

Journey Toward Wholeness Transformation Committee
Meeting Notes
September 8, 2010

Present Members: José Ballester, *Board Liaison*; Taquiena Boston, *President's Representative*; Helen Boxwill; Connie Brown; Natalie Fenimore; Scott McNeill; Michael Sallwasser, *Co-chair*; Arthur Tackman; Wendy von Zirpolo, *Co-Chair*; Tracy Ahlquist, *Staff Support*

Start Time: 9:00 AM Eastern Time

End Time: 6:00 PM Eastern Time

Topic	Discussion	Decisions/Actions
Worship, Check-In, and Teambuilding – Michael and Wendy		
Business: Approve Minutes	Minutes were approved.	
Housekeeping	<p>Should the JTWTC's new member orientation manual be put off until the spring meeting? Should the orientation manual go into the appendix of the report as a model for other committees?</p> <p>When the committee prepares its report, it goes to the BoT—which reviews the report, the recommendations, etc. The committee has also presented a workshop at General Assembly. Wendy asks about web coverage and UU World coverage. Taquiena suggests that the committee speak with Don Skinner of InterConnections, John Hurley (Director of Communications), and Chris Walton (Editor of UU World) about coverage. The MFC/RSCC report was shared with the folks who were interviewed; Michael shared the district report at a district presidents' meeting. It would be appropriate to share the results with the committees who were interviewed, and to create an appreciation of those committee members. It might also make sense to follow up with those committees to ask if the report was helpful and whether it moved them to change their practices at all.</p> <p>Re: including the orientation manual, it would make sense to review the BoT manual and the CoC manual first. The JTWTC also hasn't used its own manual in practice yet, so it might be presumptuous to include it as a model. In Wendy's conversation with Nancy Bartlett (the chair of the CoC), Nancy mentioned the orientation manual that they send to all UUA committee chairs. Wendy was unfamiliar with it, so she asked that Nancy send it to her. Scott is working on a new member orientation manual that outlines the various facets of the committee in order to give guidance to new members. Taquiena says that the CoC orientation manual and the JTWTC orientation manual shouldn't be part of the same conversation—the</p>	

	<p>former is germane to the report, and the latter is not. Scott has fulfilled his responsibility to the committee by sending a draft to the JTWTC, and the committee will follow up. Michael suggests that the JTWTC orientation manual could be included as an online supplement at a later time.</p> <p>Scott volunteers to do the process observation for the day.</p> <p>Wendy reminds the committee that folks need to observe financial deadlines in order to not impact future fiscal years. Arthur reminds the committee members If folks want to do a tax-deductible contribution, they can get a letter thanking them for their in-kind donation. Scott asks when the deadlines are; T&Es should be submitted within a couple of weeks of the end of each meeting, and there's a final hard-and-fast deadline at the end of the fiscal year.</p>	
	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Dedication and Acknowledgements – Scott to leaders—past, present, and future 2) Appreciation – Natalie 3) Table of Contents – Natalie 4) Executive Summary – happens at the end; Wendy and Michael 5) Introduction – Connie <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. including the committee's charge, background, vision, purpose, design process & methodology, summary of survey responses, and the limits of the study. Connie's current draft doesn't include a summary of survey responses; she needs input from others re: the limits of the study. Why is the committee doing this? Connie read the "why" section of the Introduction. She'll mention the 3 elements of the report. b. Clarification of why the JTWTC is focusing on the role of these committees, rather than going into detail. If people want to connect to other parts, they can navigate via the links. Short summary of who, why & how. Charges for both committees & how they're comprised/ "who are the committees"—these should use links to the committees' uua.org pages for ease of access. 6) Analysis: Recruitment and Selection – Michael, Arthur, and Jonipher (5 pages/2200 words) The group has a draft that the three members have each contributed to in significant ways. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Introduction (talk about the charges of the two committees and how that relates to recruitment & selection); how inclusion is important—doing this through a lens of AR/AO/MC—this frame could be followed by other 	

