



UNITARIAN
UNIVERSALIST
MINISTERS
ASSOCIATION

UUMA GUIDELINES REVISIONS CHAPTER STUDY GUIDE

TABLE OF CONTENTS

[A Note to Facilitators](#)

[General Format of the Study Guide](#)

[Session #1: Preparing the Ground for Conversation](#)

[Session #2: Broadening Collegial Respect](#)

[Session #3: Criminal Justice to Restorative Justice Framework](#)

[Session #4: Challenging Oppression](#)

[Session #5: Strengthening Emotional and Sexual Boundaries](#)

UUMA Guidelines Revisions Chapter Study Guide

A Note to Facilitators

First: thank you SO MUCH for agreeing to facilitate this conversation with colleagues. We heart you.

An explanation about the format

We have created a modular format to allow different groups who have different amounts of time available a variety of ways to engage these topics. The first session is important, because it prepares the ground for a more authentic and vulnerable conversation. Our hope is that at the very least you will have 90 minutes to do the first 30 minute session and then one of the following 60 minute sessions. If you have more than 90 minutes, you can repeat this process with as many sessions as you can accommodate into your schedule.

The *format* for sessions 2-5 is the same, the *content* changes based on the topic. We repeat the format deliberately, to create a sense of familiarity and comfort, and to allow participants to go deeper into each topic.

Different options for how to use this guide

Some UUMA chapters will choose to engage the entire study guide sequentially during their fall retreat. Others might begin the process and then complete it in either clusters or other small groups. At least two of the chapters (Transition Ministers and PoC) meet primarily online and will engage this accordingly.

Each session (after the first) requires one hour. If you are gathered together in a large chapter meeting and don't have the time to do all the sessions, you might want to use an open space technology approach and invite folks to choose the topic they are most interested in discussing and gather accordingly (after conducting the first session together). If more than five colleagues want to discuss any particular topic we recommend subdividing into smaller groups. Please ask for volunteers to guide each of the small groups; the guide is fairly self-explanatory and it is our hope that folks can guide each other through the process.

Taking the temperature of the group you're facilitating

How is the level of conflict and trust in your chapter/cluster/group? If your group is particularly contentious, we encourage you to spend more time creating a covenant and addressing the underlying currents that might complicate these conversations.

Engaging time

We recognize that the topics may bring more thoughts and feelings than can be processed in the time allotted, particularly when colleagues have experienced difficult situations first-hand. We encourage you to be as flexible as needed to allow what emerges to emerge. If it works for the people in the room, creating alternate spaces and times for continued processing might be necessary. It might also be helpful to make pastoral resources available.

Caucusing is helpful

We recommend that you give colleagues with marginalized identities the option to choose a caucus space that might increase their comfort and success with these discussions. If you have only one colleague representing a marginalized identity, we recommend that you contact that person in advance and discuss options that will suit them.

Feedback is very important!

Please do not let the conversations end without providing participants the opportunity to provide feedback in the moment. Remind them that they can always go back and add more feedback later, but it's important to capture some ideas while the discussion is fresh in their minds and hearts.

How to prepare to facilitate

If at all possible, please attend one of two zoom calls to speak with other facilitators and get ready both emotionally and logistically. Please register on the UUMA by going online or clicking the corresponding link below:

The first will be on [Sept. 17 at noon EST](#)

The second will be on [Sept. 18 at 7pm EST](#)

For this process to be successful, each participant will need a copy of the case study and the suggested revisions. They will also need a place to journal their thoughts. We recommend contacting all the participants in advance and requesting that they have this Study Guide PDF available on their laptop, tablet or phone, and making a few paper copies to distribute as needed.

General Format of the Study Guide

Session 1: Preparing the ground for conversation (30 minutes)

3 mins	Introduction: what we are trying to accomplish and why.
5 mins	Reflection, followed by paired sharing: how do I feel about engaging in this process?
10 mins	Brainstorm: what do I need in this space to have a successful and productive conversation?
3 mins	Read Adrienne Maree Brown's "group agreements for emergent spaces" out loud, taking turns.
7 mins	What needs to be added to these agreements based on our brainstorm?
2 mins	Prayer to bless our conversations: Rev. Theresa Soto's "We Hold Hope Close."

