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Bylaw Amendment:

ARTICLE X - STANDING COMMITTEES

Standing Committees of the UUMA include Guidelines; Anti-Racism, Anti-Oppression, and Multiculturalism; and Ethics and Collegiality. The Board of Trustees shall appoint Standing Committees. The Board of Trustees may set up or abolish such temporary committees as may be necessary from time to time except for those specified in these bylaws.

Guideline Amendments:

Continuing Education Change (for one-time vote)

The UUMA is in the midst of a cultural change, moving from a learned ministry to a learning ministry. We recognize that in order to effectively minister, we need to keep learning, keep growing, keep engaging and responding to the world within which we live. In order to cement this change within our institutional structure, we are proposing adding a reference to a learning ministry to the Standards of Professional Practice.

Standards of Professional Practice
I.C.5 (renumbering existing 5-12 to 6-13)

Ministers engage in a learning ministry, committed to a path of continued growth and education through every stage of ministry.

Severance Change (for one-time vote)

The following amendment brings the UUMA Guidelines into agreement with UUMA/UUA Joint Ministerial Letter of Agreement.

Amendment to IV. G 5.

In the event of a negotiated resignation, unless otherwise provided in the Letter of Agreement, salary, parsonage use or housing allowance, and benefits, although not professional expenses, are expected to continue at the same level for the longer of three months or one month for each full year of service up to eight ten months from the date of a negotiated resignation, or until the minister has found another position, if sooner. Minimal contractual obligations should apply in the case of criminal malfeasance or of an acknowledged violation of the Code of Professional Conduct directly injuring the involved institution.
Report to the Board by the Ethics Team of the Guidelines Committee

Members of the Committee: Anita Farber-Robertson, Melitta Haslund, Leisa Huyck, Rob Keithan, Nathan Ryan and Kim Wilson, Chair.

Our Charge

The UUMA Board of Trustees charged our committee with studying the existing Guidelines and proposing revisions to clarify and strengthen our professional standards against behaviors that perpetuate white supremacy, heteropatriarchy, and other systems and structures of oppression. A daunting task, to say the least! The Guidelines have been written from a social location in which a white New England male perspective predominates. During our first discussions beginning in January 2018, our collective feeling was that in order to significantly alter this orientation, the document would need to be totally reconceived and rewritten, and we reported this to the Board.

The Board agreed that a complete overhaul needed to be undertaken in the future, but asked us to limit our scope at this point to the gaps in our ethical standards in the Code of Conduct and to eliminate the inconsistencies in the rest of the Guidelines that compromise clarity about ethical conduct. We were also asked to make “actionable” (any statement within the Code of Conduct) all conduct that needed to be actionable (and therefore subject to the Accountability Procedures), which would involve a careful review of the Standards of Professional Conduct (which describe “non-actionable” conduct). For example, in section II.G., our Standards currently state: “In all cases, ministers must be careful not to take advantage of those they serve, or damage the integrity of any congregation, agency or enterprise in which they serve. Ministers must always put the needs of those they serve above meeting their own romantic or sexual needs.” As it stands now, a minister who takes advantage of those they serve, damages the integrity of those in their setting, and/or puts their own romantic and sexual needs first, has not engaged in misconduct that is actionable.

Because of the above statement and others in the Standards, our current Guidelines remain ambiguous with regard to sexual and romantic relationships between ministers and those they serve, supervise, or otherwise hold authority over or with. Although we understand that in some cases in the past, these relationships have “succeeded,” we now recognize that there are inherent power imbalances in these relationships and that more often than not, harm is done either within or beyond the relationship.

With the granting of power and authority, there is of course always the potential for misuse of that power, whether consciously or unconsciously. As the MFC and the Board of Trustees have navigated cases of misconduct to the best of their ability, they have been hampered by several provisions in our current Guidelines. These provisions have been routinely misused by colleagues engaging in misconduct in order to successfully evade accountability. Power and authority also have also too often led to bullying and emotional abuse, which our Guidelines do not address at all. Another concern that the Board and we share is that the imperatives to confront and dismantle white supremacy and to address unjust discrimination of all kinds are not specific or detailed enough to be actionable when they are not heeded.

We solicited feedback from a variety of constituents and stakeholders, described in more detail below. Many expressed frustration with and a high level of concern about the current expectation that we will not speak “scornfully or in derogation” of colleagues. Our Guidelines need clarity and details in the area of speaking to and/or about a colleague when there is problematic behavior. Too often, our current Guidelines have led colleagues to remain silent, believing that we are required to do so, and in the
process, allowing further harm to occur. In the proposed revisions, we call upon colleagues to place the well-being of those we serve, staff with whom we serve and other colleagues above the protection of a colleague whose behavior is causing harm.

In the steps we have taken to strengthen and clarify our ethical behavior, we, in conjunction with the Board and the Accountability Committee, are proposing a foundational shift in our ministerial culture. It is one that moves us away from patriarchy and its model of relationships marked by domination and competition and instead places compassion, respect and right relationship at our ethical center. Working together, we hope to create a culture in which we see all relationships as covenantal. All covenantal relationships are ideals, meaning that we will often fall short of the ideal. Covenantal relationships include a commitment to the restoration of both the covenant and the relationship.

Obviously, any change to a culture takes time. Yet we are excited about the possibilities for the future of the UUMA and, as the changes ripple outward, to Unitarian Universalism as a whole.

Our Process

From the beginning, we realized that we, as a committee, were not in a position to undertake our work in a vacuum; we needed to devise a way to hear about the concerns of relevant parties from as broad a spectrum of perspectives as possible. Last October, our Ethics Committee, the Accountability Committee and the Board spent three days in Spokane to work out these and other details of our tasks. We had the benefit of working for a full day with an excellent outside consultant, Rev. Dr. Debora Jackson, Director of Lifelong Learning at Yale Divinity School and former Executive Director of the Ministers Council, American Baptist Churches, USA, who helped us devise a plan and a process for achieving our goals.

The two committees together brainstormed and then refined a list of UU ministers and others with a variety of expertise, experience and perspectives, and a list of organizations and other entities (for example, UUA leadership) within our denomination. (Note that as part of our research, our committee also reviewed the ministers’ guidelines for several other denominations). The Ethics Committee conducted interviews of approximately two dozen people, all of whom have had broad exposure to the UU ministry. We asked them, “What behaviors in our UU ministry trouble you?” and “What do you think is allowing this to continue?” We also asked for any additional comments.

The feedback we received affirmed the Board’s charge and provided us with details and real-life examples of misconduct that we found invaluable. Feeling more grounded in our work, we then proceeded to put into place revisions that addressed our charge, with nuances added based on our deepened understanding of the issues. We added language to name and describe bullying and emotional abuse. The Board approved our proposed revisions with some small edits. We then proceeded to share the proposed revisions with representatives of a broad set of UU-related organizations and entities.