	<p>sections.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> b. Theology: why do we do this, why is leadership & addressing inclusion, marginalization, and diversity a theological question? They relied on Paul Razor’s Barry Street Address, “Ironic Provincialism,” as a framework. c. Analysis and statistics: they relate some of the stats they gathered re: diversity of nominations and appointments. They also referenced interviews and the committee’s meeting with Gini Courter in November of 2008. Goals: diversity/inclusion, and cultural competence of people who are recruited (regardless of identity). d. Recommendations. <p>7) Analysis: AR/AO/MC Awareness, Training, and Internal Processes</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Important to impress upon NomCom and CoC the importance of their role and the impacts that it has on committees and on leadership in general. The subcommittee has been looking at the paper trail: what the BoT expects the committees to know, to do, etc. What the committees expect of themselves—do these expectations impact how they recruit and encourage leaders? If the gatekeepers aren’t walking the talk and don’t have the competence to assess the people coming through, what impact does that have on leaders and leadership? Arthur points out that how you do your recruitment determines the candidates that you get (different than ministry, where a variety of folks feel called to the work—self-selection. Natalie: There is a conversation about being more intentional about identifying people for ministry who will fill a need in UUism. There’s a challenge to balance these two as ministers work to do ministry in the community). <p>8) Analysis: Orientation, Support, and Retention</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. They’re in the process of fleshing their thoughts out, and have just begun their draft. They need to get together and write the report. They realized that there were questions that hadn’t been asked—they sent follow-up questions to the chairs of NomCom and CoC. They’re realizing that this piece will be recommendations-heavy. There’s a journal that’s passed between NomCom members as they leave the committee that may have interesting insights. <p>9) Overall Conclusions/Observations; Recommendations</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Pull out recommendations from each section and create Summary Recommendations section. b. Closing/ Conclusion: what are the meta-lessons? What did the committee learn in doing this report about where we are on the journey? This would be 	
--	---	--

	<p>something that churches and committees could use, and how it might translate to the district and congregational level. Context of UUA moving toward its 50th anniversary...</p> <p>10) Appendix placeholders:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Phone interviews: questions b. Online Survey: how many were sent out, how many were completed, the survey questions & of inquiry c. Demographic data from CoC d. JTWTC: history, glossary, definition of cultural competence e. Resolutions f. JTWTC creation & evolution, past reports? <p>11) (Online version only) Who is the JTWTC? Photos, recorded intro, charge</p> <p>To discuss:</p> <p>1) Formatting: online vs. print</p> <p>2) Location of Executive Summary/other teaser</p> <p>3) Introduction</p> <p>Should information about Paul Razor's article appear in the Introduction?</p> <p>4) Theology: targets, accountability, evidence</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Placement b) Messaging c) Each group will have a section on theology that can be incorporated into the introduction & serve as the glue. <p>5) Accountability & impact (to constituent organizations and how those orgs and groups may receive this report)</p> <p>6) Inclusion or exclusion of Susan Gore's report, and inclusion or exclusion of documents from NomCom & CoC.</p> <p>7) Appendices</p> <p>8) Title of Report</p> <p>Should the UUA be thinking about numbers, targets, numbers as reflection of commitment? Raises theological questions of accountability.</p> <p>Graphs/charts that should be in the appendix in order to complement each section of the report—each group should consider which graphs will be most useful.</p>	
--	--	--