Topic-Specific Sessions (Sessions 2-5; 60 mins each)

3 mins	Opening reading/chalice lighting that sets the emotional stage.
5 mins	Topic for this session: 5 minute introduction. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Topic 1: Broadening Collegial Respect ● Topic 2: Criminal Justice to Restorative Justice Framework ● Topic 3: Challenging Oppression ● Topic 4: Strengthening Emotional and Sexual Boundaries
5 mins	Journaling: self-reflection questions about topic. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. What is your relationship to this topic? 2. Do you have personal experiences, either lived or witnessed first-hand? 3. What feelings come up for you as you engage this topic?
5 mins	Share reflections in pairs.
15 mins	Case study presentation and discussion in groups of 4-5.
5 mins	Study proposed changes in guidelines relevant to topic.
15 mins	Small group discussion about proposed changes: What do you want your colleagues to know about the proposed changes, given your lived experiences with this topic?
5 mins	Fill out feedback form for section relevant to topic.
2 min	Closing/blessing/prayer

Session #1: Preparing the Ground for Conversation

3 mins **Introduction: What We Are Trying to Accomplish and Why**

Facilitators: Please paraphrase these ideas in your own words

Why are changes to the Guidelines being proposed? To put it very simply, our current Guidelines do not offer a way to adequately resolve the issues or heal the harm when a colleague violates our Ethical Code of Conduct. Several years ago, it became abundantly clear to the UUMA Board of Trustees that changes were needed both to the ethical standards to which we hold ourselves, and to the accountability process. In late fall of 2017, the Board charged two committees to propose revisions: a Committee on Ethics and a Committee on Accountability. These two committees spent 18 months intensively studying the guidelines, interviewing numerous colleagues, and gathering resources.

Specifically, the Board of Trustees charged the Guidelines Committees with proposing revisions to clarify and strengthen our professional standards against behaviors that perpetuate white supremacy, heteropatriarchy, and other systems and structures of oppression (collectively termed “kyriarchy”), and to develop a process of accountability and restoration for colleagues who experience a covenantal breach with another colleague or colleagues. They were tasked with proposing revisions that would change our system from one that allows the perpetuation of harm to one that confronts abuses of power and seeks to heal trauma and restore covenant. In order to heal harm, we must be able to effectively hold each other accountable. The new process of accountability would be more consistent with the relational values we uphold in our covenant and would replace the current adversarial, judicial model of accusation, adjudication, and punishment.

These proposed guidelines revisions reflect a desire to shift our UUMA culture away from one that too often reflects the dominant culture - and toward a culture that is more congruent with our Unitarian Universalist theology and ideals, which call us toward love, compassion, justice, healing and reconciliation.

5 mins **Reflection, followed by paired sharing**

Please journal: How do I feel about engaging in this process?

Take 3 minutes to jot down some notes or thoughts. Then, please share in pairs, taking one minute each, and summarize what you are noticing.

10 mins **Brainstorm**

What do I need in this space to have a successful and productive conversation?

Facilitators: This can be done out loud or with post-its; if online on zoom, you can use the chat function

3 mins **Group Agreements**

Please make and distribute copies of Adrienne Maree Brown's "group agreements for emergent spaces" (following this outline). Read out loud, taking turns.

7 mins **Discussion**

What needs to be added to these agreements based on our brainstorm?

2 mins **Prayer to bless our conversations**

"We Hold Hope Close"

By Rev. Theresa Ines Soto

In this community, we hold hope close. We don't always know what comes next, but that cannot dissuade us. We don't always know just what to do, but that will not mean that we are lost in the wilderness. We rely on the certainty beneath, the foundation of our values and ethics. We are the people who return to love like a North Star and to the truth that we are greater together than we are alone. Our hope does not live in some glimmer of an indistinct future. Rather, we know the way to the world of which we dream, and by covenant and the movement forward of one right action and the next, we know that one day we will arrive at home.

Handout for Session #1: Group agreements for emergent spaces

(from *Emergent Strategy: Shaping Change, Changing Worlds* by Adrienne Maree Brown)

- Listen from the inside out, or listen from the bottom up (a feeling in your gut matters!);
- Engage Tension, Don't Indulge Drama;
- W.A.I.T. - Why Am I Talking?
- Make Space, Take Space — a post-ableist adaptation of step up, step back to help balance the verbose and the reticent;
- Confidentiality — take the lessons, leave the details;
- Be open to learning;
- Be open to someone else speaking your truth;
- Building, not selling — when you speak, converse, don't pitch;
- Yes/and, both/and;
- Value the process as much as, if not more than, you value the outcomes;
- Self-care and community care — pay attention to your bladder, pay attention to your neighbors.

