



6/1/2021

Most Reverend William D. Byrne, D.D.
Roman Catholic Diocese of Springfield
76 Elliot Street | P. O. Box 1730
Springfield, Massachusetts 01102-1730

Dear Bishop Byrne,

Lamade Psychological Services, P.C. respectfully submits the following summary as part of the Dioceses of Springfield's Office of Safe Environment and Victim Assistance (OSEVA) review of clergy and other religious, against whom an allegation of sexual abuse against a minor was made. The summary contains the scope of work, independent review procedure, findings, including a breakdown of determined credible allegations, and recommendations.

Respectfully submitted,

Raina V. Lamade, Ph.D.
President, Lamade Psychological Services, P.C.
Credentialed National Register Health Service Psychologist
Licensed Psychologist, New York State and the Commonwealth of Massachusetts

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

ENGAGEMENT AND SCOPE OF WORK

I was contracted by Roman Catholic Bishop of Springfield, a Corporation Sole (“Diocese of Springfield”) in February 2021 to conduct an independent and outside review of the Office of Safe Environment and Victim Assistance’s (OSEVA) process reviewing allegations of child sexual abuse, and classification of findings. This review is part of the OSEVA’s process in the release of a list of clergy and other religious against whom credible allegations of sexual abuse of a minor have been made. This review does not make an independent determination of whether an allegation is or is not credible; nor does it examine procedures related to how credibility was established. This is exclusively a review of the work already completed with respect to credible determinations.

INDEPENDENT REVIEW PROCEDURE

Method

Jeffrey J. Trant, MSW, LCSW, CPRP, Director of Safe Environment and Victim Assistance provided access to the data listed in the section below that I reviewed. I obtained an overview of the background, history, and process from Mr. Trant. After completing an initial review of documents, I identified and requested supplemental case data, which were provided to me. Upon my second review of case documentation, I compiled a list of cases to review for status updates and outstanding inquiries. This also included, for example, inquiries such as confirming age at the time of the allegation. Upon my final review, I had the opportunity to review requested supplemental case data and have my outstanding questions addressed by OSEVA to complete my assessment to render an opinion about their review process.

Data Sources Reviewed

The following data sources were reviewed.

1. Master document of sexual abuse allegations that included data about the alleged victim, perpetrator, reporting data, victim type (child/adult), and credibility determination.
2. Record Review Summary Document.
3. Dataset Variable Definitions.
4. Documentation pertaining to credibility determination for cases.
5. A list of Members of the Commission to Investigate Improper Conduct of Diocesan Personnel (1993-2002) and Review Board (2002-present).
6. Resumes/CVs of three raters working at or with the OSEVA involved in this current review.
7. Supplemental documents: Apostolic Letter Issued Motu Proprio by the Supreme Pontiff Francis entitled “*Vos Estis Lux Mundi*,” a Special Report written by the Diocese of Springfield entitled “*Promise to Protect...Pledge to Heal. How the Diocese of Springfield*

has responded to the clergy abuse crisis;” two reports authored by the John Jay College Research Team, Principal Investigator, Karen J. Terry entitled “*The Causes and Context of Sexual Abuse of Minors by Catholic Priests in the United States 1950-2010;*” and “*The Nature and Scope of Sexual Abuse of Minors by Catholic Priests and Deacons in the United States 1950-2002;*” an review submitted to the Fall River Diocese and a report to the Diocese of Springfield Massachusetts: Independent Investigation Prepared By: Hon. Peter A. Velis (Ret) dated June 21, 2020.

FINDINGS

Summary of the Methodology and Procedures Employed by OSEVA

A team of three staff members from the OSEVA reviewed case files consisting of all available allegations from 1992 to present. Each case was reviewed by two raters independently to determine a) the nature of the allegation (e.g., sexual abuse of a minor), b) whether the allegation was referred to the Misconduct Commission or Review Board, c) whether the allegation was determined to be credible, not credible, or undetermined. In cases where there was a disagreement, a third reviewer was brought in and a final determination was made. A subsequent case review was conducted, and primary sources were retrieved to confirm rating classifications. Source materials consisted of, but were not limited to, board meeting minutes, documentation about the determination made by the board, documentation about the investigation, correspondence sent directly to the diocese and legal counsel, and file notations for cases currently under review.

