

JTWTC FALL MEETING NOVEMBER 10-11 2012

Notes “Who are We?” Are We Who We Say We Are?” “Who do We Want to Be?”

Saturday November 10

Ben led us in Worship

Checked-in

Note-taker - Carrie

Process Observer - Sat. Tracey; Sun. Jonipher

Sun. Worship – Walter

Timekeeper - Walter

Theological Journeys – Jonipher, Carrie, Tracey, Ben; Walter, Taquiena, David, Wendy

Focus 1 – Wendy, Walter, David – Who we are? Who we believe we are?

3 questions: Who do we aspire to be? Where do we think we are as an association? Where is the dissonance? What are the categories of data collection? Accessibilities, race, gender, politics...

What happens if we don't prioritize? What is the process/parameters? How do we gather the data outside of the self-selected/How do we get data from those outside/How do we include everyone? How do we not become overwhelmed? How is it disseminated/How can it be usable?

Discussion: Taquiena: What drew you in/What made you feel excluded? David: Aren't we about transformation? (rather than data collection). Stories. Carrie: Gathered Here process suggested.

Taquiena: Leaders repeat stories that fit the dominant narrative – so how do we find counter-narrative?

Walter: Are we a 3rd Party neutral? Or do we have an agenda? Wendy: role of JTWTC has been part of that process – actions of body itself actually play a role. Taquiena: Not just the doing, the reflection and sustainability of the doing. That's why you ask the question!

Ben: Should we discuss all groups instead of separately to get our answers for GA workshop? Jonipher: use of focus group – bring individuals to a group to gather data (rather than going to the larger UU world). Carrie: Heisenberg's principle – we already change what we look at – be a change agent rather than objective data collector/reporter.

Wendy: Bring in leaders. Carrie: related to Focus 3 – look at who's advancing the work.

What's the data we need?

How do we do it?

Who?

What do we want to know?

Summary: Moved away from large data collection effort. Will we have surprises? Or usual suspects?

Taquiena: pay attention to margins – where transformation happens. David: look to individual deviation – tell you what no one else can. Walter: Is there some way to use this committee to say who we are that gets in our way – are we not uniquely positioned to be able to say to this denomination: what's in our way? Inherent in who we are? Wendy: the knowledge is in this room plus the resources we know we can tap into – what would it look like to tap into this knowledge? Taquiena – if we say we're not who we say we are – how is that different from The Arc. The parts of UU who are doing it differently are telling us what we are not doing. We have alternative narratives. Helen Bishop narrative, Interweave, women. David: what are 'direction's we can give to congregations? Walter: we have 'middle managers' = status quo. Tracey MM's rarely have their own agenda – look to follow leader. Ben: frame the question inclusive of people of color. Carrie: sounds like we want to go in aspirational direction.

Focus 2 – [See attachment] An assessment of the work of the JTWTC including the identification of what has been learned and where the conversation is now – Tracey and Ben

Taquiena: Crossroads organizing model related more to staff. Lessons learned about organizing. Wendy: Continued discussion re: JTWTC charge. Tracey: past JTWTC reports informed staff. Wendy: Accessibilities needs to be part of the charge. Include historical pieces as needed – as they relate to current issues.

Focus 3 – [See attachment] The use of energy centers of commitment which support the alternative narrative – Taquiena, Jonipher, Carrie

Walter: what would effective transformation look like and who gets to decide? Taquiena: when the staff interviewed districts -> 4 indicators of spiritual maturity [Rev. Deb Holder, community minister PNW, Beloved Community model]: increased capacity for connection, increased capacity to make commitments beyond oneself, to enjoy life, for integrity in the face of loss. Capacity of this group – will have to engage districts/regions. Wendy: Do we know in our hearts, is District staff - are they positioned to serve in that manner. Taquiena: like congregations, all over the place. Can identify somebody/ies can identify. Wendy: loved process of nomination of energy center. David: Does it undermine association to look for energy centers outside association? Taquiena: yes and people model what they can identify. Carrie: who is in 'association'? Taquiena: if we ignore the groups that have grown out of us we do it at our peril. Jonipher: and what groups have been ignored that are part of us? Ex. Philippines. Ben: Congregations & Beyond gives us the leverage to look at these groups. Wendy: 'Faith will find a way'. Feels very natural to be looking at these groups. Taquiena: drivers are YRUUsers. David: not convinced that just looking at what's out there to inspire us rather than instigating it. Taquiena: Goes back to the question of how do you inspire? Edges of our faith. If you see the engagement – how do you shine the light on that? Wendy: Energy moment: Justice GA. Walter: but it was top down. Wendy: I disagree.

