring that is currently being done is based exclusively upon the self-reported activities of the accused priest abusers. There are few attempts to corroborate or verify any information provided by the abusers.

MONITORS

The persons assigned to be monitors of the accused priest abusers are provided little if any background information relative to the sexual abuse behavior of the priest(s) they are responsible to monitor. The monitors are not officially advised of the type of sexual abuse committed by the accused priest abuser, the sex or age of victims, the length of abuse, where the abuse took place, or details about evaluations/treatment. As a result, the monitors are unaware of the “red flags” that might suggest relapse or high risk

*Accused Priest Abuser Monitoring Report*

situations. They are restricted from making informed decisions about the accused priest abusers because they lack any information about the illicit sexual behavior.

One monitor did report requesting information about the sexual activity of the priest he was assigned to monitor, and was advised by the Archdiocese that such information could not be revealed because of confidentiality. Several of the monitors related that they did not wish to know anything about the sexual behavior of the accused priest abusers, because they considered those behaviors to be “private issues” and “none of their business.”

More often than not, the monitors are instructed to “watch” the accused priest abuser, or “keep an eye” on him. Monitors are not provided any kind of directives, written or verbal, as to what exactly their responsibilities as monitors should be. Moreover, it was unclear to most of the monitors what procedures exist for informing the Archdiocese if they do have any concerns about the accused priest abuser.

The monitors are all clergy or religious - three priests, two nuns and one deacon. None of the monitors have received any type of training relative to sex offender management procedures, sex offender identification, or sex offender treatment or supervision.

*DAILY LOGS*

Pursuant to directives of The Office of Professional Responsibility, all of the accused priest abusers are expected to maintain daily written logs. (Attachment 1) The accused abusers are expected to log, in writing, their daily activities. The logs are

*Accused Priest Abuser Monitoring Report*

supposed to be completed daily, collected by the monitor at the end of each month, and submitted to the Professional Responsibility Administrator for review.

The submission of these logs by the accused priest abusers is inconsistent. Some of the accused priest abusers are more compliant than others. According to the various monitors, some of the priests do submit the form within a week. Other accused priest abusers wait until they fall far behind, and then turn in a week, weeks or months backlogs of forms. It is not known if the logs are completed on a daily basis. Submitting the logs pursuant to a standardized protocol and in a timely fashion is an issue that should be addressed.

At least one accused priest abuser has not completed any daily logs for months. There have been no consequences for this noncompliant behavior.

When the accused priest abuser eventually completes his log, he is directed to submit it to the monitor, who in turn signs the form and forwards it to the Professional Responsibility Administrator in Chicago for her review and signature. When both the monitors and the Professional Responsibility Administrator sign or stamp their signatures to these logs, they are attesting to nothing more than the receipt of the logs. They are not attesting to the veracity or accuracy of any of the information reported in the logs.

The use of logs can be a very effective tool in sex offender management and risk control. However, the logs are only useful so long as the activities revealed in them can be corroborated, directly, through third parties, or by means of electronic surveillance. Without corroboration, there is no reason to be certain that the activities reported in the logs correspond to reality. Essentially, these logs are only a reflection of the accused priest abusers self-reported activities. As a monitoring tool, they serve no significant

*Accused Priest Abuser Monitoring Report*

purpose. Moreover, it is apparent that the accused priest abusers are only expected to log activities outside their residences. It would be beneficial for them, from both a clinical and supervision perspective, to also log the activities in which they participate while at home. It is important to know how they occupy their leisure time.

*TRAVEL/VACATION*

The accused priest abusers are expected to generate a document prior to traveling or going on vacation. A “Travel/Vacation Notification” form is used for this purpose. (Attachment 2) In practice this form appears to be used only for the purposes of notification. Although the accused priest abuser is supposed to “obtain concurrence with the Agreement, prior to a scheduled departure,” such concurrence does not appear to be practiced with regularity. The completed form reflects the accused priest abuser’s destination, the departure and return date, and the person by whom the accused priest abuser would be monitored while traveling or on vacation. It is unclear if this designated monitor is provided any training, direction or support by the archdiocese. Moreover, it is unclear if the archdiocese may approve or disapprove this person acting as a monitor. The form itself is signed by the accused priest abuser, and the Professional Responsibility Administrator. It is not signed by the monitor. The practice of allowing a sex offender to travel with a responsible person is common in sex offender management. However, the person accepting this responsibility, better referred to as a “chaperone” than a “monitor,” is usually evaluated for appropriateness, afforded training relative to sex offender behavior and relapse prevention, and designated as a signatory on a chaperone form.