Session #2: Broadening Collegial Respect3 mins **Light Chalice/Opening Reading**

“Turning to One Another” by Margaret Wheatley
(in the book by the same title)

There is no power greater than a community discovering what it cares about

Ask “What’s possible?” not “What’s wrong?” Keep asking.

Notice what you care about.
Assume that many others share your dreams.

Be brave enough to start a conversation that matters.
Talk to people you know.
Talk to people you don’t know.
Talk to people you never talk to.

Be intrigued by the differences you hear.
Expect to be surprised.
Treasure curiosity more than certainty.

Invite in everyone who cares to work on what’s possible.
Acknowledge that everyone is an expert about something.
Know that creative solutions come from new connections.

Remember, you don’t fear people whose story you know.
Real listening always brings people closer together.

Trust that meaningful conversations can change your world.

Rely on human goodness. Stay together.

5 mins **Introduction to Topic**

Please distribute copies of the introduction to the topic and invite the group to read for 5 minutes. When finished, they can go right into journaling.

- 5 mins **Journaling: self-reflection questions about topic**
1. What is your relationship to this topic?
 2. Do you have personal experiences, either lived or witnessed first-hand?
 3. What feelings come up for you as you engage this topic?
- 5 mins **Share reflections in pairs**
- Please turn to a partner and share something you noticed during your journaling.
- 15 mins **Case study presentation and discussion**
- Please distribute copies of the case study included following this outline. In groups of 4-5 people, please consider the case study and discuss it.
1. Have you ever experienced a similar situation? What does this bring up for you?
 2. Would you consider Jill's behavior bullying or abusive?
 3. Jack comes to you and expresses concern about his treatment. Where in the current guidelines would you look for assistance? Do the proposed revised guidelines help or hinder your support? Why?
- 5 mins **Study proposed changes in guidelines relevant to topic**
- Following the case study, you will find the proposed changes in the guidelines relevant to the topic. Please distribute copies of these changes and give participants 5 minutes to consider them.
- 15 mins **Small group discussion about proposed changes**
- What do you want your colleagues to know about the proposed changes, given your lived experiences with this topic?
- 5 mins **Fill out feedback form for section relevant to topic**
- Following the proposed changes, you will find the questions from the feedback form that relate to this topic. Please distribute copies of the feedback questions and give participants 5 minutes to reflect on them. Invite everyone to share their feedback via the survey at https://www.uuma.org/surveys/?id=Guidelines_Feedback. Feedback is due February 1, 2020 to give the guidelines committees time to incorporate the

feedback, share with the UUMA board, and get out any changes to members in May in time to review the proposed revisions before Ministry Days.

2 mins

Closing/blessing/prayer

“Unison Prayer of Confession: Unitarian hymnal, 1938”

O unseen source of peace and holiness,
we come into your secret place to be filled
with your pure and solemn light.

As we come to you, we remember that

we have not walked lovingly with each other.

In our weakness be the quickening power of life.

Arise within our hearts as healing, strength, and joy.

Day by day may we grow in faith, in charity,

and in the larger life of love to which you call us.

Introduction of the Topic for Session #2: Broadening Collegial Respect

Broadening Collegial Respect

As colleagues, how we treat one another matters. Implicit in our covenant is mutual respect and yet that respect is not always evident in collegial interactions. Two issues that affect our ability to maintain respect are bullying/emotional abuse and healthy communication.

Ending Bullying/Emotional Abuse

The main difference between emotional abuse and bullying is that bullying can include physical violence. Emotional abuse and bullying include any behavior that is designed to control and subjugate another person by inciting fear and humiliation. Tactics common to both include verbal assaults made up of constant criticism, belittling, berating and name-calling.

Abuse is a learned behavior. Sometimes people learn it in their families of origin. Often, bullies and abusers had an inadequate relationship between parent and child, and developed patterns of dominance and manipulation to get what they want. Anyone can become an abuser, and anyone can be abused.

Although emotional abuse and bullying are not common among colleagues, it does happen. It usually occurs in settings where there is more than one minister. Often there is a power differential between the positions, such as senior and associate minister or supervisor and intern or staff. The effects on the abused have been devastating and traumatic.