The feedback we received was significant and compelling. We asked the Board for permission to submit a second round of proposed revisions, and they agreed. In particular, we further addressed the need for a clear understanding, or more accurately, a new understanding, of how we as ministers need to communicate with one another when we perceive a colleague’s behavior as misconduct, malpractice or incompetence. We needed to make it absolutely clear that we have a responsibility to prioritize the value of the larger good over that of maintaining a colleague’s reputation, AND that there are ways to tell the truth with respect and without unkindness.
We added a statement at the end of our covenant to counter the cultural norm of perfectionism, naming ourselves as human and inherently imperfect and thereby giving ourselves permission to make mistakes.

We also added a section describing tokenism, which is not well-understood by most colleagues (most of whom are white). This is important, because tokenism hurts those who are tokenized. While we as a group know about and believe in the UUA’s commitment to anti-racism, anti-oppression and multiculturalism (ARAOMC), many of us do not understand the difference between promoting diversity and multiculturalism and inadvertently engaging in tokenism.

The Board approved our second round of proposed changes. Our committee is grateful to the Board and to you, members of the UUMA, for granting us the opportunity to revise our Guidelines and thus to promote ethical behavior that evolves with our collective understanding of the best practices of ministry. May we open ourselves to these changing understandings with courage, compassion for ourselves and others, honesty, the willingness to be vulnerable, and a dose of humility.

Respectfully submitted,
The Ethics Guidelines Committee
THE UUMA GUIDELINES FOR THE CONDUCT OF MINISTRY:
Proposed changes for June 2019 Annual Meeting (Note: deletions are struck out; additions are in bold; sections not related to proposed changes have been removed)

COVENANT
United in our call to serve the spirit of love and justice through the vocation of ministry in the liberal religious tradition, we, the members of the Unitarian Universalist Ministers Association, covenant with one another:

- To conduct ourselves with integrity, honoring the trust placed in us;
- To embody in our lives the values that we proclaim on behalf of our faith;
- To support one another in collegial respect and care, understanding and honoring the diversity within our association;
- To hold ourselves accountable to each other for the competent exercise of our vocation;
- To use our power constructively and with intention, mindful of our potential unconsciously to perpetuate systems of oppression;
- To seek justice and right relations according to our evolving collective wisdom, and to refrain from all abuse or exploitation;
- To cultivate practices of deepening awareness, understanding, humility, and commitment to our ideals;
- To labor earnestly together for the well being of our communities and the progress of Unitarian Universalism.

We recognize that none of us is perfect and all are works in progress. We hold one another in love as, through fidelity to this covenant and our Code of Professional Conduct, we aspire to grow in wholeness, and bring hope and healing to the world.

CODE OF CONDUCT:

Ethical Standards

1. I will be honest and diligent in my work to fulfill the offices of ministry according to the stipulations of my call or employment and my best professional judgment.
2. I will not misappropriate the money or property of the congregations, agencies or enterprises I serve, or of their members, staff or clients.
3. Within the limitations of law, I will respect the confidentiality of private communications from those to whom I minister or who I supervise.
4. I will honor the intellectual property of others, assuring that appropriate attribution is given to avoid intentionally creating the impression that the work of others is my own.
5. I will not engage in racist or oppressive actions or speech. I will demonstrate respect, and compassion without regard to race, color, class, sex, sexual orientation, gender expression, age, physical or mental ability or ethnicity. Such and equitable treatment shall be extended to all to whom I minister regardless of position in the organization, including to those everyone both within and outside of my ministerial context, including clergy colleagues, staff, those I serve and anyone who may disagree with me.
6. I will work to understand, identify, and eliminate unjust discrimination—including tokenism—based on racialized identity, ethnicity, gender expression, gender identity, sex, disability, affectional or sexual orientation, family and relationship structures, age, language,
citizenship status, economic status, national origin*, or religion. This includes challenging injustice in myself, in ministerial and other professional colleagues, those I serve in ministry, institutions, and in the wider world. Refer to Addendum 2 for a description of tokenism.

*From the Bylaws and Rules of the Unitarian Universalist Association, Rule G-2.3. Non-discrimination (line 1790).

7. I will publicly and privately act with respect toward staff colleagues. Such behavior includes sharing of pertinent information and insights, providing programmatic support, honoring their professional abilities, respecting confidences, and giving public support although not necessarily agreement.

8. I will refrain from relating to colleagues, and staff, and members of the congregation or constituents of the setting in which I serve in a manner that creates an intimidating, hostile or offensive oppressive environment. I will not engage in bullying behavior or verbal abuse, further defined in Addendum 1 of the Guidelines. I will not intentionally deceive colleagues, staff, or members of the congregation or constituents of the setting in which I serve.

9. I will work to confront attitudes and practices of unjust discrimination on the basis of race, color, class, sex, sexual orientation, gender expression, age, physical or mental ability, or ethnicity, and to challenge them within myself and in individuals, congregations, and groups I serve.

10. In all cases, ministers must be careful not to I will not take advantage of those they I serve, or damage the integrity of any congregation, agency, or enterprise in which they I serve. I will not use those I serve to meet my own romantic, sexual or emotional needs.

11. I will not engage in sexual contact, sexual harassment, sexualized behavior or a sexual relationship with any person I serve as a minister.

12. I will not engage in sexual contact, sexual harassment, sexualized behavior or sexual relationships with colleagues who are interns, associates, students, counselees, mentees, or others — whether ministers or other religious professionals — under my direct or indirect supervision, or with any other colleagues serving the same congregation, unless we were previously partnered with each other.

13. I will make myself a candidate for a pulpit or other position of ministry only with serious intent, and I will observe the established candidating procedures of the Unitarian Universalist Association.

14. I will not engage in public words or actions that degrade the vocation of ministry, or diminish among us the esteem of our calling.

15. I will stay informed of the latest rules and policies of the UUA’s Ministerial Fellowship Committee.

Expectations of Conduct

1. I will share and support the concerns of the Unitarian Universalist Minister’s Association, especially as reflected in the UUMA Covenant, Code and Standards.

2. Within the limitations of law, I will respect confidences given me by colleagues and expect them to respect mine.
3. I will not speak scornfully or in derogation of any colleague in public. In any private
conversation concerning a colleague, I will speak responsibly and temperately. I will not solicit
or encourage negative comments about a colleague or their ministry.

When speaking to or about a colleague in any venue, public or private, I will do so
respectfully. There are times when it is necessary in the service of the greater good to name
a colleague’s problematic behavior, whether related to misconduct, malpractice or
incompetence. In naming such behavior, I will speak honestly but not unkindly, and I will use
descriptive rather than judgmental language. This means I will describe the behavior and its
impact, and not engage in name-calling.