*Accused Priest Abuser Monitoring Report*

There are no deadlines established for submission of Travel/Vacation Notification forms. That is, the accused priest abuser could submit the form, and begin travel immediately.

The form also reflects that, “Inappropriate situations and locations incompatible with a priestly lifestyle are to be avoided.” However, there could certainly be situations and locations totally compatible with a priestly lifestyle that are totally incompatible for accused priest abusers.

RESIDENCES

Residence #1

Twelve accused priest abusers currently live at the Cardinal Stritch Retreat House, located on the grounds of St. Mary of the Lake University in Mundelein, Illinois. The priest abusers are referred to as “permanent residents” at this facility. The Retreat House Director, a Permanent Deacon, acts as monitor for all twelve accused priest abusers.

The accused priest abusers have unrestricted movement, and are not mandated to be present at the retreat house for any particular time. Although the monitor believes that most of them are in the facility at night, there is no effort to verify their presence. In addition, no procedures exist requiring the accused priest abusers to sign in or out of the facility. They may or may not be present in the residence at any given time. At least one accused priest abuser spends most of his nights at a private residence other than the Retreat House.

*Accused Priest Abuser Monitoring Report*

The retreat house provides a variety of retreat experiences to priests, deacons, religious and deacons' wives. Thus, individuals participating in the retreat activities, and who commonly stay overnight in the facility's guest rooms, are both male and female.

The retreat house is neither a secure nor restricted living setting for the accused priest abusers. The rooms in which the accused priest abusers live are distributed throughout the three story structure. The accused priest abusers have complete freedom of movement within the structure, and around the grounds. They live on the same floors as those occupied by the retreat participants.

All of the accused priest abusers possess a master key that allows them access to the retreat building 24 hours a day, as well as access to all of the guest rooms. Apparently, the locks on all the rooms are identical. Accordingly, it would be possible for the accused priest abusers to gain entry to the rooms of retreat attendees. Such affordable access could pose significant risk issues.

The Archdiocese has made no apparent effort to advise retreat participants of the presence of accused priest abusers in the retreat house, possibly even in the room next to theirs. Doing so might impact the number of persons willing to participate in retreat activities at the facility. However, not doing so could jeopardize participants' safety.

The monitor has no access to, nor is he familiar with, the sexual offending patterns of any of the accused priest abusers. In addition, he does not discuss issues related to sexual offending with any of these accused priest abusers.

It is a generally accepted practice in sex offender management to proscribe sex offenders from having access to or being in possession of certain material. This material typically includes: adult and child pornography, child erotica, sexual paraphernalia, items

*Accused Priest Abuser Monitoring Report*

taken from victims, diaries describing sexual deviant fantasies and behaviors, and many more. There are important clinical reasons why sex offenders should not be in possession of this kind of material. The material may be used to reinforce deviant sexual desires, to disinhibit sexual acting out, and to affirm cognitive distortions related to offending behavior. It appears that the accused priest abusers are not proscribed from having any of this material in their rooms, or in their possession. There is no protocol prohibiting possession of this material, nor is there a protocol requiring or allowing occasional inspections of the accused priest abuser rooms to determine the presence of these materials.

Several accused priests in the retreat house have computers. One of them has a computer through which he can connect to the internet by a dial-up modem. The risks of a sex offender having unlimited access to the internet are obvious.

Currently, the accused priest abusers who reside at the Cardinal Stritch Retreat House are not being effectively monitored, either in residence or in the community. They are free to come and go as they please with little accountability and few apparent consequences for noncompliance with rules and protocols. They have access to unsuspecting potential victims staying at the retreat house, even those behind locked doors. They have access to potential victims in the community, because there is no way to determine if they are engaging in high risk behavior, or exhibiting relapse potential. Lacking strategies or efforts to corroborate any of their self-reported activity, these accused priest abusers are afforded a high degree of anonymity.

Residence #2

Two accused priest abusers reside at a nursing/retirement home in a northern suburb of Chicago. Each live in single rooms located in an “independent living” wing of the facility. The accused priest abusers have full and total access to all other living areas of the facility. One of the priests has a computer in his room, and may access the internet via a telephone modem. There are several public areas in the facility, including a chapel, where family and friends of the other residents, including children, may congregate.

The monitor for both of the accused priest abusers at this facility is a nun. She has no knowledge of the sexual abuse behavior of either priest, and has never had a discussion with either of them detailing their abusive behavior. She has not been provided any information relative to the abuse behavior by the Archdiocese. She has not been made privy to the results of any evaluations that indicate the level of risk for reoffending that either accused priest abuser might pose. She is unaware if either priest is in treatment, and has never had any type of contact with a treatment provider.