1. Definitions

Child Sexual Abuse was defined as: “Any interaction between an adult and a child (under the age of 18) in which the child is used for sexual pleasure, stimulation, or sexual gratification of the perpetrator or observer. Sexual abuse can include both touching and non-touching behavior. This includes the manufacture, distribution and viewing of child pornography.”

2. Inclusion and Exclusion Criteria

The inclusion criteria for this review were child sexual abuse allegations reported to the Diocese of Springfield during 1992-present, and allegations that were determined credible by another diocese or religious order. Exclusion criteria for the list of credibly accused include:

- individuals who were adults*, defined as 18 years or older at the time of the alleged sexual abuse;
- allegations of sexual abuse of a minor by a cleric that were not assessed by the Misconduct Commission or Review Board; or were not determined credible another diocese or religious order.
- cases of exclusive physical abuse allegations, without a sexual abuse allegation component;
- allegations of sexual abuse of a minor who were assessed by the Misconduct Commission or Review Board but did not result in a determination of credibility;

- allegations of sexual abuse against individuals not associated with and/or outside the jurisdiction of the Diocese of Springfield.

3. Classifications

The following classifications were used by OSEVA raters.

- a. Referred to the Review Board: Cases were designated as either: a) referred to the review board, b) not referred to the review board, or c) in process (i.e., under review by authorities or OSEVA).
- b. Credible: Whether the diocesan Misconduct Commission or Review Board determined the allegation to be: credible, not credible, or indeterminate. Cases that involved victims' attorneys were referred to outside legal counsel instead of the Diocesan Misconduct Commission or Review Board. These cases were designed as "referred to counsel." Cases where the allegation is under review by law enforcement authorities (e.g., DA) or OSEVA were designated as "in process."
- c. Type of sexual abuse: Was determined by the age of the alleged sexual abuse. Cases were classified as adult* if the individual was 18 years of older at the time of the alleged abuse; minor if the individual was under 18 years of age at the time of the alleged abuse; and missing if there was no information in the records about the age of the individual at the time of the alleged abuse.

Administrative Review Disclaimer: This review contained allegations that were administratively reviewed by processes established at the Roman Catholic Diocese of Springfield and is independent of any criminal proceedings. Any report or determination of a credible finding does not constitute a legal finding of criminal responsibility.

Summary of Independent Review Classifications

Overall, there was a high degree of agreement between OSEVA's review findings and my independent review. Of the cases reviewed, based on my request for data and further review, I identified the following items that were reviewed with Jeffrey J. Trant, MSW, LCSW, CPRP and reconciled in accordance with the source material records. None of these, however, impacted the list or number of individuals that were determined to have a credible allegation against them. In conclusion, based on the data reviewed, the list of credible allegations is accurate.

The following is a summary of case determinations that were made or finalized during the review process. Three were determined credible, and one case was not, and these were updated accordingly. During the review period, documentation was provided for two credible allegations that were determined credible by another diocese or religious order consisting of *individuals in public ministry within Springfield*, and were included in this category.

The following is a summary of adjusted items based on a review of source materials. With respect to age, five cases that had age listed as missing were verified as minors at the time of the allegation, and two cases that were listed as minors could not be confirmed through source material and were modified to missing. Nine cases that were listed as missing or minors were

confirmed to be adults. An additional two cases were adults that each made an allegation on behalf of a child already included in the database, and therefore not part of this review. Regarding the classification of whether an allegation was evaluated by the board, two cases were adjusted from yes to no, and six cases were adjusted from no to yes. With respect to credible allegations, 11 cases were modified from no to undetermined, three were recognized as referred to counsel, and two cases, involving allegations against individuals already on the list, were modified to credible. An existing case mentioned another “unknown priest” in the documentation and this allegation was added as an additional undetermined allegation that was reviewed by the board.

Credible Allegations

There were a total of 61* individuals for whom allegations of sexual abuse of a minor were determined credible. This finding was consistent with OSEVA’s classification; a breakdown is as follows.

Credibly Accused Incardinated in Diocese of Springfield: 20

Deceased clergy incardinated in the Diocese of Springfield for whom criminal or ecumenical proceedings were not complete: 23

Credibly Accused from Other Diocese: 3†

Credibly Accused Religious Order: 6

Credibly Accused Layperson (employee): 3

Credible allegation determined credible by another diocese or religious order consisting of Individuals in Public Ministry within Springfield: 5

*One allegation of sexual abuse involving an individual who was an adult at the time of the alleged abuse was included in a previously released list and retained in this list.