	<p>Groups will send their drafts to Tracy, who will provide paper copies on Thursday and Friday mornings. This will include the graphs that Michael sent around to the group.</p> <p>Committee members will take 30 minutes to read the draft on Thursday morning and then will reconvene for groups 2 and 3 to offer 5-minute presentations on their rationale behind the points in their section.</p> <p>Should the CoC internal orientation draft be used as documentation of awareness and expectations of competency? This is evidence of ongoing work. There isn't a similar orientation manual from NomCom, so the second group will need to draw more from interviews and the conversation between NomCom & JTWTC.</p> <p>The third group will have lots of recommendations, but the committee wants to hold up best practices, positive stories, etc. and to be mindful of wording.</p> <p>NomCom and CoC will welcome recommendations, but any recs need to be sensitive of the reality of a volunteer BoT and the amount of work that they're still holding.</p>	
Process Observation – Scott	Scott offered process observations.	
Discussion of report draft	<p>Committee expressed appreciation that the report is coming together.</p> <p>Dedication: delete first sentence? Combine first & second sentences and add “therefore?”</p> <p>Appreciation: list JTWTC members who have worked on the report; other past members can go in the appendix, if need be. Scott and Natalie will look at the Dedication & Appreciation sections together.</p> <p>Intro: should appendix references appear in the intro, the body of the report, or both? In the same way, authors don't need to re-define the NomCom & CoC in the body of the report, unless they're adding to what was said in the introduction. Each sub-group will review the intro and make sure to cut down on redundancy.</p> <p>Discussion of round 2 interviews should be pulled from the first and third subgroup sections and put into the intro.</p> <p>Past chairs of NomCom & CoC were interviewed; also, did Susan Gore get through to the last committee member?</p> <p>References to 1997 resolution may or may not need to be there.</p> <p>Second paragraph of “Vision” may be redundant; at least, it needs to be updated with the various topics from the ToC. Or “difficult work of leadership development?”</p> <p>Background: the process of selecting the topic of study flowed from a desire to study the process of leadership development, which led to</p>	

	<p>How is “elitism” being defined? We don’t use that term when we’re talking about anti-oppression. Why is it there and what do we mean by it? Members decided to take it out.</p> <p>PowerPoint presentation—whose?</p> <p>“This report focuses on”—revisit?</p> <p>The committee undertook an intentional discussion of process around offering suggestions and edits to the original authors of specific sections.</p> <p>Group 1</p> <p>Re: Recruitment and selection theology section on ministers—does that need to be there?</p> <p>Theology feedback: democratic process, search for truth and meaning—these are two of many values that we can hold up in terms of diversity instead of tokenism.</p> <p>Diversity, inclusion, and cultural competence are headers; if the title of the section is recruitment and selection, should those be headers?</p> <p>Should the report state findings first and then state the committee’s analysis of those findings?</p> <p>Should the theology piece be in each section, or should it be something that’s woven as an introduction to the entire report? The theology section is rich and deep, but could it tease out a couple of ideas that ground the report and then move on? Could the numbered sections be lifted out? Some committee members argue that we can reason our way to multiculturalism—disagreement with Paul Rasor’s thought that we have to leave behind our intellectualism in favor of emotions...we’re called to this work through our principles—which are very relational. The sacred is present in interactions. If the positives are numbered and the negatives are in the narrative, people will notice it differently.</p> <p>If the report is going to say anything negative, that should come out in the recommendations; it’s not necessarily the job of the JTWTC to discuss the failings and weaknesses of Unitarian Universalism & UU faith communities. It’s important for the committee to ground its report in a theological and a religious context. “Our saving message for a hurting world” message from Bill Sinkford recognized both those things.</p> <p>“Judging” at end of first paragraph may not be the wording that folks want to use.</p> <p>“If we agree” paragraph should also talk about the formal application process; is the Nominating Committee missing, or placed elsewhere?</p> <p>What does “systemic use of any metrics” mean? What would they be/look like? What are the JTWTC’s metrics standards (if any)? The committee shouldn’t hold committees to higher or different standards. If the committee makes a recommendation, others will ask what the JTWTC does. It’s not unreasonable to ask these two bodies (NomCom and CoC) to develop metrics to determine cultural competency. Or if they can’t do so, a third party (Council on Cross-Cultural Engagement, Multicultural Growth & Witness?) could do so.</p>	
--	--	--