The monitor, other religious at the facility, and some lay administrative staff are aware of the status of the accused priest abusers. All other employees who might have contact with the priests, including security staff, are unaware of their status as accused sexual abusers.

None of the families of the residents are informed that the accused priest abusers live at the facility. The facility also accommodates volunteers, including adolescent confirmation candidates earning confirmation hours. The candidates, their parents, and their school and parish authorities are not officially advised of the presence of the two accused priest abusers in the facility.

### *Accused Priest Abuser Monitoring Report*

The monitor collects the logs of the accused priest abusers at the end of the month and submits them to the Professional Responsibility Administrator. She is uncertain if the accused priest abusers complete the logs on a daily basis; she only sees them at the end of the month. Neither she nor anyone else attempts to corroborate any of the self-reported activities described in the logs. She presumes what the accused priest abusers report is true.

The accused priest abusers who reside at this facility are not being effectively monitored, either in residence or in the community. They enjoy unrestricted movement, both within the facility and in the community. They have access to unsuspecting potential victims at the facility, including infirm residents, residents' family members (including children), and teenage volunteers. They have access to potential victims in the community, since there is no way to determine if they are engaging in high risk behavior, or exhibiting relapse potential. Lacking strategies or efforts to corroborate any of their self-reported activity, these accused priest abusers, like the others described in this report, are afforded a high degree of anonymity.

#### Residence #3

Two accused priest abusers live in this retirement home for priests in a southern suburb of Chicago. Each accused priest abuser is assigned a retired priest as a monitor. Neither monitor has been afforded any information relative to the sexual activity of the accused priest abusers. They understand, only through what they read in the newspaper and hear through the grapevine, that one of the accused priests victimized adults, and the other accused priest victimized children. The Archdiocese is in the process of selling

*Accused Priest Abuser Monitoring Report*

some land adjacent to the retirement home to a local municipality, which plans to build children's playground on the site.

The monitors have never been made privy to any information gleaned from psychological evaluations, including the risk to reoffend posed by either accused priest abuser. Neither monitor has ever received any official directions detailing their responsibility as monitors. They are not certain who they would contact if they wish to report concerns about the accused priest abusers to the Archdiocese.

One of the accused priest abusers never submits logs. According to the monitor, he is "excused" from this obligation. The other accused priest abuser does submit logs, but the monitor never corroborates any of the information therein. Indeed, this monitor indicated that he "trusted" the accused priest abuser, and assumes any self-reported activity to be true.

One of the accused priest abusers has traveled out of town, but has not submitted a Travel/Vacation Notification Form.

Each accused priest abuser has his own room. One of them has a computer that has a dial-up modem. There are plans for the facility to wire throughout for high speed internet access.

Neither of the monitors has had in-depth discussions with the accused priest abusers regarding the nature of the sexual abuse, and both voiced their discomfort in doing so.

The two priests living at the residence are not being effectively monitored. They have unrestricted movement, and there is no effort to corroborate their self-reported activity. Their monitors are uninformed about the accused priest abusers' sexual history,

*Accused Priest Abuser Monitoring Report*

and are reluctant to learn about it. Although they do not appear to have access to potential victims at the residence, both of the accused priest abusers own cars, and are allowed unrestricted movement in the community.

Adjacent to the retirement home, and connected to it by tunnels, is a nursing home operated by Catholic Charities. One of the accused priest abusers who resides at the Cardinal Stritch Retreat House in Mundelein works at this nursing home twice a week. He works in the dining area busing tables, usually from 10:30 am-7:30 pm. His status as an accused priest abuser is known to the nursing home administrator and some of her staff, but not to the patients or their families. There is a chapel in the nursing home that is open to the public, including children, and which currently provides Perpetual Eucharistic Adoration. The accused priest abuser often spends time in this chapel.

Residence #4

One priest abuser lives in a nursing home facility in Chicago. The accused priest abuser lives in a single room on the first floor of this two story facility. His access to other areas of the nursing home is unlimited. He owns a laptop, but his monitor does not know if he has access to the internet.

His monitor, a nun, has been provided no written documentation relative to the accused priest abuser's sexual molestation history. She believes that there were three allegations against him, long ago. She has initiated conversations about the sexual behavior with the accused priest abuser on two occasions, and he has responded that he could not remember any details.