How do 3 foci relate?

Have we moved conversation along? Ben – yes.

Tracey: Our purpose is to highlight alternative narratives to achieving Journey

Walter: Difficulty with 2 & 3 due to lack of knowledge of the history. Is there enough data? Taquiena: what history is relevant. #3 gets back to indicators – effective transformation or commitment to transformation. Not possible to identify ER's unless we're clear about what we're looking for – what are they actually doing? Walter: what is it that we want people to be doing? What does effective transformation look like? Do others tell us? Or do we tell them? Wendy: both and. No one's doing it all, but there are pieces being done. Ex. Overcoming privilege of not having/being compelled/necessary to the work. Walter: we have to articulate what we are looking at it and why it grabs someone. Tracey: filling in pieces of history. Walter: can see the usefulness of painting history for information and legitimacy. Taquiena: JTWTC history 'who the hell are you and why we should pay attention to you' answer. aka 'You Better Check Yourself'. Ben: part of the reason for doing the report is to legitimize work. Wendy: what's the relevant history? Lends authority. Ben: put into framework of what we're trying to do. Not a self-assessment. Carrie: telling our story along with other stories. David: question of authority: how much is authority vs. personal relationships. Taquiena: and that's why things like SSL provides for individuals a community plug-in place even if congregation is not engaged.

Process Observation – Tracey: stayed within charge without being strangled by it; energy was good, took breaks when needed; were well-prepared as time permits; be mindful of assumptions of level of knowledge – ask clarifying questions; Alex did fabulous job of handouts and food, some did well on getting notes in packet – do more of; covered enormous amount for territory; conversation rich, lose track of question queue; no conflict or dissent; pattern of discussion – seems to work well, not sure it honors all styles; some groups named – can probably do more; outreach to accountability groups; conversation about margins and edges included – some is by being at his table; shared observations; not yet at decision-making point; moments of Woo-Hoo. Additional: we do a good job at monitoring

participation; monitoring time vs. agenda – time seems to come up a lot – we talk about it but have great conversations. Sharing journeys respectful curiosity. Momentary pause re: JTWTC – mirrors – leading in front or behind? We are definitely wiser together! Conversation about time-sensitivity.

Sunday November 11

Walter led us in Worship
Check-in around time.
Time-keeper – Ben

View from the balcony –

Wendy: We aspire to be this. We claim to be this. Here are the stories. Here are the barriers that have been impediments to being who we say we are. Here are the places where it's happening despite the many barriers. We need to be who we are called to be and hold up those who are doing it and help us get over the barriers; call out the impediments that are real.

Jonipher: I like that idea – seeing the bigger whole. Subgroups came up with same issues, yearnings, info. How do we not recreate the wheel and create synergy together. And maybe this is one of the ways we don't repeat mistakes. Would like visual presentation from Wendy.

Taquiena: Yes. UU's where we aspire – not success but active aspirants. IN UUMA, LAREDA, even lay leaders understand that it's not you've been through this training and you're done recognizing that some of what is happening is coming because of what has gone before. Even if approach doesn't fit, taking the values forward, recognizing this has never been done; each change leads to another portal. It's happening even the context of racism, homophobia, and classism. "The Mountain" – we've been called – not going voluntarily. Some UUs stay in the valley on this side. Some have said we're gonna climb **"Called to The Mountain"**

Walter: WE need to define, imagine, show, or point to what "IT" is. Both for us, so that we have a common understanding, and for "them". Important gift we can give – our obligation. Juxtapose the IT against what its not. Ex. Difference between giving and feeding. Being 'good-hearted' is not sufficient. Need to look at component parts. "So what would be happening?" "How would we recognize it?" Tie it to our faith beliefs – need to ground, leverage our faith belief to engage us all to be called to the Mountain.

Ben: Focus two folded into other two groups. Before we look at what we think WE are, we, JTWTC need to clarify what our understanding is as a group.

Carrie: Recommended using a process similar to Gathered Here. Leverage Justice work as center of our faith.