When expressing concerns about a colleague’s conduct, if I feel safe in doing so I will first
speak directly with the person about whom I have the concern. If I do not feel safe, I will
contact a Good Offices Person (GOP). I will not remain silent when silence would allow
further harm to occur, unless the harm to me has been so traumatic that I am unable to speak
of it. The importance of identifying and addressing ministerial misconduct (as defined in this
Code) and the resulting harm to individuals, colleagues, congregations, and agencies or
enterprises, takes priority over expectations of collegial confidentiality.

4. These Expectations of Conduct apply to all forms of public or private media including electronic
and internet communications.

5. I will seek consultation among my colleagues practicing the diverse forms of parish-based and
community-based ministry within the same geographical area, so that we may develop a
mutually agreed Letter of Understanding regarding our several roles and the ways in which
these may and may not intersect.

6. If I am not a settled, interim or consulting minister of a congregation served by a colleague, I
will not offer, and will not accept requests for, ministerial services or public leadership from
members of that congregation, or in that congregational context, unless I have a covenant with
or until I have consulted with the minister serving there.

7. If my colleague asks me to refrain from performing such service or appearing in a leadership
capacity, I will comply.

8. Should emergency circumstances make advance consultation impossible, I will render only
limited service, and consult with my colleague at the earliest possible opportunity.

9. If I have occasion to perform ministerial or leadership functions, apart from routine contact
with members or clients of my current ministry, in contexts where colleagues are serving, I will
make an effort to communicate with those colleagues, and to respect their professional
prerogatives and be responsive to their concerns.

10. Ministers of a congregation hosting District, Regional or UUA events will be assumed to have
invited colleagues to appear in leadership capacities at such events.

11. If I am to share the ministry of a congregation with other ministers, I will seek clear delineation
of responsibility, authority, accountability and channels of communication before
responsibilities are assumed. I will thereafter work in cooperation and consultation with my
colleagues, taking care that changing roles and relations are re-negotiated with clarity, respect
and honesty.
12. I will acknowledge the reality of power differences based on defined responsibilities and authority within congregations, agencies or enterprises. I will acknowledge the reality of privilege arising from differences of social location and historical marginalization. I will exercise the power of my authority and the privileges of my social location in such a way that I do not disadvantage my colleagues on the basis of my or their race, color, class, sex, sexual orientation, gender expression, age, physical or mental ability or ethnicity, racialized identity, ethnicity, gender expression, gender identity, sex, disability, affectional or sexual orientation, family and relationship structures, age, language, citizenship status, economic status, or national origin.

13. As a supervisor, I will recognize the special responsibility I have to colleagues and staff who I supervise, and I will work justly and compassionately with the authority given to me.

14. As a minister working in a role supervised by a senior colleague with other clergy colleagues in the same setting, I will work to support my colleague’s leadership and the success of our shared ministry.

15. When my ministry to a congregation has ended, I will refrain from offering or performing ministerial services for members of that congregation, except at the invitation of my incumbent successor colleague(s).

16. If I belong to or attend a congregation served by a colleague, I will honor the prerogatives of that colleague’s responsibility for leadership in that congregation, and in all ways seek to support that colleague’s ministry. I will initiate an open and direct conversation with my colleague(s) in order to create a mutually agreed covenant, expressed in a Letter of Understanding, about the role I am to play in the church. If I am a member of a congregation that I once served, this may include the possibility of absenting myself from any presence at all. I will articulate clearly my own hopes and expectations regarding my relationships in the congregation, and my intention to avoid wielding any undue influence among the members. I will only participate in leadership roles that support and benefit the ministry, and at the request and with the permission of the minister(s). I will neither listen to nor volunteer criticisms of my colleague(s). As necessary I will describe appropriate channels of communications to members seeking to express concerns.

17. If I am a settled minister in a congregation having retired or other ministers as members, I will seek to foster cordial and candid relations with my colleagues in recognition of the value of their presence in the congregation. I will initiate an open and direct conversation with my colleague(s) to enter a mutually agreed covenant, expressed in a Letter of Understanding, about their participation in the life of the congregation. I will bring any concerns arising from the relationship my colleague(s) have with the congregation directly and promptly to the attention of my colleague(s).

18. If I am elected Minister Emeritus/a, I will recognize that this honor sustains a continuing but changed relationship with the congregation I once served as one of its ministers. I will initiate an open and direct conversation with my successor colleague(s) to enter a mutually agreed covenant, expressed in a Letter of Understanding, about the role I am to play in the church. My successor colleague may choose to include the congregation’s board of trustees in this covenant process. I will honor the prerogatives of my colleague’s responsibility for leadership, and in all ways seek to support that colleague’s ministry.
19. If I am a settled minister in a congregation that has elected a Minister Emeritus/a, I will recognize the meaning of the honor that the congregation has bestowed, and the significance of the continuing relationship of ministry it implies. I will initiate an open and direct conversation with my Emeritus/a colleague(s) to enter a mutually agreed covenant, expressed in a Letter of Understanding, about their participation in the life of the congregation. I will bring any concerns arising from the relationship the Minister Emeritus/a has with the congregation directly and promptly to that colleague’s attention.

20. The discovery of ministerial misconduct and the healing of congregations, agencies, enterprises and persons that have experienced such misconduct, take priority over the expectations of collegial courtesy.

20. In calling attention to any deviation by my colleague(s) from this Code, I will adhere to the processes described in Accountability, below. So doing will not be regarded as a failure of collegial loyalty.

G. Personal or Romantic Relationships
Recognizing that ministers are called to nourish the health and wholeness of the communities they serve, and recognizing the fiduciary nature of our profession, and as stated in our actionable Code of Conduct, ministers will not engage in sexual contact, sexualized behavior, or a sexual relationship with any person they serve as a minister. The following are non-actionable best practices drawn from the wisdom of much research across many religious organizations about what behaviors uphold healthy religious communities and ministries. In the spirit not of legalism but of deepening our understanding of loving, just, healthy relationships, these guidelines point towards truths about the profession of ministry and healthy ministerial conduct, understanding that no truth names the whole truth or covers every situation. To that end, ministers should engage in discerning dialogue with themselves and with their colleagues—to better understand what these best practices mean in the context of each ministers’ own ministerial setting and in the context of the collective ministry we all share.

1. Ministers will conduct their behavior concerning romantic relationships in accordance with laws on ministerial misconduct.

2. Ministers will not engage in sexual contact, sexualized behavior or a sexual relationship with any person they serve as a minister. In the case where a minister chooses to enter into a romantic or sexual relationship with someone for whom they have previously served as a minister, ministers will observe a significant period of time during which no ministerial services are rendered before initiating such a relationship. refrain from having any contact with the person for a period of time at least 2 years. Ministers who engage in such activity after the two years bear the burden of demonstrating that there is no exploitation, in light of all relevant factors.