The monitor believes that the accused priest abuser is in treatment, but does not know where or with whom. She has never had any contact with a treatment provider, and

*Accused Priest Abuser Monitoring Report*

has never seen any kind of treatment summary. Likewise, she has neither seen, nor been privy to, any information from psychological evaluations.

The other residents of the nursing home, and their families, are not officially advised of the priest's sexual abuse history. There is a chapel in the facility, and the public, including children, may attend services there.

The monitor collects the completed logs from the accused priest abuser at the end of the month and forwards them to the Professional Responsibility Administrator. None of the self-reported activity in the logs is corroborated.

Due to the general policy of the nursing home, none of the residents, including the accused priest abuser, may leave the facility unaccompanied. The accused priest abuser may only leave accompanied by a chaperone. It is unclear if these chaperones are made aware of details of the priest's sexual history or patterns of abuse.

Residence #5

One priest has been removed from his parish in South Holland, Illinois pending an investigation into allegations of sexual abuse. This accused priest abuser is currently living in a private home in LaPorte, Indiana. He is monitored by a local priest in LaPorte. This monitor indicates that he has only met personally with the accused priest abuser on one occasion. However, he also related that the accused priest abuser calls him on a daily basis and provides information about his activities for that day. There is no attempt to corroborate any of this activity. The monitor has driven by the home in which the accused priest abuser resides, but has never entered the residence. The monitor has received little information from the Archdiocese relative to the alleged sexual abuse behavior, but relates that the accused priest abuser has shared some of that information

with him. According to the monitor, the accused priest abuser reports that the allegations were predicated by “recovered memories” that the alleged victim became aware of in therapy. The monitor believes that “this is all baloney,” and doubts the allegations are credible. The monitor has not maintained any regular contact with the Archdiocese.

### TREATMENT

The accused priest abusers are encouraged to participate in treatment, but the decision to initiate or remain in treatment is at their discretion. Treatment is not mandated. Currently, eleven accused priest abusers are involved in some kind of treatment; six others are not involved in treatment.

The psychologist who provides treatment to most of the accused priest abusers is a general practitioner, and does specialize in sex offender specific treatment. He does not utilize current sex offender actuarial instruments that measure risk to re-offend, partly because the alleged abuse occurred twenty or more years ago, and partly because he questions the validity and reliability of these instruments. He questions focusing on sex offender specific treatment for the accused priest abusers since none of them were adjudicated through the court system and are technically not “sex offenders.”

A therapist who provides treatment to just one accused priest abuser is also a general practitioner, and does not provide sex offender specific treatment to the priest. The focus of treatment for this accused priest is “supportive” therapy. The therapist has weekly individual sessions with the accused priest abuser, and all of the sessions are conducted by telephone. This therapist currently treats no sex offenders. She is not

*Accused Priest Abuser Monitoring Report*

familiar with the sex offender specific actuarial instruments used to predict risk of re-offense.

The third therapist who provides treatment is currently treating two of the accused priest abusers. This therapist, who provides treatment conjointly with a psychologist and psychiatrist, suggests that the therapy is sex offender specific, and involves group treatment weekly and individual treatment as needed. She believes that one of the accused priest abusers that she treats is also in treatment with another therapist outside of her practice. She has not communicated with this other therapist.

None of the current therapists use clinical polygraphy as a treatment tool, nor do they require the accused priest abusers to develop written relapse prevention plans, or generate individual offense cycles.

The therapists all indicate that they have a good relationship with the Archdiocese. However, their contact with the Archdiocese is minimal. There are no regularly scheduled meetings with diocesan personnel, and there are no requirements for routine submission of treatment reports to any diocesan officials.

The Illinois Sex Offender Management Board has developed standards for the evaluation, treatment and management of sex offenders. This board has also developed an “Approved Providers List” of therapists who meet established criteria to provide sex offender specific treatment. A list of these approved providers for Cook and Lake Counties is attached to this report. (Attachment 3) None of the therapists currently providing treatment to accused priest abusers are included on this list.

The Association for the Treatment of Sexual Abusers (ATSA) is an international organization focused on the prevention of sexual abuse through effective management of

sex offenders. ATSA provides ethical guidelines for sex offender treatment, publishes a quarterly journal of treatment research, and offers regional and national training conferences specific to sex offender management and treatment. None of the therapists providing treatment to the accused priest abusers are members of ATSA.

### EVALUATIONS

Confidentiality prohibited the review of any evaluations completed on the accused priest abusers. However, attorneys for the archdiocese did discuss the nature of the testing and the evaluation procedures. The identification of those evaluated was not revealed. From these discussions, it did not appear that the evaluations focused on the sexual abuse that prompted the referral for evaluation. The psychological testing sounded general in nature. There was no indication of use of sex offender specific actuarial risk assessment instruments, or clinical polygraphy to validate sexual history or sexual misconduct.