Communication: Healthy, Responsible, Respectful

Many of us were taught that in order to remain safe, we must go along with the flow and be “nice” to others. We were taught to comply, even if we knew something was wrong. At the same time, we were taught that success in life depends on competing and winning.

We get these conflicting messages: on the one hand, it’s important to never rock the boat, and on the other, if we do, we have to either win at all costs, or be totally destroyed. No wonder so many of us avoid conflict! But what if we saw conflict in a different way? What if, instead of seeing it as something that endangers us, we saw it as the natural expression of diversity in healthy systems?

As colleagues, it is essential that we work to improve our collective ability to have conversations that in the past have too often been avoided. The result has been that hurts and misunderstandings between colleagues are never addressed; rifts and bad feelings linger. We witness colleagues getting themselves into trouble and we don’t approach them; harm is done that might have been avoided. We notice a colleague in pain; but when their pain is caused by a colleague, they don’t feel free to discuss the problem.

Case Study and Questions for Session #2: Broadening Collegial Respect

Jack is called to serve as an assistant minister in a large congregation. They were very active in their previous chapter as a leader and is clear that they want to be active in this chapter as well. During a chapter meeting, the senior minister, Jill, interrupts Jack saying “You don’t know what you are talking about.” This behavior continues at subsequent chapter meetings, including snide remarks such as “Did you think that no one else has thought of that?” During social time, Jill makes demeaning comments about them. “People talk about how good a minister they are, but the don’t know what they are doing.” As the year progresses, Jack speaks less and less at meetings, and eventually stops coming to chapter events all together.

Questions for discussion

1. Have you ever experienced a similar situation? What does this bring up for you?
2. Would you consider Jill’s behavior bullying or abusive?
3. Jack comes to you and expresses concern about their treatment. Where in the current guidelines would you look for assistance? Do the proposed revised guidelines help or hinder your support? Why?

Proposed Changes in Guidelines for Session #2: Broadening Collegial Respect

From Ethical Standards

3. Within the limitations of law, I will respect the confidentiality of private communications from those to whom I minister **or who I supervise.**
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.**
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.

From Expectations of Conduct

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 fulfill my commitment to professional ethics and justice to 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 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) including harassment, bullying and emotional abuse and the resulting harm to individuals, colleagues, congregations, and agencies or enterprises that have experienced such misconduct, takes priority over expectations of collegial confidentiality.

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.
- ~~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.

From the Standards of Professional Practice

II. Ministers' Expectations of Institutions They Serve

M. Staff Relationships

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 not 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

5. **Ministers must not never 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:
- who has what degree of accountability for articulating the mission, vision or direction of the congregation, agency or enterprise;
 - whether the position represents a call by the congregation, hiring by the institutional leadership, or by a minister already on staff;
 - 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.

From the Addenda

1. **Bullying and Emotional Abuse**

Ministers must never 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, or 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.

(Source: Psychology Today, <https://www.psychologytoday.com/us/blog/toxic-relationships/201704/forms-emotional-and-verbal-abuse-you-may-be-overlooking>)

Feedback Question for Session #2: Broadening Collegial Respect

Do the proposed revisions provide the needed grounding for accountability? Why or why not? If not, what would do so? Please reference specific paragraph numbers.

Session #3: Criminal Justice to Restorative Justice Framework

3 mins

Light Chalice/Opening Reading

“Interdependence in the Face of Oppression” by Mark Morrison Reed

In the stillness of this
moment,
Before the release of the
next breath,
In the pause between heart
beats,
Before thought once again
tramples over intuition.
Let us sense Thy Presence
move among us
along the web of
interdependence
which lovingly but firmly
binds us to each other and
to all
that ever was or shall be.
Amen

5 mins

Introduction to Topic

Please distribute copies of the introduction to the topic and invite the group to read for 5 minutes. When finished, they can go right into journaling.

5 mins

Journaling: self-reflection questions about topic

1. What is your relationship to this topic?
2. Do you have personal experiences, either lived or witnessed first-hand?
3. What feelings come up for you as you engage this topic?

5 mins

Share reflections in pairs

Please turn to a partner and share something you noticed during your journaling.

15 mins Case study presentation and discussion

Please distribute copies of the case study included following this outline. In groups of 4-5 people, please consider the case study and discuss it.