3. Refrain from asking communities they serve to accept a succession of exploratory romantic relationships on the part of the minister.

4. All ministers are guided additionally by the expectations of the agencies or enterprises where they work, and by the standards of other professional organizations to which they may belong, regarding the establishment of sexual contact, sexualized behavior, or a sexual relationship with any person served professionally or any colleagues serving in the same setting, unless they were previously partnered with each other.
5. In all cases, ministers must be careful not to take advantage of those they serve, or damage the
integrity of the congregation, agency, or enterprise in which they serve. Ministers must always
put the needs of those they serve above meeting their own romantic or sexual needs.

6. Ministers who would like to initiate a romantic or sexual relationship with a ministerial
colleague must be mindful of power differentials in the relationship and always act in ways that
protect the well being and dignity of the colleague who is more vulnerable. Ministers shall not
be in sexual relationships with colleagues who are interns, associates, students, counselees,
mentees, or others under their direct or indirect supervision.

M. Staff Relationships

1. A harmonious and coordinated relationship among staff members is important to the well-
being of any congregation, agency or enterprise.

2. Ministers should publicly and privately act with respect toward staff colleagues. Such behavior
includes sharing of pertinent information and insights, providing programmatic support,
honoring their professional abilities, respecting confidences, and giving public support although
not necessarily agreement.

3. Arrangements for accountability vary. In some institutions the minister is head of staff. In
others each member of the professional staff works with an appropriate committee, or is
supervised by another member of the staff.

4. Ministers should encourage the staff to meet regularly to discuss and coordinate planning and
administration.

5. Ministers need to recognize that inexperienced staff members will require additional time from
them or other staff for training and development.

6. It is the responsibility of the minister to advocate for suitable compensation and benefits, fair
working conditions and policies, clear job descriptions, and periodic review and evaluation for
all staff.

7. Ministers should encourage congregations, agencies and enterprises, when hiring staff, not to
discriminate on account of race, sex, color, class, ethnicity, national origin, age, physical or
mental ability, gender expression, or sexual orientation. However, the promotion of diversity
should be taken into account when choosing among well-qualified candidates.

8. The authority of the office of the minister is grounded in trust, compassion and accountability
to the mission of the institution they serve. Neither staff nor ministers should be required to
work where harassment by anyone creates an intimidating, hostile, or offensive oppressive
environment. Ministers should educate institutions and their leadership to be particularly
aware of their responsibility to provide an environment free from harassment based on race, sex,
color, class, ethnicity, religion, national origin, age, physical or mental ability, gender
expression, or sexual orientation. Racialized identity, ethnicity, gender expression, gender
identity, sex, disability, affectional or sexual orientation, family and relationship structures,
age, language, citizenship status, economic status, national origin, or religion.

Ministers must never engage in bullying or emotional abuse of staff. See Addendum 1 for
a more detailed description of bullying and emotionally abusive behaviors.
III. Responsibilities and Expectations Among Colleagues

B. Ministers in Multiple Staff Settings

1. All ministers should understand, periodically review, and renegotiate when necessary, the document that sets forth their relationship with the congregation, agency or enterprise that calls or employs them.

2. All ministers serving together in the same congregation, agency or enterprise should develop written documents articulating the covenant of relationship and responsibility with the other minister(s) in that setting. These documents should be periodically reviewed, and renegotiated when necessary.

3. Collegial relationships between ministers serving together in the same congregation, agency or enterprise should be characterized by:
   a. mutual respect;
   b. support for the success of one another’s ministries;
   c. shared loyalty to the well-being of their congregations, agencies or enterprises;
   d. a commitment to good communication;
   e. clarity regarding the assignment of roles, responsibilities and authority.

4. Each minister, regardless of role, is entitled to all protections, rights and courtesies, and is bound by all collegial expectations, as defined in the UUMA Covenant, Code of Professional Practice and in these Standards.

5. Ministers must not ever engage in bullying or emotional abuse of colleagues. See Addendum 1 for a more detailed description of bullying and emotionally abusive behaviors.

6. Multiple ministers serving the same congregation, agency or enterprise are most likely to work effectively together if the structures of their roles are clearly articulated before these relationships begin, at the time of search, hire, call or affiliation. Structural elements may include, but are not limited to:
   a. who has what degree of accountability for articulating the mission, vision or direction of the congregation, agency or enterprise;
   b. whether the position represents a call by the congregation, hiring by the institutional leadership, or by a minister already on staff;
   c. whether the position has the potential to become a called ministry, and if so how and by whom that decision is to be made;
   d. how and by whom and for what reasons the decision can be made to end the minister’s tenure in the position;
   e. how conflict between the minister and the congregation, or with other ministers working in the same setting, will be addressed; this would include clear processes by which a minister being supervised by another minister can report abuse;
   f. what the lines of accountability, reporting, and supervision are.

7. In addition, when ministers serve together in the same setting, special attention needs to be paid to the power and privilege dynamics in the relationship(s) when there are differences in social location and historical marginalization.

8. Should conflict arise between ministers serving together in the same congregation, agency or enterprise, every effort should be made to preserve the well-being of the institution. Provisions
for this eventuality should be specified in the Letter of Agreement, contract or Letter of
Affiliation between the congregation, agency or enterprise and the minister, and these
provisions should be adhered to. In most instances Chapter Good Offices should be consulted.

9. As indicated in the Code of Professional Practice, ministers who function as supervisors to
colleagues serving in the congregation, agency or enterprise have special responsibilities to
those they supervise, including:

a. conformity to the UUMA Code of Professional Practice;
b. awareness of a supervisee’s job description and terms of employment;
c. creation and maintenance of a written list of mutually understood expectations;
d. self-awareness of power differentials that may exist between supervisor and supervised
colleague;
e. dependable opportunities for collegial consultation and communication;
f. recognition of privilege arising from differences of social location and historical
marginalization, and advocacy to address the ways these conditions differences in
social location and historical marginalization may affect a colleague’s ability to fulfill
their ministry;
g. regular review and evaluation of the supervisee’s job performance based on written job
descriptions and expectations;
h. clear understanding of how the supervisee reports a supervisor’s abusive behavior
i. advocacy for a colleague’s suitable working conditions;
j. recognition of a colleague’s efforts, successes and accomplishments;
k. clarity in long range plans and directions that may affect a colleague’s position;
l. deflecting or countering unwarranted criticism or interference in the performance of
the supervisee’s ministry;
m. support for the colleague’s professional development and future career.

10. Ministers who serve together without supervisory relationships should consider which of these
obligations apply to them.