Evaluations completed some years ago did seem to focus on the sexual abuse issues, and included use of physiological instruments to measure sexual arousal patterns. It is noted that the accused priest abusers themselves determine whether or not to undergo an evaluation, and may choose their own evaluator.

### CONCLUSIONS

Although the Archdiocese has made a good faith effort to provide some sort of monitoring for accused priest abusers, the monitoring is insubstantial due to almost total dependence of the accused priest abusers' self-reported activities, and lack of

corroboration of those activities. In this current “honor” system, the accused priest abusers are essentially self-monitored. They may choose whether or not to be in treatment, choose the type of treatment, choose the treatment provider, choose when, where and with whom they travel, choose where they work and choose what to report on their daily logs. They may be required to reside at particular sites, but even there they have unrestricted movement with no curfew restrictions. This current “honor” system of monitoring allows the accused priest abusers to remain relatively anonymous. Sex offenders strive for and thrive on anonymity. It is anonymity that allows them to offend against many victims, and offend over very long periods of time. Effective monitoring crushes anonymity.

A major and profound weakness in this monitoring system is the lack of communication among the parties who have some direct responsibility for the accused priest abuser. The treatment provider does not communicate regularly with the Professional Responsibility Administrator, the Professional Responsibility Administrator does not communicate regularly with the Vicar for Priests, and nobody communicates regularly with the monitors.

The potential consequence of this failure to communicate effectively is well illustrated in the case of Father Dan McCormack. Shortly after Father McCormack was questioned by Chicago Police Officers about child molestation allegations in late August, 2005, a Vicar of Priests assigned another priest to act as monitor. The monitor lived in the St. Agatha Parish rectory with Father McCormack, but was not assigned to that parish. His ministerial duties were elsewhere, and he spent very little time in the rectory. The Vicar asked the monitor to ensure that Father McCormack would not be alone with

*Accused Priest Abuser Monitoring Report*

minors in the rectory. In response, the monitor advised that he was rarely in the rectory, and that he had plans to be out of town several times in the near future, including the imminent Labor Day weekend. The Vicar told the monitor to advise him if he were going to be out of town for any longer than a week.

There was no communication between the monitor, the Vicar, or any other Archdiocesan officials until Father McCormack was arrested in January, 2006. The monitor had received no direction regarding his monitoring responsibilities, other than to ensure that McCormack was not alone in the rectory with minors. The monitor was not provided any details about the sexual abuse allegations, including where the sexual abuse took place, or the age and sex of the victims. He was not advised that Father McCormack should not be in schools or should not coach. The monitor asked for some details about the offense behavior, but was told that the information could not be revealed to him.

The monitor was not advised that Father McCormack should complete daily logs or submit travel notification forms. Father McCormack told the monitor that he submitted to an evaluation, and that the evaluation determined that he was not a risk to children. The monitor was never advised by diocesan officials that any evaluations had been completed, or what the evaluations concluded or recommended. The monitor has never been officially advised that his monitoring duties are terminated.

So long as the monitoring of accused priest abusers is based on an “honor system,” and does not ensure effective communication among all parties, it is likely that situations similar to those of Father McCormack will reoccur. The next section of this report recommends a model for accused priest abuser monitoring and supervision which, if implemented correctly, could result in curtailing further incidents such as this.

**PART II: RECOMMENDATIONS**

The following recommendations are based on the most effective and current strategies for sex offender management used in the public sector. These management strategies are typically used to monitor and supervise sex offenders on probation, parole, and other kinds of court ordered supervision. The strategies and model of management described are applicable to monitoring priests who have been determined to be culpable of sexual abuse behavior, as well as priests against whom unsubstantiated but credible allegations have been made. It is acknowledged that the Archdiocese must deal with certain ecclesiastical and canonical issues that might limit the operationalization of these recommendations.

1. *Collaborative system of monitoring.*

It is recommended that the current passive “honor” system of monitoring be replaced with a more aggressive and proactive system of monitoring and supervision. The model of sex abuser monitoring that might best fit the needs of the Archdiocese is the collaborative case management team model. Absolutely essential for this model to be effective is regular communication among all the parties involved with the accused priest abusers and requires the establishment of a Case Management Team. Minimally, the Case Management Team should consist of an Archdiocesan Casemanager, treatment providers, monitors, and others whom the Archdiocese determines to be stakeholders in these matters.