David: RE: objective tests. Defining "IT". Repudiating privilege – not objective so that you can evaluate it quantitatively, it's qualitative. Not allies, but solidarity – paradigm shift of giving up privilege. Echo bring SJ to center of our faith. Why don't we Dedicate UUA resources? Get evaluations through stories.

Wendy: Council on Cross-Cultural Engagement (started as Task Force on Cultural Misappropriation – headed by Gini Courter including 3 members of UUMN, ARE, DRUUM UUA Board, Nancy Lawrence as Staff added UUMA and LAREDA) conversation very much resides in the area of these three questions. What is the dominant culture and why are we stick there. This group could be our focus group. So there is a group of leaders of our professional organizations

Carrie: GH was multi-level

Jonipher/Wendy: Theology added to top of Mountain as tying the work to our faith.

Taquiena: Having a conversation about what IT is and indicators. Sees justice not as center but the margin used to move the center.

Ben: Principles are center – manifested by justice.

Walter: "Is our work, the work of the journey toward wholeness the core work of our faith?" Is that not what is transformative.

Taquiena: Allen Johnson – take the path of most resistance. Something about repudiation connotes that. Don't take this work on without faith – it is a faith journey. Privilege is a burden that will not sustain us on the journey.

Wendy: Beloved Community is at the top of the Mountain.

Jonipher: Active participants would be the climbers. Inactive folks at the bottom feeling it out. The impediments are the weather conditions and internal thoughts and blocks – weight of the backpack of privilege is external and internal. Are we going to be climbers?

Ben: Using the visual of the Mountain – how do we represent the internal struggle?

Taquiena: It's not just those who climb and those who don't – some stop midway, some come back down. Beloved Community is not the mountaintop – it's on the other side. The mountaintop is a peak experience. You won't see it if you don't make this climb.

Wendy: If we can share that visual – who does hold that picture up? WE don't articulate that very well.

Carrie: High level of faith development.

Jonipher: Fears of getting to the mountaintop – what's getting in our way? Heads. Hearts. Physical. Unpack that. Spectrum of people.

Walter: We're never gonna get to perfect; never gonna get there. Juxtaposed with the idea that we're good folks – closer than most or 'those folks'. Point of comparison.

Taquiena: Have we done enough to show even what the mountain looks like? Are there resting places we can show? Folks helping others make the climb.

Jonipher: called to keep practicing. That you are on the journey is what's important.

Wendy: need to provide vision.

Ben: Mountain and accessibility issue – how do we help each other?

Carrie: use our history was examples of peak experiences – not as 'achievements' a path of successes to hold up as we have been on the journey.

Walter: powerful to name the intimate relationships. Being in relationship with people who are increasingly different than ourselves.

David: Focusing on repudiation of privilege. Theory & theology. Need something to make privilege understandable. Another point to focus on in 'the peaceful valley.' Rope, base camps – extend metaphor – not leaving anyone behind. Conversation about privilege, solidarity, costs of privilege. Remove barriers to intimacy. Humility. 'I can't do it without you.' Contradiction in terms to do it on own because its about relationship. Privilege as social control - all the ways we separate ourselves.

Ben: Needed to make the climb

Taquiena: Destination is the journey.

Wendy: issues with language – perception and barrier and access.

Jonipher/Carrie/Wendy: Different views of who we think we are.

Walter: redefining 'privilege' – reclaim it.

Wendy: that's a whole 'nother struggle – yet

Carrie: Privilege as something everyone should have. Does repudiating privilege means, for example, everybody in wheelchairs.

David: long term – privilege is costly. 'Hard to see the posint in the posion bait' The argument level up or level down, is tactical.

Ben: Repudiation of white privilege has not worked in congregations. Like the idea of interdependence. Accessibility issues give a very real visual of issues related to climbing this mountain.

Taquiena: Where are we in terms of the three questions?

Walter: Answers the questions – flip charts 3-5 minutes each.

Jonipher: Remind us to be mindful of groundwork we've done: History of JTWTC and Energy Centers.

Who do we aspire to be?

- Inclusive
- Human family diverse in many ways
- United in our dream of beloved community
- Good
- Comfort the afflicted and afflict the comfortable
- On the side of love
- Justice seekers
- Truth tellers
- Present
- Relevant
- Embodiment of compassion
- Spiritually mature
- Emotionally sophisticated
- Good partners – interfaith
- Right relationship
- Influencers
- Models
- Humbly courageous
- Creatively maladjusted
- Theologically grounded and motivated

Who do we think we are?