1. Have you ever experienced a breaking of covenant? What processes have you used/might you use to restore covenant?
2. If you were the Good Officer, how might you draw on the current guidelines to support the junior colleague? How might you draw on the proposed revisions?

5 mins Study proposed changes in guidelines relevant to topic

Following the case study, you will find the proposed changes in the guidelines relevant to the topic. Please distribute copies of these changes and give participants 5 minutes to consider them.

15 mins Small group discussion about proposed changes

What do you want your colleagues to know about the proposed changes, given your lived experiences with this topic?

5 mins Fill out feedback form for section relevant to topic

Following the proposed changes, you will find the questions from the feedback form that relate to this topic. Please distribute copies of the feedback questions and give participants 5 minutes to reflect on them. Invite everyone to share their feedback via the survey at

https://www.uuma.org/surveys/?id=Guidelines_Feedback. Feedback is due February 1, 2020 to give the guidelines committees time to incorporate the feedback, share with the UUMA board, and get out to members in May in time to review the proposed revisions before Ministry Days.

2 mins Closing/blessing/prayer

“Prayer for Living in Tension” by Joseph Cherry

If we have any hope of transforming the world and changing ourselves,
we must be
bold enough to step into our discomfort,

brave enough to be clumsy there,
loving enough to forgive ourselves and others.

May we, as a people of faith, be granted the strength to be
so bold,
so brave,
and so loving.

Introduction of the Topic for Session #3: Criminal Justice to Restorative Justice Framework

When we listened to stories about ways in which people had tried to use the current system of accountability to restore covenant, we heard about legalism (assumption of innocence until proven guilty; threats of lawsuits against those seeking to be heard; filing of complaints that take years to process.) We heard about a system in which persons with very little systemic power are expected to speak directly to someone with more systemic power about ways in which the more powerful person has caused harm. We heard about traumatized people being expected to confront an abuser with little or no guidance or help, and no resources to help them heal. And these are the people who are still here. We can only guess how much harm has been done to the people who have left the ministry and our movement.

Howard Zehr provides this contrasting model of Criminal Justice vs Restorative Justice:

Criminal Justice	Restorative Justice
Crime is a violation of the law and the state (Violation of the Guidelines)	Crime is a violation of people and relationships
Violations create guilt	Violations create obligations
Justice requires the state to determine blame (guilt) and impose pain (punishment)(UUA/UUMA/MFC determine guilt and punishment)	Justice involves victims, offenders, and community members in an effort to put things right
CENTRAL FOCUS: offenders getting what they deserve	CENTRAL FOCUS: the victim’s needs and offender’s responsibility for repairing harm

Zehr believes these two models answer different questions:

For CJ the questions are:

- What law has been broken?
- Who did it?
- What do they deserve?

For RJ the questions are:

- Who has been hurt?
- What are their needs?
- Whose obligations are these?

Case Study and Questions for Session #3: Criminal Justice to Restorative Justice Framework

A powerful senior minister in an urban congregation makes disparaging remarks to a junior colleague at a national gathering. The junior colleague feels they have been harmed and seeks the help of a Good Officer in restoring covenant. The senior colleague says they are too busy to go out of their way to have a conversation. The junior colleague must fly to the city where the senior minister serves in order to seek reconciliation. The Good Officer holds space for the conversation but does not participate. The senior minister never acknowledges having caused harm. In following up with the Good Officer, the junior colleague is told that their only other option is to file a complaint with the UUMA or UUA. The junior colleague wants healing, not punishment, and goes away feeling unheard, unsupported, and more degraded by the attempt to restore covenant than by the initial remarks.

1. Have you ever experienced a breaking of covenant? What processes have you used/might you use to restore covenant?
2. If you were the Good Officer, how might you draw on the current guidelines to support the junior colleague? How might you draw on the proposed revisions?

Proposed Changes in Guidelines for Session #3: Criminal Justice to Restorative Justice Framework

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 misconduct^[2] 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 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)^[3]. 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^[4], 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.^[5]

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.

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.^[12] 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.

[1] See, for example, <https://www.ccarnet.org/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.

[3] See the Executive Summary for a fuller description of this role. A publicly available handbook for RRG's and Good Officers should be created by the UUMA Executive Team and approved, after a period of public comment, by the UUMA Board, before these changes to our process are implemented.