*Accused Priest Abuser Monitoring Report*

2. *Archdiocese of Chicago (AOC) Casemanager.*

It is recommended that the Archdiocese create a staff position of Archdiocesan Accused Priest Abuser Casemanager. This person would assume managerial and operational responsibilities for all aspects of the accused priest abuser monitoring system. As the leader of the Case Management Team, this person would ensure that other team members remain in close contact with one another through regularly scheduled case management team meetings. Ideally, the individual chosen for this position would be a professional with experience in sex offender supervision and treatment.

In addition to ensuring communication between other members of the case management team, this AOC Casemanager should also have regular contact with the accused priest abusers. As the “field operator” of the team, the AOC Casemanager would make unannounced home visits to the accused priest abusers, establish the validity of information contained in daily logs, approve of travel companions, and ensure in general that the accused priest abusers are adhering to all the protocols that have been established.

3. *Case management team meetings*

The Case Management Team Meeting would be the primary mechanism for coordination of services to the accused priest abuser and sharing of information among the team members. The Case Management

Team meetings should be used as a pro-active, not reactive form of monitoring. That is, the meetings of this team should not be predicated by crises, but should be used to prevent situations from evolving into crises. It is a preventative form of sex abuser monitoring, the purpose of which is to manage risk in a very aggressive and active fashion.

The AOC Casemanager should be expected to monitor the monitors. This would involve informing the monitors of the sexual abuse behavior of the accused priest abusers, patterns of the abuse, victimology, “triggers” for re-offense, and other pertinent information. This is a critical function, as the current monitors operate with little if any knowledge or direction.

4. *Written guidelines for monitors*

There should be written guidelines establishing the duties and responsibilities of the monitors. These guidelines should be reviewed with a prospective monitor before that person is designated as a monitor. Should the designated persons be uncomfortable with the monitoring responsibilities, then that person should not be appointed as a monitor. In addition to detailing the responsibilities of the monitors, these written guidelines should also describe in detail the actions the monitor should take in reporting suspected activity of the accused priest abusers.

5. *Initial meeting between Case Management Team and accused priest abuser*

As soon as an accused priest abuser is placed on monitoring, the case management team should meet collectively with him. Minimally, this meeting would include the AOC Casemanager, treatment provider, and monitor. It should be made very clear in this meeting what the responsibilities of all the parties are relative to the monitoring of the accused priest abuser. The protocols for monitoring should be reviewed, and any questions about those protocols answered. The frequency and modality of treatment should be determined at this time, and any restricted activities or movement clarified.

6. *Corroboration of activities*

The current monitoring system is based almost exclusively on self-reporting by the accused priest abuser. Therefore the current system it is best described as an “honor” system. For a monitoring system to be effective there must be some attempts to corroborate this self-reported activity. The AOC Casemanager, as the “field operative” of the Case Management Team, should have the primary responsibility for corroborating this self-reported activity. The corroboration of activities could also be enhanced by employing services of private security firms, or utilizing electronic surveillance techniques, particularly Global Position Satellite (GPS) techniques.

7. *Daily logs*

The Clergy Daily Log is used as a self-reporting mechanism by the accused priest abuser. Without corroboration of the activities, the logs serve little if any monitoring function. However, the logs could become very helpful once the AOC Casemanager, or others, begin to aggressively use them to corroborate the activities reported therein.

There are additional ways to improve the use of daily logs. First, there should be some standardization regarding requirements for completion and submission of the logs. For instance, the logs should be submitted to the monitor within 24 hours of their completion. Second, the logs should reflect activity in residence, as well as in the community. This should include descriptions of residential leisure time activities. The books and movies that an abuser reads or watches could have clinical significance, and be used therapeutically. Contact with other accused priest abusers, and the nature of those contacts, could also prove useful for both clinical and monitoring purposes.

The accused priest abuser should list any incidental contact he has with minors that occurs either in residence or in the community. This incidental contact is inevitable. By logging this material, the accused priest abuser can exhibit his progress in therapy by how he handled the situation of contact. (For example, this may include sexual fantasies the contact might have triggered, and descriptions of how the priest responded to the fantasies.)

The logs could also be used to reflect the accused priest abuser's management of money. He could be advised to record in a separate section of the log, moneys received and money spent. If he was also told to maintain receipts for items and services, these receipts could later be cross-checked with the information described in the logs. This allows further corroboration of self-reported activity.