	<p>Cultural competence is part of the recruitment & selection process, as well as the awareness & training process. There's a baseline, and then there is training.</p> <p>Group 2</p> <p>Natalie read her draft of the introduction to the committee, as well as the draft of the theology section.</p> <p>Lived experience is a good phrase. The subgroup wanted to hold up the fact that this is a work-in-progress, so not everything will be perfect all the time.</p> <p>Accessibility awareness, training, and conversation just isn't there. In the last report, the committee was really intentional about discussing accessibility, but it needs to be incorporated more.</p> <p>Are all appointed committee members expected to attend the AR/AO/MC training post-GA? And they're funded by the committee for it? Yes. It would make sense to have that training every year. The documentation indicates that it's offered every year—it needs to be implemented that way. Is there a way to split the training up and offer it at different points during GA? Is there a metric to assess people's presence (physically as well as in terms of intellectual engagement) at the training? Could these trainings happen in a district or regional way?</p> <p>Staff support members are folks whom people should speak with if they have a special need.</p> <p>Move section II to after section III—section II is findings (interviews), and section III includes analysis.</p> <p>Group 3</p> <p>Helen talked through the various pieces of the orientation, support & retention section.</p> <p>Should the closing section contain the theological statements? Or just a couple of sentences to tie it to the larger issue of leadership so that the recommendations piece doesn't end the section?</p> <p>"In an effort to maintain confidentiality..." the report shouldn't contain names, so there should be stylistic agreement. Should quotes be interspersed, or set apart? Some individuals gave permission for their names to be used,</p> <p>"Where people have given permission for us to use their names, we have done so. In cases where permission was not granted, composite statements are used"—in introduction? If people aren't identified, does it change the relevance change? No. committee members are concerned that everyone will know the significance of certain names, but that's not necessarily true. It's more important to know the stories and how they connect to experiences—and identifying information, if it's helpful.</p> <p>External practices are more important here, but the committee doesn't have very much</p>	
--	---	--

	<p>information about those practices (and they'll be working more on their recommendations section).</p> <p>Nominating Committee and Committee on Committees will be spelled out each time.</p> <p>Should other abbreviations be used?</p> <p>GLBT/LGBT/BGLT—what should the order be? Multicultural Growth & Witness uses Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, and/or Transgender (LGBT) and then LGBT throughout. People outside of the UUA recognize this abbreviation.</p> <p>Committee members will consider whether it needs to define certain terms in a glossary, rather than simply spelling out acronyms.</p> <p>Appendices</p> <p>It might help to spell out specific examples to explain certain elements of the graphs and charts.</p> <p>Should Susan Gore's summary report be included in the appendices? Members had a sense of wanting more when they read the summaries.</p>	
	<p>Committee discussed their budget dilemma: how to accommodate the cut? Canceling the spring meeting and sharing rooms at GA would make up the shortfall. Are committee members ok with that? If the JTWTC goes to GA, how will committee members commit to setting aside time? Members go to GA with the best intentions, but it's hard to dedicate a substantial amount of time to any one thing—it's already hard to make these choices. Presenting the highlights of the report at GA (during Plenary) rather than doing a workshop might be a different option—having the co-chairs do a presentation instead of offering a workshop might be a better return on investment. If the committee goes to a share-a-room policy, individual members could make up the difference if they want to have a private room. There's also a question of visibility—if the committee doesn't attend GA, it's automatically less visible. If the committee doesn't meet at GA, what is it doing the rest of the year? Are there other ways of cutting down? If the committee goes to GA, it really needs to spend time working at GA. The committee feels accountable to the General Assembly—it came out of a very specific set of experiences and a GA resolution, so it's accountable to the BoT and the GA. Perhaps the other meeting could happen in January instead of the fall. There's a concern about shifting the financial burden to the members of the committee—some can afford to cover travel expenses themselves, but it sets a problematic precedent. The workshop that the committee had this past year didn't create a real presence at GA; it was worthwhile for the attendees, but few people were there. Having a slot in Plenary creates a larger presence. In Michael's first year on the JTWTC, they did a worship in a workshop slot that was packed. Wendy describes her experiences on the Accessibilities Committee: they would be committed, during GA, to the work of the committee—sitting at the booth, doing the workshop, etc. If the will of the committee is to go to GA, it's not going to be possible to find</p>	