†For one individual in this category, a credible finding was reported on the previously released list and available data supported inclusion on the current list.

RECOMMENDATIONS AND SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

Access to materials and receptivity to professional opinions

Jeffrey J. Trant, MSW, LCSW, CPRP and OSEVA provided documentation and responded promptly to my requests for additional or supplemental data throughout my review. Mr. Trant and OSEVA were transparent in the approach, intent, and provision of access to data. Mr. Trant was receptive to my professional opinion.

Review of OSEVA's process and determination findings

OSEVA clearly defined the terms, parameters and established a review process that was thorough, clear in scope, and contained multiple checks and balances. The three individuals involved in the review process were qualified by education, training, and/or related expertise in this topic area. The process was reasonable in method and diligence. Information that was inconclusive or indeterminate was appropriately classified. The review process appeared to be fair to both parties, those making allegations and those who were accused. Conclusions about the classification of determinations were based on a reasonable procedure and substantiated by data in source material records.

Recommendations and Conclusions

Based on the available data, OSEVA has made progress and are trending in a positive direction. There is evidence to suggest that OSEVA is striving to approach this process with sensitivity, attempting to adopt a trauma informed approach with dignity and respect toward all parties. It is recommended that they continue this trajectory of continued self-evaluation and enhanced specificity, including for standards of credibility. They should continue with maintaining tracking and record keeping systems that are in place.

Addendum A: Raina V. Lamade, Ph.D. Credentials and Biographical Summary

Raina V. Lamade, Ph.D., President of Lamade Psychological Services, P.C. is an Assistant Professor of Psychology at the University of Massachusetts Dartmouth, where she teaches undergraduate and graduate courses. She is a licensed psychologist in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts and the State of New York. Dr. Lamade conducts forensic assessments in the court clinics of the Commonwealth and maintains a private assessment and consulting practice, including conducting disability compensation and pension exams, often involving PTSD (Posttraumatic Stress Disorder) and MST (Military Sexual Trauma) for veterans. She is on the National Registry of Health Psychologists and is a member of several state and regional professional organizations including the American Psychological Association (APA), the Association of Treatment of Sexual Abusers (ATSA), and American Psychology-Law Society (APLS). Broadly speaking, her research and practice areas of specialization include sexual violence, trauma, veterans, and psychological and forensic assessment and decision-making processes, including risk assessment.

Dr. Lamade obtained a doctoral degree in clinical psychology from an APA (American Psychological Association) accredited program, Fairleigh Dickinson University, with a concentration in forensic psychology. She completed an APA internship at the Northport Veterans Administration Medical Center, working with a range of mental health issues, including combat trauma and sexual violence. Her training in clinical and forensic psychology includes the assessment and treatment of mental illness and trauma, in outpatient and inpatient, including forensic psychiatric hospital settings. She completed APA approved postdoctoral training at St. John's University in forensic psychology and worked on two federal Department of Justice (DOJ) grants. Dr. Lamade was a Postdoctoral Researcher and Project Manager for a grant funded by the Office of Sexual Offending Sentencing, Monitoring, Apprehending, Registering, and Tracking (SMART) to develop and pilot test an intervention program for college students found responsible of sexual misconduct. This was a four-year national study of which she was responsible for all aspects of grant management, research development and protocols, data collection, IRB and DOJ compliance, and project deliverables. On the operations end, she managed a team of over 15 graduate students, led data collection at 13 colleges and universities and over 10 pilot implementation sites. She was the primary person responsible for project oversight, training all site PIs and research assistants. On the research end, she oversaw data entry, management, and analyses. On the clinical and intervention side, Dr. Lamade developed assessment tools, a psychoeducational training curriculum and therapeutic intervention materials, and trained providers in administering the developed psychoeducational and treatment protocol. Dr. Lamade has published articles and chapters on sexual violence and related topics in forensic psychology. Dr. Lamade has provided clinical services to both victims and perpetrators of sexual violence and is a Certified Sex Offender Treatment Provider. She has testified as an expert in New York State, as well as superior and district courts of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts. Additionally, Dr. Lamade has served as a psychologist for treatment diversion programs and problem-solving courts (e.g., Veterans Treatment Court), and has provided forensic mental health assessments of criminal defendants in New York City.