8. *Travel/Vacation Notification*

It is recommended that the AOC Casemanager discuss travel plans with the accused priest abuser prior to his departure. Thus, the Travel/Notification Form should be submitted in a timely fashion. The accused priest abuser is expected to travel with a "monitor." It is recommended that this traveling companion be designated as a "chaperone." In addition, it is strongly recommended that the Case Management Team meet with the chaperone prior to the scheduled departure. It cannot be assumed that the chaperone chosen by the accused priest abuser is fully informed about his sexual offending history. If information is lacking, the chaperone would be unable to assist the accused priest abuser in avoiding in high risk situations. In other words, "inappropriate situations" should be defined, clarified and operationalized.

There are some countries that the accused priest abusers who have a history of child molestation should be encouraged to avoid because of the flourishing child sex trade, such as Thailand, the Philippines, and India.

While the accused priest abuser is traveling, he should still be expected to complete daily logs. These daily logs should be initialed by the chaperone. When the accused priest abuser and chaperone return from traveling, they should be debriefed by the Case Management Team.

9. *Residences*

All of the residences where accused priest abusers currently live present issues of third party risk. The accused priest abusers at the Cardinal Stritch Retreat House should not have keys that unlock the doors to all the rooms in that facility. It is recommended that the locks be changed on their room doors, and that they surrender their master keys to the Retreat House Director.

Only monitors of the accused priest abusers, and some staff, are aware that priest abusers reside in these various facilities. Other persons who reside at those facilities, or who use those facilities, including children, are not made aware of their presence. Accordingly, the accused priest abusers reside at all of these facilities in relative anonymity.

The Archdiocese should consider making some sort of notification to others (residents, employees, families of residents, volunteers, etc.), allowing them to make their own informed decisions.

10. *Individual specific protocols*

The Individual Specific Protocols that detail the conditions of treatment and monitoring that each accused priest abuser is expected to conform to may be refined based upon the sexual abuse history of each accused abuser. For instance, there might be a prohibition from being within a certain distance of a victim's home or school, a prohibition from being in public parks, a prohibition from being in movie theaters, all contingent upon past patterns of sexual abuse.

Pornography is frequently used by sex offenders to reinforce deviant fantasies and disinhibit sexual behavior. Accordingly, proscription against pornography should be considered on a case-by-case basis. Additionally, accused priest abusers with access to the internet should be proscribed from accessing pornographic sites, or entering chat rooms used by children or adolescents. If there is reason to suspect that an accused priest abuser is using a personal computer for these inappropriate purposes, then the Case Management Team should demand that software be loaded on the computer that would allow the Case Management Team to track the web sites visited by the accused priest abuser.

11. *Sex offender specific evaluations*

Since sexual abuse was the behavior resulting in the accused priest abusers being removed from public ministry and being placed on monitoring, it follows that all of them should receive sex offender specific evaluations. The Illinois Sex Offender Management Board has established

standards for the evaluation and treatment of sex offenders. (Attachment 4, *20 Illinois Administrative Code 1905*) It is recommended that the Archdiocese adopt the general standards for conducting evaluations as described in this document, Sections 1905.230 through 1905.250. The Illinois Sex Offender Management Board has also generated a list of approved sex offender specific evaluators and treatment providers. It is recommended that the Archdiocese utilize these providers to conduct evaluations for the accused priest abusers. (Attachment 3)

In addition, it is recommended that the Archdiocesan officials provide all information relative to the sexual abuse, including victim statements and investigative reports, to the evaluator.

As a general practice, it is also recommended that the evaluators of the accused priest abusers submit to peer review to determine if there might be ways to improve their evaluations.

12. *Sex offender specific treatment*

The Illinois Sex Offender Management Board has also established standards for sex offender specific treatment. (Attachment 4, *20 Illinois Administrative Code 1905*) It is recommended that the Archdiocese adopt the standards for sex offender specific treatment as described in this document, Section 1905.300 through Section 1905.320. Additionally, it is recommended that the Archdiocese utilize treatment professionals who are

identified on the Sex Offender Management Board approved providers list.  
(Attachment 3)

The treatment provider should be an active and willing participant of the Case Management Team. Otherwise, the collaborative effort to monitor the accused priest abuser is undercut. The input of the treatment provider is critical to help the other Case Management Team members to understand the dynamics of the accused priest abuser, and to identify potential triggers for relapse behavior.

It is recommended that the treatment provider submit a monthly written progress report on each accused priest abuser. The report should be submitted to the AOC Casemanager. The report should detail time, date and modality of each therapy session, issues addressed, cooperativeness of the accused priest abuser, level of denial, attainment of treatment goals, identification of sexual fantasies, triggers for reoffending, and current level of risk for reoffending.