8 hours to meet. If the decision is made to have two people give a Plenary presentation, **Wendy** will be pushing to have a different solution than two white co-chairs presenting. **Taquiena** says that the committee is new every time a new member comes on, but there isn't much of a getting-to-know-you process. Relationship stuff is important, too—how is the group feeling? The committee does do some team-building and telling of its stories. That could happen at the spring meeting. **José** says that this report will no doubt rock the boat with the BoT; this report impacts two committees and the BoT, but not necessarily the GA. It might be wiser to have a spring meeting. A lot of the buzz will be around what to do in 2012, and this report could get lost. **Connie** points out that the committee had discussed congregational applications of the report, and might need to return to that conversation. Committee took a straw poll between the spring meeting and GA. E&P needs as much lead time as possible if the meeting is going to be canceled. A spring meeting could plan a workshop at GA, dissemination of the report, etc. This isn't necessarily a decision that will set the standard for all years going forward—it's just for this year. If the committee did go to GA, it might ask for a chunk of the NomCom & CoC meeting time to present the report and answer questions. The co-chairs will check in with the NomCom & CoC chairs to ask about meeting with the committees at GA, and **José** will check in with the BoT.

Wendy expresses gratitude in the face of the difficulty inherent in writing the report as a group. **Connie** acknowledges that each member has worked very hard, and would offer that some people are invested in their particular sections and might have a hard time hearing criticism. She suggests that if members are offering paragraphs/drafts for other members' sections, they be mindful of understanding that sometimes that might not mesh with what's already been written. And if newer members request historical information, they should be able to receive it so that they can incorporate it into the piece that they're working on. **Michael** says that the lack of team-building is showing up here; there have been problems in the past when people took ownership of specific sections of the report and got upset when changes were suggested. The entire committee owns the entire report—the conversation of ownership of the report hasn't happened. **Connie** says that of course, the entire committee has ownership of the report, and that everyone is invited to comment on every part of the report. But each person has been assigned a section of the report, and should be able to incorporate changes in a way that honors the work that they've done. **Helen** says that writing is very personal, and it's hard to let go. **Taquiena** reflects on a quote from the report that the BoT, often times in working on their task at hand, loses the AR/AO/MC process. That seems to have happened here; there was no process observation yesterday, no continuing education, etc. We began this meeting with a conversation of how this is relational work, and it's the relational piece that has been difficult. **Scott** says that in relationship with people at this table, he trusts each person and hopes to offer suggestions with grace—and to receive them gracefully as well. That's right relationship, and it's sad that we have to ask for it. **Jonipher** recognizes that individualism seems to be taking over; the communal and the relational is important. **Natalie** says that her name is only on the report as part of the group, so she doesn't feel an attachment to particular wording. There may be words here that, personally,