11. As indicated in the Code of Professional Practice, ministers who are supervised by colleagues
serving the same congregation, agency or enterprise have special responsibilities to their
supervisors, including:

a. conformity to the UUMA Code of Professional Practice;
b. awareness of one’s job description and terms of employment;
c. creation and maintenance of a written list of mutually understood expectations;
d. self awareness of power differentials that may exist between supervisor and supervised
colleague;
e. regular collegial consultation and communication;
f. recognition of privilege arising from differences of social location and historical
marginalization, and advocacy to address the ways these conditions may affect a
colleague’s ability to fulfill their ministry;
g. participation in regular review and evaluation of one’s job performance based on
written job descriptions and expectations;
h. clarity about conditions necessary for the performance of one’s ministry;
i. support to the organization served by adhering to the established lines of authority and
keeping disagreements with supervisors between colleagues when asked.
ADDENDA

Bullying and Emotional Abuse

Ministers must not engage in bullying or emotional abuse of colleagues, staff, congregation members or anyone else they serve. This may include, but is not limited to:

- Speech and/or behavior that is derogating, demeaning, controlling, punishing, or manipulative.
- Withholding communication, support, or resources.
- Passive-aggressive behavior (covert hostility).
- Inappropriately leaving a colleague/staff person out of decision-making.
- Spying, stalking, hovering, and invading someone’s person, space, or belongings.
- Making threats, judging, destructive criticism, lying, blaming, name-calling, ordering, and raging.
- Couching criticism in the form of jokes, sarcasm or teasing.
- Opposing: a pattern of arguing against anything someone says, challenging their perceptions, opinions, and thoughts. Treating another as an adversary, in effect saying “No” to everything, so a constructive conversation is impossible.
- Blocking: may include switching topics, accusations, or use of words or other means to stop conversation.
- Discounting and belittling: minimizing or trivializing someone’s feelings, thoughts, experiences, or credentials.
- Undermining and interrupting: use of words intended to undermine someone’s self-esteem and confidence, such as, “You don’t know what you’re talking about,” finishing sentences, or speaking on someone’s behalf without their permission.
- Denying: denying that agreements or promises were made, or that a conversation or other events took place, including prior bullying behavior. In the extreme, a persistent pattern of denying is called gaslighting.


2. Tokenism

Tokenism in the context in which we practice refers to any superficial gesture, however well-intentioned, of accommodation to the principles of diversity, equity and inclusion of members of underrepresented, historically-marginalized groups. The practice of tokenism may include a sense by a member of the dominant group of fulfilling an ethical mandate, of “doing the right thing”, or of avoiding criticism. Within the context of our ministries, tokenism may appear, for example, in the areas of hiring practices and volunteer recruitment, congregational membership, and programming.

Avoiding tokenism requires ministers to deepen their understanding of the values of promoting such diversity, equity and inclusion.

The following questions may be helpful:
1. When seeking to bring or add diversity to the setting in which I serve, what is my motivation?

   a. Am I seeking to make the setting “look” more diverse?
   b. Is it to experience a sense of pride in “doing the right thing?”
   c. Am I trying to bring in “the (name of marginalized group) perspective?” (There is no such thing as a single perspective within any marginalized group.)
   d. Do I expect someone who identifies as a member of a marginalized group to be an “expert” on that identity? (An example would be expecting a transgender person to be an expert on all transgender issues.)

2. When hiring or recruiting volunteers, am I considering the candidate’s identity more than their areas of knowledge and expertise?

3. Am I or is the leadership of the setting in which I serve:
   a. hiring or recruiting members of marginalized groups to leadership positions, but keeping all the power?
   b. hiring or recruiting members of marginalized groups only for positions related to that identity?
   c. maintaining an organizational structure that promotes and protects the dominant culture, which may include practices such as a lack of transparency, withholding information, and making indirect statements?

4. Am I deepening my understanding that the equitable inclusion of people of diverse identities and from diverse backgrounds:
   a. provides opportunities for people who have historically been denied such opportunities?
   b. gets us out of our own “echo chamber” and enables us to gain understanding that comes from voices outside of the dominant culture?
   c. brings a variety of new perspectives to a religious community which will enrich and change that community?

Report to the Board by the Accountability Team of the Guidelines Committee

Members of the Team: Michelle Favreau, Matthew Johnson, Jonalu Johnstone, Lynnda White, Karen Stoyanoff, and Paul Langston-Daley, Chair.

Executive Summary for the Board and Members of the UUMA

Our Accountability processes, culture, and habits do not work. Too often, over generations, our covenant has been broken without consequences, harm has been amplified rather than stopped, power has triumphed over justice, legalism has prevented healing, and secrecy has protected violators. Part of the process of healing and justice is that we are called to name this truth. The UUMA Board, and the body as a whole, must and will engage in this truth and reconciliation work.

And, we must change the way we do things.

The Accountability Team of the Guidelines Committee was charged with improving our accountability procedures. Given what we now know and have experienced about covenant, harm, trauma, healing, power, identity, role, and accountability, how should we hold ourselves and each other accountable for the keeping and health of our covenant? The members of the team worked for 2 years on this project, reviewing reports, interviewing people, and developing possibilities. In October 2018, the team met in Spokane and had a set of breakthroughs in our understanding.

First, we agreed to rewrite the whole section. There are some good parts of the current procedure, but it is not working. UUMA Members, the Committee on Ethics and Collegiality, and the UUMA Board and Executive Team all agreed that what we are doing now isn’t working and supports maintenance of current power structures, causing particular harm to people of marginalized identities.

Second, we agreed that what we needed was not just new language, but a new culture. Words on a page can help, but they cannot substitute for sustained, widely-shared practice. These new accountability procedures will not work -- none will -- unless we shift our culture. How?

We must move from secrecy to appropriate transparency, from punishment to accountability, from silence to healing, from avoiding consequences to stopping harm, from fear to trust, from shame to empathy, and from defensiveness to learning. In short, we must make our covenant real. Covenant assumes, correctly, that we will err. Covenants are bent, broken, misinterpreted, and forgotten. Our accountability procedures, and our culture of covenant, must bring us back to learning, growing, healing, and right relationship. They serve us as persons, as ministers, and our faith, when they are robust, honest, and effective.

What does the restoration of our covenant look like? Each situation is different. Sometimes a misunderstanding needs clear communication. Other times, accountability might demand both an apology and concrete changes in behavior, sustained over time. And, removal from ministry, as well as healing for those harmed by misconduct, is sometimes needed. Our values of justice, integrity, and healing guide this work, as well as a concern for public safety, the integrity of our ministry, and faithfulness to one another as human beings with inherent worth and dignity.
After that October Meeting, we interviewed dozens of people, both UUMA members and lay leaders, about their hopes, concerns, wisdom, and ideas for how to make this work. Their input was essential in the crafting of this proposal.