- All of the above
- Right
- Good
- All educated and professional
- Exceptional
- Intellectually superior
- Welcoming
- Better
- Not guilty
- Non-evangelical
- Too sophisticated to be religious
- All have a northeast perspective
- White
- Affluent
- more spiritual than religious
- Non-fundamentalist
- Superior
- We're all saved
- Enlightened
- Engaged multi-generationally
- Better than most, less good than MLK
- Special
- New

- Different
- Afraid we're not as good as we think we are.
- Entitled
- In charge
- Don't require leaders/not followers
- Misfits
- Cultural outliers
- Good whites
- Exceptional people of color
- We're there
- Antiracist
- Open minded
- Liberal
- Non-materialistic
- Green

Who are really?

- All of the above
- Racist
- Bullies
- Gentle loving people
- Good intentioned
- Intolerant
- Rude as hell
- Spirited
- Xenophobic
- Spiritual seekers
- Striving for good
- Right
- Intellectually curious
- Agnostic
- Cultural creative
- Caring
- Humanist
- Eurocentric
- Naturalist
- Protestant/Puritan
- Allergic to 3 g-words – god, giving, growth
- Spiritually immature
- Well-meaning/intentioned
- Busy
- Time-conscious
- Social activists
- Humanitarians
- Inhospitable
- Given to self-deception
- Politically correct

- Multi-syllabic
- Change agents
- A little odd
- Religious refugees
- Welcoming
- Believers
- Liberal
- Over-emphasis on intellectual/rational beyond belief
- Classist
- Able-ist
- Literal/fundamental
- Conservative worship celebrants/introverted
- Non-emotional
- Self-congratulatory
- Full of ourselves
- Ironically challenged
- Can laugh at ourselves
- Optimistic
- Privileged
- Difficult
- Individualistic

GA Budget

Wendy requested for two meetings, GA and post-GA ARAOMC training

Meeting at Wendy's in Anasqum for May 6-7 2013 meeting

ACTION – Wendy will make arrangements with Alex; Members will make travel plans with Ken.

GA Workshop – proposal is in.

ACTION – Dates for November meeting; succession planning

What questions do we have?/Next steps? -> what do we do with our 3 question process.

1. Is our work furthered by inviting others into answering the 3 questions process. (GA workshop)
2. Who would be those others? Focus group?
3. Next step? Create story from words on each list to inform.
4. What's the POP (purpose, outcome, process)? Methodology
5. Name Energy Centers – this is how we recognize – identifiers/indicators

Taquiena: Alternative narrative

Walter: Purpose -> education and engendering transformation

Carrie: Like a 5-paragraph essay – thesis, topic statement, points, substantiation. Not either/or

Taquiena: Construction of the narrative - Here's where we're falling short and here's where we are getting where we aspire to be

Ben: Create story from brainstormed list, using energy centers. Can use info from GA workshop and incorporate, as well as focus group, GH

Tracey: using GA workshop to protagonize list

Wendy: affirmation of our process or more expansive – regardless, one of the outcomes of a roomful of people engaged in the process.

Walter: present this at GA as this is our thinking, here's where it's happening. From Taquiena -> Aspire. What is. Identify the gap = what we really.

Taquiena: 'Can't be who we want to be by being who we are'

Jonipher: Story of Self (last GA) Story of Us Story of Now - > another story, of transformation, as protagonists.

Ben: Concern that we are shifting from GA proposal – is data gathering from GA? Or are we disseminating it? Propose that we create a draft propose that includes gathering the data.

Carrie: can do both

Walter: does not see need for further data gathering. Does not have clarity on what that would look like. Replicating process would evoke

David: Uncovering blind spots – use physiological experiment to demonstrate the sociological phenomenon – avoidance. Having a stake is the privilege.

Ben: must have a format that is inclusive.

Wendy: must provide an experience for attendees. What is purpose of workshop? What outcome are we looking for? What can they use? Based on last year – do this process for workshop.

It's data-gathering, story-telling, testifying that people want to give, that gives them a stake. And more useful to send them home with something they do. Also affirmation of something where someone give a hoot about explaining my truth.

Taquiena: What folks take home/what's useful to them – to have that conversation about what their aspirations are and where their community is. It's useful to show where you are and where you want to be – like BCT. Is there a benefit to know thing they can take that process home.