	<p>she couldn't get behind, but it's different when it's a group product. The people receiving this will have parts that they like and don't like, as well. It should be something we can be proud of as a group. She invites everyone to go back to the place they were in the first day where they came to have a product from almost nothing. Wendy holds up gratitude, groovy, grace, and group as four words to contemplate.</p>	
	<p>Where should the Executive Summary fall? In other reports, the Executive Summary comes at the very beginning—in past JTWT reports, it has come after the dedication and appreciation. Scott likes beginning the report in the spirit of gratitude. Committee members decide unanimously to leave it where it is.</p> <p>Closing: does the committee want to have a closing for each section, or a closing for the entire report? Each subcommittee will create a sentence or two to close each section. The closing will be a larger-context piece about the broader application of the report (possible uses at congregational/district level), meta-lessons, etc; Michael and Wendy will take a stab at drafting it. NomCom & CoC are to a certain extent dependent on the AR/AO/MC work that congregations and districts are doing, as well as their leadership development work. Whatever demographics congregations have, they can still do this kind of AR/AO practice and develop cultural competency. There seems to be a desire for more training in this area (local, district, etc.). Acknowledgment of the constraints and challenges, as well as best practices that are already in place—and specific applications of those best practices to congregations. Connie asks about an appendix of resources: mentoring guidelines, process observation, metrics, suggestions for conducting meetings within a multicultural paradigm/framework. Michael says that this report will be passed along to the BoT—he's concerned about burdening the people who are receiving it. Wendy suggests that it would make sense to create a page of links online. Scott agrees that there's added value—maybe this is something that can happen at another time.</p> <p>Accountability and impact: how is the committee going to interact with stakeholder groups and what will the impact be?</p> <p>Theology: placement, messaging, targets vs. measurement (already addressed), accountability, evidence. Should the theology portion be a separate section at the beginning of the report, or as a thread through the report (or both)? Taquienna notes that theology was lifted up throughout the report, but that the quotes that appeared at different points were all from straight white men. Jonipher: Also some quotes didn't have sources attached. Taquienna: What does beloved community look like? There's a reference in the intro, but we could use a statement about what it is; "uniting the human family so that we all live whole and reconciled" is the phrase that the Leadership Council uses. Scott would hope that the quotes match the sentiment—in their piece, they referred to it. Wendy says that it is the intent of the theological subgroup to make sure that happens—they'll be adding quotes, not substituting them.</p>	<p>Helen will collect title suggestions and administer the vote.</p> <p>Formatting: online vs. print. Connie and Jonipher and Michael will work with Tracy on formatting questions.</p> <p>Wendy and Michael will draft the conclusion section, and other committee members will send any additional thoughts.</p> <p>Scott and Connie will take on creating a page of resources and will welcome suggestions from the rest of the group.</p> <p>Wendy, Connie, and Jonipher will look at the theological context and message (quotes, flow, etc.) and work on making sure it's intact and full. Helen will send along quotes.</p> <p>Michael will work on getting pieces of the appendix together.</p> <p>Timeline: September 17th: Title (Helen) and appendices (Michael) done.</p> <p>Theological: Helen will get quotes to Jonipher, Connie, and Wendy before the 17th, and the trio will communicate next week regarding their timeline.</p> <p>September 19th: Executive Summary and Closing (Michael and Wendy) will be done; other committee</p>

	<p>Appendix on page 44: “perceived need;” could this be a different kind of chart?</p> <p>Still to be added: Gini’s PowerPoint</p> <p>Appendices that are named in the report but might be better in link/citation form, or that don’t need to be included:</p> <p>P. 2 list of committees that NomCom & CoC are responsible for</p> <p>P.5 all of the documents regarding procedures of NomCom and CoC</p> <p>P. 5 Bullet point summaries from Susan Gore</p> <p>P. 7 NomCom slate demographics—did these ever come?</p> <p>P. 12 Manual for committee chairs</p> <p>P. 14 Additional responses referring to the post-GA training</p> <p>1) Overall consistency: Michael & Wendy plus any fabulous thoughts from others</p> <p>2) By the end of Tuesday night (9/14), everyone with comments will have sent an email with the subject line “Feedback to Section #____.” If folks get feedback on their section, they will acknowledge it.</p> <p>Taquierna: It’s important to lift up what points the committee wants folks to take away. Michael notes that lived experience is a good thing to lift up as important to us. Connie notes that it could appear in the introduction. Natalie suggests that if there are important points that need to be preserved/lifted up, contributors should note that to Michael and Wendy.</p>	<p>members will give feedback on the 20th & 21st; Wendy and Michael will then revise on the 22nd and 23rd.</p> <p>Tracy will be in touch with Connie, Michael, and Jonipher about formatting on the 20th.</p> <p>Resources: Connie & Scott. The final version for the BoT packet will be done as of the 19th; the committee can add to the resource list on the website going forward.</p> <p>Final appendix will include a copy of the process observation document and a summary from José.</p> <p>No new data after September 19th—nothing that would impact the ToC, the title, etc. Executive Summary and closing will be done, but only minor revisions will happen after the 19th.</p> <p>1) Overall consistency: Michael & Wendy plus any fabulous thoughts from others</p> <p>2) By the end of Tuesday night (9/14), everyone with comments will have sent an email with the subject line “Feedback to Section #____.” If folks get feedback on their section, one person per section (Michael, Scott, and Wendy) will acknowledge it.</p>
Process Observation – Michael	Michael offered process observations.	