Below, you will see our new language. Some important notes:

We call for a new office, the Right Relations Guides (RRGs). These RRGs would be a separate group from the Good Officers. Good Officers would thus focus on relations between UUMA members and congregations, covenanted communities, and other external bodies. They can assist with negotiations, employment practices, and similar issues. The RRGs, on the other hand, are there to assist UUMA members in responding to experiences of bent and broken covenant between us. The RRGs should receive a small stipend. A portion of the UUMA Website would list them, including their biographies, identities, and serving experiences. They should have regular check-ins with each other for support, pattern identifications, and continuing education. They need to be people who are deeply grounded and aware of and able to manage vicarious trauma. They should be trained in trauma-sensitive care, harassment, systems theory, anti-racism, anti-oppression, and multiculturalism (including deep understanding of cultural competency), and restorative practices. These RRGs are accountable to the health of our ministry and the integrity of our ministry. They report to the UUMA Executive Team, will share reports of their work with each other, the Executive Team, and the Common Ethics Panel staff (see below). Given the current demand, let alone the pent-up demand awaiting an effective process, we may need 25-50 of these RRGs. A budget will be necessary -- trying to do accountability and healing at low cost has been one of the failures of our practice.

We should also set aside (in collaboration with the UUA) a fund for restorative and healing practices. Survivors of misconduct, trauma, bullying, and harassment should receive a ministry of healing. This can include talk therapy, retreats, embodied healing practices, continuing education, and more. RRGs would be able to allocate funds for healing resources.

You will note that this procedure refers to a Common Ethics Panel. This Ethics Panel, which would respond to misconduct and harm by religious professionals in Unitarian Universalism, would be an independent body. As we write this draft in March of 2019, the discussions about the shape and nature of that Panel are ongoing but expected to conclude in May 2019. Revisions to the below may be needed based on the details of that Panel’s work. Some questions we expect these conversations to address include: the independence of that panel; how its recommendations for repair, suspension, or removal are acted upon by the MFC and UUMA; what happens to a minister’s membership in the UUMA and fellowship with the UUA while under review by this panel; the notification and opportunity to respond of any identified as violating the covenant; and, of course, how changes to these process are reflected in the UUA bylaws and rules.

Some other professional bodies have adopted, or may adopt, the code and procedures of the UUMA for their own work. A common understanding across our bodies is welcome. While recognizing differences in role, power, privilege, and resources, there are ways that common covenants between religious professionals can be strengthened. We hope that leaders among the UUMA, AUUMM, LREDA, UUAMP, UUSCM, and AUUA will continue to work together in this direction.

We strongly recommend that the MFC and UUA make it a rule that to be in fellowship with the UUA, you must be a member of the UUMA.
We support the MFC’s and UUMA’s joint consideration of a plan to require continuing education on professional ethics and multicultural competence.

Our previous rules indicated that one conclusion of a process could be that a “grievance is unfounded.” The Common Ethics Panel will still sometimes find this to be the case. We hope that a right relations process will, even when no clear violation of the covenant has happened, still lead to better communication, understanding, and relationship between colleagues.

One theme that became incredibly clear in our interviews was the importance, not just of the general covenant between us as UU ministerial colleagues, but the even more robust and specific covenants between colleagues who serve together in the same communities. We cannot emphasize enough the importance of working to create, revise, maintain, and embody a deep covenant between colleagues serving in the same setting, retired and/or emeritus colleagues and serving colleagues, supervisors and students/interns, and colleagues serving community ministries and colleagues serving congregations and covenanted communities in the same locations. When differences of identities are at play, a coach/mentor to help craft these covenants becomes even more important. A proactive, just, and faithful effort at this can prevent larger and more intractable problems from developing. When violations of our covenant occur between ministers connected to the same ministry setting, both our UUMA code and the personnel policies of that setting (including seminary policies, UUA policies, and more) will need to be followed. Always, if restoration is to happen, a new, robust and authentic covenant must be created and followed.

Lastly, a note about record keeping and sharing. The failure to keep accurate records and share relevant information has compounded harm. Our team places far less value on confidentiality and far more value on protecting from and healing harm. The record-keeping and record-sharing body shall be the staff of the Common Ethics Panel. They will operate according to procedures agreed to by the UUMA, UUA, and other bodies, and follow best practices in this field. Part of the purpose of record-keeping is to look for patterns -- from individual offenders, and wider structural issues that demand intervention, clarification, and/or education. The RRGs will provide reports to the Panel staff, and they would have clear instructions on sharing that information -- with chapter leaders, with local colleagues, with successor colleagues in a ministry setting, or with the body as a whole. The details of this procedure need to be worked out and are not spelled out in detail here.

Two true things were articulated to us in our interviews. First, that a complicated or opaque procedure gives permission for misconductors, decreases trust, and makes accountability difficult. Second, that a one-size fits all response can make people hesitate to report violations, does not respond to differences in identity and power, and will not be used by our colleagues. We have tried, as best we can, to offer both simplicity and options.

This process is iterative. Just as we expect one another as professionals to grow and change, we expect our culture and processes to do the same. As our culture of covenant grows stronger, and we learn from the RRGs and each other, the UUMA Board and the body as a whole should revise and improve these procedures.

This summary and draft is provided to the UUMA Board in March of 2019. Alongside the separate recommendations of the Guidelines Ethics Team, it will be considered for a first vote at the UUMA Annual Meeting in June 2019. A learning guide will be distributed separately to the members in the coming weeks. Please review these materials and discuss these matters in your chapters, clusters,
and networks. A second vote will happen in June of 2020. Meanwhile, the UUMA Executive Team and Board will be working with the UUA, the MFC, and other professional organizations to create the Common Ethics Panel, as well as the handbook for RRGs and revise the handbook for Good Officers, so that, if all the parts line up, this process can begin in July 2020. If the Common Ethics Panel does not materialize as anticipated, then a revision would need to be approved by the body in accordance with our bylaws.

This is cultural work. It is the work of generations, the work of care, and the work of love. Let us meet it with courage, commitment, and honesty.

In faith and hope,
The Accountability Team of the Guidelines Committee

Accountability Procedures

The provisions of the Code of Conduct identify standards of behavior for members of the UUMA.

Violation of these standards by any member is a matter of concern to other members, and may result in disciplinary actions.

The following procedure is to be followed when a member of the UUMA becomes concerned about a colleague’s adherence to the code.

Concerns and the Role of UUMA Good Offices

In most instances, a member who believes a colleague’s behavior to be inconsistent with the Code of Conduct should express their concern directly. As an alternative, or should the direct approach not achieve the desired result, a Chapter Good Offices Person (GOP) should be consulted. A GOP is initially neutral, advising the member, and exploring the possibility of an informal resolution of the concern.

In the event that a Chapter GOP cannot settle a concern between ministers, the minister or the Chapter GOP will seek advice or intercession with the Continental GOP. If the concern is still unresolved, the concerned minister should write a letter of complaint to the Committee on Ethics and Collegiality (CEC), fully specifying the nature of the concern making it a formal complaint.