[4] Anti-Racist, Anti-Oppressive, and MultiCultural analysis and policies acknowledge and address the intersection and imbalance of power given our social location and social identities. A commitment to ARAOMC work will address these imbalances and work for equity and justice for all.

[5] The member harmed may require that the other member seek counsel from a RRGs before a healing conversation is attempted, in order to reduce the potential for continued harm through a clumsy apology.

[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] Accountabla-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.

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

Feedback Question for Session #3: Criminal Justice to Restorative Justice Framework

1. Paragraphs 1 and 2 address the values we bring to this work and the importance of understanding power. What feedback do you have about this?
2. Paragraphs 3-5 indicate that an attempt to heal is usually appropriate, but sometimes is not appropriate; or the invitation to heal is not answered, and what happens when that's the case. What feedback do you have about this?
3. Paragraphs 6-7 describe how a person harmed, or one who has done harm, might contact a Right Relations Guide, and the duties of the Guide. What feedback do you have about this?
4. Paragraph 8 lists possible remedies when there is a breach of our covenant. What feedback do you have about this? Be sure to note which sub-paragraph (A-H) your comments refer to.
5. Paragraphs 9-10 lists remedies and healing practices for the restoration, both for the person (or persons) who experiences harm and the person who is out of covenant. What feedback do you have about this?
6. Paragraph 12-13 describes the reporting of violations and remedies to members, and the iterative learning process we will do as a body in this area. What feedback do you have about this?
7. Paragraph 14 describes why a covenantal, and not legal, process is appropriate for this work. What feedback do you have about this?
8. Paragraph 15 describes the responsibility of the UUMA to disclose violations and remedies to certain people in certain cases. What feedback do you have about this?

Session #4: Challenging Oppression**3 mins Light Chalice/Opening Reading****“Imagine the Angels of Bread,” by Martin Espada**

This is the year that squatters evict landlords,
gazing like admirals from the rail
of the roofdeck
or levitating hands in praise
of steam in the shower;
this is the year
that shawled refugees deport judges
who stare at the floor
and their swollen feet
as files are stamped
with their destination;
this is the year that police revolvers,
stove-hot, blister the fingers
of raging cops,
and nightsticks splinter
in their palms;
this is the year that dark-skinned men
lynched a century ago
return to sip coffee quietly
with the apologizing descendants
of their executioners.

This is the year that those
who swim the border's undertow
and shiver in boxcars
are greeted with trumpets and drums
at the first railroad crossing
on the other side;
this is the year that the hands
pulling tomatoes from the vine
uproot the deed to the earth that sprouts
the vine,
the hands canning tomatoes
are named in the will
that owns the bedlam of the cannery;
this is the year that the eyes stinging from the poison that purifies toilets
awaken at last to the sight
of a rooster-loud hillside,
pilgrimage of immigrant birth; this is the year that cockroaches

become extinct, that no doctor
finds a roach embedded
in the ear of an infant;
this is the year that the food stamps
of adolescent mothers
are auctioned like gold doubloons,
and no coin is given to buy machetes
for the next bouquet of severed heads
in coffee plantation country.

If the abolition of slave-manacles
began as a vision of hands without manacles, then this is the year;
if the shutdown of extermination camps
began as imagination of a land
without barbed wire or the crematorium,
then this is the year;
if every rebellion begins with the idea
that conquerors on horseback are not many-legged gods, that they too drown
if plunged in the river,
then this is the year.

So may every humiliated mouth,
teeth like desecrated headstones,
fill with the angels of bread.

5 mins

Introduction to Topic

Please distribute copies of the introduction to the topic and invite the group to read for 5 minutes. When finished, they can go right into journaling

5 mins

Journaling: self-reflection questions about topic

1. What is your relationship to this topic?
2. Do you have personal experiences, either lived or witnessed first-hand?
3. What feelings come up for you as you engage this topic?

5 mins

Share reflections in pairs

Please turn to a partner and share something you noticed during your journaling.