Walter: Propose that POP of GA and project there is no difference. We have monitored and we have assessed. Here is the process that they can take home even if answers are different. Outcome is to drive behavior changes, use a different process in a workshop than communicating to the larger UUA world.

Ben: Can take the option of extending workshop to include our report and having participants do our process.

Jonipher: hearing two things: we have the information and the necessity of stakeholders doing the process on their own -> for them to feel engaged in the process.

Walter: would we present our data?

Jonipher: yes – envisioning an interactive process. Maybe question is “Now What?” How can we carry this transformation and replicate it. Now that we've seen what's on the mountaintop are we going to settle down and take up residence? Or are we going to go back down and bring others up. None of us reach Nirvana unless all of us do. MLK: Not free until all of us are free.

Wendy: Concerned about draw –the tasty thing is how we engage people – then giving them a tool that can use in their congregations for transformation. Second, maybe we'll hear some stories about energy centers.

Taquiena: use a continuum for participants to mark where they are vs. where they would like to be and tell that story. Where do you think it's happening? Bring it back next year. Promotes an interesting exchange.

Ben: Purpose is to engage participants in 3 q's. Outcome is educate and drive behavior transformation – take home - > spike to create energy centers; report. Process is engaging participants in answering questions; JTWC presenting information to educate.

Wendy: also have plenary flash words [wordle]

Jonipher: support statement about success of last year's GA

Walter: feel strongly about claiming our knowledge and authority. If we can do it all, OK. But will feel strongly that we will have missed if we don't share our knowledge. To what extent are manifesting white UUism by saying everyone has to voice an opinion vs. black view that it's time to preach, Fear that we are walking away from authority in an effort to be nice.

David: Conflicted about being 97% white and yet we need to be inclusive. Blind spot is privilege, not just white privilege. We need to point out where core is and map it.

Wendy: imagining workshop space would be mostly marginalized communities of UUism. Letting go of data-gathering and what transformation would be available for participants? How do we make sure we have an authoritative voice? Plenary.

Tracey: Purpose – to create and/or energize the transformation that we seek. Outcome – for whoever's in the room are energized protagonist with whatever they need to work with. Process – effective, which we could do in all different ways. It's about the Story of Now to get the alternative narrative to move through it to the other reality.

Carrie: how do we use our experience and authority, and model humility and inclusiveness?

Next steps:

GA Workshop

POP

David: do caucus groups for process

Ben: this would work for data collection, but is its best for engagement?

Jonipher: that gets at AR but not at AO? So not the whole picture.

Walter: what's missing is education and enlightenment. Yes we want to engage group. Give direction – trail signs. 1. Ask 3 q's 2. Here's some answers. 3. Here's where it's happening. In some way we need to be defining.

Ben: can that be done in plenary?

Walter: can be done anywhere, how might change.

Taquiena: Answers can be used Continuum can be a tool for assessment and for reflecting where community is "why is this where you think we are? Where is this happening?" Also learn how to take this tool and learn how to have the conversation. Some way for UU's to name and also analyze, get down deeper into behaviors that are keeping us stuck and what does that say about getting us unstuck in order for us to move in the right direction.

David: purpose is engagement, not data collection. Show at plenary. Dissonance between caucuses there that ought to give people pause.

Taquiena: congregations would have a tool for naming and assessing. Allows them to enter into difficult conversations.

Wendy: Plenary info could also include send questions and answers out to listservs to also answer.

Leaving with a tool.

Taquiena: picturing the pictures people put on Facebook to illustrate 'what I look like' 'what others think I look like'.

Wendy: What we think we look like? What we really look like? What others think we look like?" "What we want to look like?"

Carrie: sounds like a Train-the-trainer numbers of people of color in ministry.

Jonipher: add to graphic Mountain imagery.

Walter: what is plenary talk?

Wendy: opportunity to use 5-6 minutes with visuals to tell assembly what we've been working on. Script by May.

David: artist to draw mountain. Hold up.

Carrie: All been done before

Wendy: visual with words

Jonipher: Facebook page inviting people to add then do a word cloud

David: something a-typical

Carrie: putting words into story?

Taquiena: instead of saying 'typical' UU's let's name we're talking about 'white', etc.