Consideration of Complaints by the Council on Ethics and Collegiality

The CEC, working in consultation with the UUMA Board of Trustees’ GOP, will assess the complaint; invite communications from involved UUMA members; make recommendations toward the resolution of the complaint; and report to involved UUMA members and to the UUMA Board of Trustees that the complaint:

1. has been resolved at this stage, or
2. relates to disagreements about Standards that are not actionable, or
3. is without foundation, or
4. should become a formal grievance, and be referred to the UUMA Board of Trustees.

Chapter GOP may continue to be involved in a consulting or pastoral role.

In dealing with complaints against a UUMA member serving on the staff of the UUA related to actions undertaken in the line of their duties, the CEC will:
1. advocate and practice forbearance;
2. consult with the appropriate supervisor at the UUA;
3. remain mindful of the complex roles and responsibilities with congregations, agencies, enterprises and other parties carried by such members of the UUMA.

Consideration of a Grievance by the Board of Trustees

When a written complaint is referred by the CEC to the UUMA President for consideration by the Board of Trustees it becomes a formal grievance. An action under this process may also be initiated by the Board of Trustees or the President of the UUMA. Grievances will be acted upon as follows:

1. In their fact-finding, discussion and actions in response to grievances, the President and members of the Board of Trustees will be guided by four fundamental principles:
   1. confidentiality;
   2. caring for the persons involved;
   3. fairness;
   4. concern for the severity of the issues.

2. Consistent with these principles, members of the UUMA bringing complaints and grievances, or against whom complaints and grievances have been brought, are assured that collegial confidences will not be disclosed by members of the CEC or the Board of Trustees, except:
   1. as mandated by law;
   2. to prevent a clear and immediate danger to a person or persons;
   3. where disclosure of a confidence may be required for defense in a legal action between colleagues;
   4. if, and only to the extent that, there is a waiver previously obtained in writing.

3. The Board of Trustees shall notify the member in writing of its intent to act on a grievance at least 30 days prior to its meeting. The member may respond in writing to the Board of Trustees and/or attend the meeting in person. The member shall be offered reasonable expenses to attend the meeting. If an adverse action is taken, the member may make a final appeal to the next annual meeting of the UUMA.

4. UUMA members shall have full access and full freedom and right to respond to all evidence cited against them. In addition, they always have the right and option of advisement by counsel at their own expense, but at no time can they be represented by counsel in these proceedings.

5. The UUMA Board of Trustees’ action in response to a grievance shall be in writing to the members involved, and will be in the form of one of the following actions:
   1. advice that the grievance is unfounded, or undeserving of action in which case no public notice shall be made by the UUMA, or
   2. private caution, professional admonition or formal reprimand in which case no public notice shall be made by the UUMA, or
   3. conditional probation, indefinite suspension or removal from membership in the UUMA.

6. Any member against whom an action has been taken may appeal to a meeting of the membership. Such appeal must be made by certified mail to the President of the UUMA, within thirty days of notification and no later than 45 days prior to the next annual meeting of the UUMA. In such cases the action of the Board of Trustees shall stand until and unless overturned by a vote of the UUMA membership. Unless the action of the Board of Trustees is overturned by the membership, it shall become the official position of the UUMA, and be binding on all members. The action of the membership meeting shall be final.
7. If, and only if, an action consisting of probation, suspension or removal has been taken, and no appeal has been made within thirty days, or the appeal has been denied, notice of the action by the Board of Trustees shall be given promptly thereafter to the member’s congregation or other employer and to the Ministry and Professional Leadership Staff Group of the Unitarian Universalist Association, the Ministerial Fellowship Committee and the membership of the UUMA.

New Language to be adopted:

1. All members of the UUMA are in covenant together. Our systems of accountability are designed to restore this covenant when it is broken, to protect the integrity of this covenant, promote public safety, and work toward healing the person(s) who is harmed. Our core values in this system of accountability are justice, integrity, and healing.

2. In all efforts at remedy, differences in power and privilege shall be faithfully considered and accounted for. Some ways to consider and account for these differences include: counter-oppressive best practices; systemic and not overly individualistic analysis; concern for public safety; knowing how differences in role, authority, and social location inform our ethical responsibilities; culturally competent understandings of identity, history, harm, and healing; centering the experiences of marginalized people; and genuine openness to learning and growth.

3. If a member notices that our covenant is broken or violated or even bent, an attempt to restore the covenantal relationship is usually appropriate.

4. If, however, a party who is identified as breaching the covenant is unwilling to participate in the restoration of covenant, they cannot be considered a member, and, at a recommendation from a Right Relations Guide (RRG), the UUMA Board shall suspend their membership, notify the members of the UUMA of the suspension, and refer the suspended member to the Common Ethics Panel for review of their fellowship as a minister. A member of the UUMA who resigns their membership rather than participate in accountability and restoration shall be referred to the Common Ethics Panel and recommended for removal from fellowship, and the membership at large shall be informed that they have resigned in order to avoid responsibility for their actions.¹

5. When the violation of the covenant is egregious misconduct² and makes returning to our covenant untenable, a referral by any member (a survivor of harm, a witness, an RRG, and/or the UUMA Executive Team or Board) to the Common Ethics Panel is called for. In addition, the UUMA Board may suspend the membership of a referred member while the Panel investigates the misconduct. If the Panel

---

¹ See, for example, https://www.ccar.net/ccar-expelled-rabbis/, on how this can be done. This Rabbinical body is clear that “resigned during the pendency of suspension, is itself a violation of the Ethics Code.”

² Egregious Misconduct means violations of the UUMA Code related to the misappropriation of money or property (paragraph 2), sexual harassment (paragraph 10) sexual behavior with those we serve (paragraph 11), and sexual behavior with colleagues under our direct or indirect supervision (paragraph 12). Other violations of the code, including plagiarism (paragraph 4), racist or oppressive behavior (paragraph 5b), and relating to colleagues and staff in a manner that creates a hostile environment (paragraph 5e), can become egregious misconduct if they are willful, repeated, and continue after interventions.
recommends, after an investigation, that covenant can and should be restored, the below processes may be used to do so.

6. When an attempt at repairing and restoring the covenant is advisable, the person(s) harmed shall have the primary but not exclusive right to shape the process.

7. Here is how covenant may be restored, renewed, or repaired:

A. When a member of the UUMA is treated out of covenant by another member of the UUMA, they should contact a Right Relations Guide (RRG). They can contact any of the RRGs listed by the UUMA. The RRG will discuss the issue with the member, be a support/coach to the member, and help the member decide how to proceed. The RRGs will be trained in trauma-informed care, ARAOMC, and be prepared to guide the member through how and where to report, seek redress, and find healing. The RRG will file a simple report of the contact with the staff of the Common Ethics Panel. If the member declines to proceed the report shall so note and acknowledge that in the future the member may reverse this decision and choose to proceed.