Sex offender treatment providers should submit to some form of peer review, and should be expected to stay current with the latest research and methods in the field.

13. *Mandatory treatment*

Treatment for accused priest abusers should be mandated. It is acknowledged that the Archdiocese is limited in what it can mandate an accused priest abuser to do. However, it should be recognized that the

behavior that resulted in the priest being removed from ministry is sexual victimization, and the likelihood for further sexual victimization may best be reduced through a combination of sex offender specific treatment and monitoring. If an accused priest abuser refuses to participate in evaluation or treatment services, then the Archdiocese should consider imposition of swift and significant sanctions. These could include confinement to residence, restricted movement, no movement without approved chaperones, employment restrictions, etc.

14. *Clinical polygraphy*

Clinical polygraphy has become a standard tool for sex offender evaluation, treatment and monitoring. Clinical polygraphs may be used to detect deception regarding compliance to monitoring protocols, adherence to a relapse prevention plan, abstention from deviant sexual activities, and disclosure of deviant or inappropriate behavior. The Illinois Sex Offender Management Board has identified licensed polygraph examiners who have undergone sex offender specific polygraph training. (Attachment 5)

It is recommended that the Archdiocese consider use of clinical polygraphy to enhance monitoring, evaluations and treatment of accused priest abusers.

15. *Periodic drug testing*

Sex offenders frequently use drugs and alcohol to purposefully disinhibit themselves, which allows them to more readily act out sexually. Accused priest abusers should submit to periodic drug tests. If it is determined by these tests or other means that the accused priest abuser is abusing drugs or alcohol, then he should be referred for substance abuse counseling. The substance abuse counselor would then become a member of the Case Management Team.

16. *Levels of monitoring*

Different levels of monitoring should be adopted predicated by the accused priest abusers' compliance with established protocols, progress in treatment, acceptance of responsibility, financial stability, presence of narcissistic behavior, active substance abuse, and other dynamic factors. The Case Management Team should be responsible for adjusting the level of monitoring. A high level of monitoring may result in increased therapy sessions, increased Case Management Team Meetings, increased personal contacts by the AOC Casemanager, increased collateral contacts by the AOC Casemanager, frequent drug testing, use of third party surveillance, use electronic surveillance, and use of clinical polygraphy.

17. *Record keeping*

It is recommended that a central file for each accused priest abuser be maintained by the AOC Casemanager. This file should include all documents relating to the sexual abuse, including victim statements, investigative reports, evaluations, and treatment summaries. In addition, the AOC Casemanager should maintain notes that chronicle any and all contact between the accused priest abuser and other entities involved in monitoring the accused priest abuser. Every chronological note should include date, type of contact, duration of contact, place of contact, name of persons spoken to, and a narrative of the issues discussed.

In addition, it is also recommended that the monitors maintain and generate chronological notes similar to those described above, and that these notes be submitted to the AOC Casemanager along with the Daily Logs.

18. *Training*

All Archdiocesan staff who deal with accused priest abusers, especially the AOC Casemanager and monitors, should receive extensive training in sex offender management. That training should include sex offender typologies, grooming behaviors, paraphilias, defenses of sex offenders, relapse prevention, “triggers,” and monitoring strategies.

*Accused Priest Abuser Monitoring Report*

The Archdiocese of Chicago has made a good faith effort to provide some kind of monitoring for accused priest abusers. Unfortunately, the current monitoring system lacks essential elements required to reduce the likelihood of future sexual victimization.

Removing an accused priest abuser from an assigned parish or other ministerial office, and stripping him of public ecclesiastical functions, does not necessarily reduce his risk to sexually reoffend. Certainly, both of those actions are steps in the right direction. However, until and unless the accused abuser's sexual proclivities are identified through sex offender specific evaluations, treated with sex offender specific treatment, and monitored closely by a team of professionals dedicated to public safety, his likelihood to reoffend remains undaunted.

Implicit to the effectiveness of these recommended strategies and procedures is the ability and willingness of the Archdiocese to demand the accused priest abusers comply with monitoring and treatment protocols. Absent the means to enforce such compliance, an effective monitoring system geared toward reducing further sexual victimization by accused priest abusers is, in this writer's opinion, unattainable.

The Archdiocese has proclaimed that the protection of children is paramount. To that end, it is respectfully recommended that the monitoring strategies and procedures described in this report, or ones similar to them, be adapted, developed and implemented by the Archdiocese as soon as possible.

  
Terry D. Childers, LCSW

  
Date