Ben: VOLUNTEERED to set up Facebook page
Wendy: ACTION report to plenary twice – 4 minutes each
Carrie: similar to RRT
Wendy: ACTION Twitter #hashtag – people could tweet words
Walter: careful that we also use positive words
Wendy: VOLUNTEERED to take this list and order it on a power point
Carrie: Do we want to edit the words.
Wendy: for January – leave every word on 11/11/12.
David: what reactions? If you don't like it – come to our workshop. Don't want to lose stories and presenting them.
Walter: stories – can imagine one from each word – presenting.
Taquienna: 'picture is worth 1,000 words' using photos to illustrate the counter-narrative
Wendy: 'PRE- INVITE Groups
Ben: MANAGE workshop deadlines
Jonipher: ACTION artist to create mountain graphic WENDY -> JONIPHER
Ben: MEME of 3 Q's
David: contact with cartoonist. How we challenge the dominant paradigm thinking.
ACTION ITEM (Google doc): whenever you have an idea for a visual ALEX
Walter: 'a real UU' photo of Nigerians
ACTION: Phone meeting – BEN
Carrie: would like a concrete list of terms:
Taquienna: UUA video conferencing abilities. ACTION: ALEX
ACTION: JAN meeting POP on project.
ACTION: Fall 2013 meeting [Carrie prefers 1st weekend in Nov.]

Process Observation – Jonipher: Energy fluctuated, overall used time efficiently, handouts – used Alex's folders, discussion produced rich metaphors, brainstorming energetic and uplifting, most part good at stepping up and stepping down, including calling quiet into conversation, use of humor, honored wrenches, incorporated species discussion, conflict handled well – mending relationship and healing in real time, moments when acknowledge own reactions, speaking up for self, discussion on time honored style differences. Suggestions for future: parking lot, become aware of other oppressions – did bring in some. Rich discussion re: including other affinity groups in our work, and center of our faith –honored questions of our own spiritual growth and emotional maturity. Mindful that we didn't want to silo ourselves. Differences of opinions were heard – kept bigger picture/mission in mind. Woo Hoo moments interspersed throughout.

Appreciations and check-out.

Appendix A

JTWTC Subgroup 2: Tracey Robinson-Harris, Ben Gabel

Topic: An assessment of the work of the JTWTC including the identification of what has been learned and where the conversation is now.

Timeline

- Start with 1st resolution in Calgary GA 92 or Phoenix GA 97 when JTWTC was created? – we can give brief description between 92 and 97.
- Do we want to work chronologically?
- Look at JTWTC Spring 2012 minutes for committee's timeline.
- How and why were the JTWTC reports generated? –Get reports from Alex.
→Examine report about Ministerial Fellowship Credentialing Committee

Lessons From the Past

- Draw lessons from the timeline.
- What have we learned? Build upon those.
- Examine previous JTWTC reports to the GA.
- Use the *Arc of the Universe* as a resource.
- There needs to be a way for congregations to the *Welcoming Congregation* model.
- Examine the Crossroads Ministry approach and see if this model fits within congregational polity.
→ Is authority or centrality needed for transformation to occur?
→ Is the JTWTC this group? → Was the JTWTC to model the Crossroads approach?

Where are We Now?

- Big piece is accountability and what does that look like?
→ Moving away from why we are having this conversation to how we will have the conversation.
- Where is the JTWTC most effective?
→ associational, district/regional, or congregational level?
- Where are the congregation/community access points with the JTWTC?

Future JTWTC

- What direction do we want to point to?
→Accountability? Cultural Competence?
- Create grassroots campaign at congregational/community level?
- How can we interconnect the work of our subgroup with subgroups 1 and 3?

Link to U & U RACIAL DIVERSITY HISTORY TIMELINE

<http://archive.uua.org/programs/justice/timeline.pdf>

Link to Resolution in Calgary GA 1992

<http://www.uua.org/statements/statements/14413.shtml>

Link to Resolution in Phoenix GA 1997

<http://www.uua.org/statements/statements/14244.shtml>

Timeline created at JTWTC Spring 2012 meeting

(1990): Welcoming Congregation Program starts.

(1991ish): Creating a Jubilee World starts.

(1992): Calgary GA resolution. Relationship with Crossroads began to develop.

(1996-1998ish): Power analysis trainings were being delivered to UU leaders by Crossroads-trained folks who adapted the Crossroads analysis to a UU context.

1997: GA resolution called for the creation of the JTW Transformation Committee.