B. A minister who has been identified as breaking covenant (including if they themselves realize they have erred) may contact an RRG to assist them in restoring covenant. A minister who so requests shall be provided coaching to repair a breach, especially but not only involving power and/or identity, and thus reduce the risk of re-traumatizing another member.

8. In collaboration, the affected minister(s) and the RRG(s) may do one or more of the following things. In most cases, either the minister(s) or the RRG may make contact as appropriate. If any approach fails to restore covenant, other approaches should be used.

A. Stop the Harm. The RRG may instruct another minister to stop the harm, including to cease a behavior and/or to refrain from any communication with another member immediately, pending steps at repair outlined below. This instruction must be followed. A failure to follow this instruction constitutes egregious misconduct and necessitates a referral to the Common Ethics Panel. In some cases, if an instruction to stop the harm is not followed, the RRG may request the Executive Team of the UUMA to contact, directly, and/or through regional UUA staff, the chair of the governing board of the ministry setting and request immediate action to intervene. The minister who is thus instructed may appeal, in writing, this instruction to the Executive Team of the UUMA, who may affirm, amend, or overturn the instruction, or remand the matter back to the RRG.

B. Contact the staff of the Common Ethics Panel. The RRG or Minister(s) should always do this if any concern of misconduct, abuse, or legal violation has occurred or may have occurred —
whether that misconduct or abuse is against a minister or not.\(^6\) Consider this mandatory reporting.\(^7\)

C. The minister who has experienced the break may speak directly with the minister(s) involved in the breach of covenant. This is optional, but never required. The RRG might coach or support the member to plan this conversation in advance.

D. Engage in a restorative justice circle. These circles should be led by someone trained in restorative justice work\(^8\), and all parties\(^9\) must voluntarily participate. The outcome of the circle shall be reviewed by the RRG. If mutually agreed to by all parties, the outcome may be affirmed by the RRG as binding.

E. Engage in a mediation session. The affected minister(s), their RRG, and the minister(s) identified as breaking the covenant (and their RRG or Accountability Colleague\(^10\), if they have one) may gather to mediate the concern(s). They should select an independent credentialed mediator.\(^11\) The outcome of the mediation shall be reviewed by the RRG. If mutually agreed to by all parties, the outcome may be affirmed by the RRG as binding.

F. Contact the regional staff if the harm affects congregations or covenanted communities or is from the congregation, community, or its members against the minister. Regional staff are charged and equipped to companion a congregation or covenanted community in healing and repair. It is highly likely that a breach of our covenant will affect congregations and covenanted communities, and this step should almost always be done.

G. Contact the minister’s supervisor, governing board chair, or other body if appropriate, as necessary for healing, the integrity of our ministry, or for the safety of others. The RRG, and, in some cases, UUA Regional Staff, can assist in determining how to make this contact.

H. If the affected minister(s), in consultation with their RRG(s), believes that the restoration or integrity of the covenant demands a letter of reprimand, suspension, or termination of membership in the UUMA and/or removal or suspension of fellowship as a minister, they shall refer the matter to the Common Ethics Panel. The Panel’s recommendations, remedies, and decisions are binding on the UUMA and its members.

---

\(^6\) Misconduct, abuse, or legal violations means violations of the UUMA Code related to the misappropriation of money or property (paragraph 2), sexual harassment (paragraph 10) sexual behavior with those we serve (paragraph 11), and sexual behavior with colleagues under our direct or indirect supervision (paragraph 12). Other violations of the code, including plagiarism (paragraph 4), racist or oppressive behavior (paragraph 5b), and relating to colleagues and staff in a manner that creates a hostile environment (paragraph 5e), can become misconduct if they are willful, repeated, and continue after interventions.

\(^7\) This does not replace Mandatory Reporting to legal authorities in your jurisdiction which might also be required.

\(^8\) The UUMA should publish a list of members trained in Restorative Justice Circles.

\(^9\) “All parties” may include other staff members, lay leaders in a congregation or covenanted community, and others. Violations and their remedies are often systemic.

\(^10\) Accountabila-buddy. These persons, often informal, are a key part of shifting our culture. They are usually someone in a similar social location, but who has done more work on cultural competency, power, and healing justice.

\(^11\) Costs for Mediation may be paid by the restoration practices fund.
9. The outcome of these interventions may include a requirement for continuing education, counseling, a behavioral covenant, a mental and/or physical health assessment, addiction treatment, caucusing with or connecting with similarly situated members, or other forms of remedy. In all cases, the RRG shall provide a report of the remedy to the staff of the Common Ethics Panel.

10. The RRG may recommend healing processes for any harmed by the broken covenant, and resources as needed shall be allocated (this includes mediation costs, therapy, restorative practices, paid leave, cash compensation, health care, or more.)

12. Procedures shall be established to notify chapter and cluster leaders, and the membership of the UUMA, and others as appropriate of breaches and repair of covenant, guided by instructions from the person(s) harmed. The value of healing and public safety shall take precedence over secrecy in the creation and implementation of these policies. In all cases, a minister, before accepting a contract or letter of agreement to serve an institution, should request from the staff of the Common Ethics Panel a summary of any violations by ministers who have served that institution. Names of those harmed may be redacted, if so requested by those harmed, from these reports.

13. The RRGs shall, as necessary, propose amendments to the documents that address our covenant of the UUMA to add clarity or correct items related to the covenant. The RRGs shall provide reports and feedback that help us learn, as a body, to grow in our anti-oppressive, collegial, and professional work. Sometimes the remedy is systemic not only individual -- and we must be a learning body and a learning people. As part of a learning, iterative process, the RRGs, the Executive Team, and the UUMA Board shall, annually at minimum, review reports, patterns, learnings, healing practices offered, and remedies.

14. The restoration of our covenant is a collegial process not a legal one. Using legal counsel, insurance agents, or similar outside bodies to prevent repair or frustrate accountability is itself a violation of this code. If a member employs these tactics to avoid accountability and healing the RRG may refer the matter to the Common Ethics Panel for review and appropriate action, which may include removal or suspension from membership and/or fellowship.

15. The RRG and the UUMA Board have a responsibility, and reserve the right, to make known the outcome or remedy of any and all covenantal or collegial matters when they deem doing so serves the UUMA covenant, secures public safety and supports the healing of harm done to individuals, congregations, covenanted communities, and institutions by members’ breeches of the covenant. The UUMA Board and Executive Team, and the Common Ethics Panel, may not agree, under any circumstances, to not report the remedy of violation to those violated or to successor colleagues in that setting.

---

12 If outside assistance is necessary, mediation (8E) is the proper pathway.