1998ish: First committee was formed, made up of volunteers and staff. Single chair – white minister. Each committee member had several stakeholder groups that they were tasked with accountability towards. That piece constantly fell by the wayside. Leadership team did more than just the JTWTC. Therefore there was vulnerability – was it volunteer or staff-driven? Multiple roles, multiple hats. ARAOMC power analysis was offered to the board, leaders, and was controversial – it had come out of a Christian context and resistance got created. JTWTC was delivering these power analyses/Jubilees. We weren't yet at the point of being able to address intersecting identities. This struggle was projected onto the committee as the committee's problem instead of being seen as a UU cultural issue.

1999ish: Jubilee 2 starts.

1999: Why Anti-Racism Will Fail – workshop by Thandeka at GA and UUWorld wrote an article on it. JTWTC coordinated a response to Thandeka. Very polarizing.

2002: Became a committee with a staff liaison, board liaison, and staff support. Convened listening sessions (east and west coasts, Chicago and Dallas) – invited congregations to send leaders to talk about the ARAOMC work they had done. JTWTC listened and compiled that information and gave it to the UUA, which created the concept of many paths, one journey. That was how the JUUST Change Consultancy came into being.

2002: First assessment of UUA staff.

2003: The committee was no longer delivering resources, but monitoring and assessing. Program development and delivery went back to being UUA staff responsibility.

2004: Movement was made toward what became Allies for Racial Equity.

2004-2006: Tension developed between those who had been part of UUA ARAOMC work for a longtime and those of a new generation. With each wave of new leaders there were more perspectives on oppression at the table, accessibility, LGBT, etc. Move was made to have self-selected co-chairs.

2005ish: Groundwork (youth anti-racism) founded. Fort Worth GA happened with much race-related awfulness. Consultation on Ministry to and with Young began.

2006: Cultural Misappropriation Task Force founded (now Council on Cross-Cultural Engagement). Diversity of Ministry Initiative begins.

2007: First formal report from the JTWTC: Snapshots of Five Districts on the Journey. Raised awareness in the association and led staff to commit to re-involving districts in ARAOMC.

2008: Accessibility Committee is no more; their charge is shifted to JTWTC. Equal Access is founded.

2008: Second report: Assessing Cultural Competence in Ministerial Formation. Came out of a conversation with Bill Sinkford (who tried to visit at least one of the committee's meetings per year).

2009: Mosaic Report published. YRUU disbanded (and Groundwork). Standing on the Side of Love launched. Arc of the Universe is published.

During this time the question of how identity figures into peoples' ability to serve started to be more present. Leaders with some marginalized identities were spread thin. How other factors such as age, financial situation, job situation play into ability to serve. Who is at the table influences the culture of the committee.

2010: Third report: Assessing Leadership Development. Took 2 years to produce. Focused on volunteer and elected leaders at associational level. Hoped that it might also be useful / impactful on congregational level.

2010: Building the World We Dream About launched.

2011: Conversation with the board and committee on committees regarding what the JTWTC's role is and how our charge fits into the changing structure of the board and governance. JTWTC identified some areas/ideas and the board gave those a stamp of approval. They want to be in relationship with us.

2011: Move from having a board liaison to relationship with right relationship group (via Michael Tino). Committee on Committee has asked Wendy to serve as a single chair.

2012: Justice General Assembly. Accountability Group.

Appendix B

FINAL 11-7-12

JTWTC FOCUS – Part 3

The use of energy centers of commitment which support the alternative narrative. These would include congregations and other UU communities engaged in effective transformation in regards to class, faith development, accessibility, transforming individual & communal lives, moving toward wholeness & holiness.

Discussion

What we ‘know’ – from Multicultural Growth & Witness:

- Congregations engaging in anti-racism, anti-oppression, multiculturalism
- Congregations involved in ministries that engage diverse communities
- “Congregations & Beyond” such as Lucy Stone Coop, Beloved Café, SSL Campaign, Beloved Community

Questions

1. As external observers, what is our authority in describing these congregations/communities?
2. What are the Criteria/Indicators/Boundaries the JTWTC wants to set? Examples: is it for congregations to tell the story; individuals. vs. communities; geography; timeframe; type of community. What is it that the committee wants to lift up as a way of inspiring and motivating UU’s?
3. Can we budget for Energy Center to hold a ‘contest’ similar to SSL video, Breakthrough Congregations?
4. Who is report for? What stake does the audience have in it?
5. What would report look like? Multi-media, interactive possibilities?
6. What would the Research and Methodology be?