- 15 mins Case study presentation and discussion**
Please distribute copies of the case study included following this outline. In groups of 4-5 people, please consider the case study and discuss it.
1. What is the role of the chapter in creating a space that is accessible for all members of the chapter?
 2. What parts of the current guidelines would bolster Carl's ability to address the ableist conditions of the chapter meetings? How do the proposed revisions help or hinder Carl?
 3. What might Jim have done differently? How would the proposed Guidelines changes provide grounding for a different response?
- 5 mins Study proposed changes in guidelines relevant to topic**
Following the case study, you will find the proposed changes in the guidelines relevant to the topic. Please distribute copies of these changes and give participants 5 minutes to consider them.
- 15 mins Small group discussion about proposed changes**
What do you want your colleagues to know about the proposed changes, given your lived experiences with this topic?
- 5 mins Fill out feedback form for section relevant to topic**
Following the proposed changes, you will find the questions from the feedback form that relate to this topic. Please distribute copies of the feedback questions and give participants 5 minutes to reflect on them. Invite everyone to share their feedback via the survey at https://www.uuma.org/surveys/?id=Guidelines_Feedback. Feedback is due February 1, 2020 to give the guidelines committees time to incorporate the feedback, share with the UUMA board, and get out to members in May in time to review the proposed revisions before Ministry Days.
- 2 mins Closing/blessing/prayer**
“V’ahavta” by Aurora Levin Morales
Say these words when you lie down and when you rise up, when you go out and when you return. In times of mourning and in times of joy. Inscribe them on your doorposts,

embroider them on your garments, tattoo them on your shoulders,
teach them to your children, your neighbors, your enemies,
recite them in your sleep, here in the cruel shadow of empire:

Another world is possible.

Thus spoke the prophet Roque Dalton:

All together they have more death than we,
but all together, we have more life than they.

There is more bloody death in their hands
than we could ever wield, unless
we lay down our souls to become them,
and then we will lose everything. So instead,
imagine winning. This is your sacred task.

This is your power. Imagine

every detail of winning, the exact smell of the summer streets
in which no one has been shot, the muscles you have never
unclenched from worry, gone soft as newborn skin,
the sparkling taste of food when we know
that no one on earth is hungry, that the beggars are fed,
that the old man under the bridge and the woman
wrapping herself in thin sheets in the back seat of a car,
and the children who suck on stones,
nest under a flock of roofs that keep multiplying their shelter.

Lean with all your being towards that day
when the poor of the world shake down a rain of good fortune
out of the heavy clouds, and justice rolls down like waters.

Defend the world in which we win as if it were your child.

It is your child.

Defend it as if it were your lover.

It is your lover.

When you inhale and when you exhale
breathe the possibility of another world
into the 37.2 trillion cells of your body

until it shines with hope.
Then imagine more.
Imagine rape is unimaginable. Imagine war is a scarcely credible rumor
That the crimes of our age, the grotesque inhumanities of greed,
the sheer and astounding shamelessness of it, the vast fortunes
made by stealing lives, the horrible normalcy it came to have,
is unimaginable to our heirs, the generations of the free.
Don't waver. Don't let despair sink its sharp teeth
Into the throat with which you sing. Escalate your dreams.
Make them burn so fiercely that you can follow them down
any dark alleyway of history and not lose your way.
Make them burn clear as a starry drinking gourd
Over the grim fog of exhaustion, and keep walking.
Hold hands. Share water. Keep imagining.
So that we, and the children of our children's children
may live.

Introduction of the Topic for Session #4: Challenging Oppression

Oppression is any abuse of power by one group at the expense of others and the use of pressure or force to maintain this dynamic. Oppression occurs over many years in institutions and in our society at large; it is a systemic problem, not solely about encounters among individuals, though that is where it often manifests.

There are multitudinous forms of oppression and unfortunately, they show up in our movement and in our professional association. Racism, tokenism, ableism, sexism, ageism, classism, sizeism, heterosexism, cisgenderism, homophobia and transphobia continue to rear their ugly heads. We also oppress one another based on the perceived status of our positions. These forms of oppression occur at both the systemic level and between individuals.

All -isms assume that the experience of the dominant group is the norm, and that all others are deficient in some way. They are required to present as closely as possible as a member of the dominant group in order to be valued by the dominant group. Systemic -isms are when a whole society (or a subsystem of it, such as the UUMA) and all of its systems of organization view the experience of the dominant group (white, able-bodied, cisgendered males) as normal, and favor that group at the expense of other groups. Personal -isms happen when individuals enact the story that the experience of the dominant group is the norm.

Some of our ministers who are best known both inside and outside of our movement for their excellent work are also among ministers who are often oppressed inside our movement by colleagues. What would it be like to be able to go to a chapter gathering and simply be together in love and solidarity, rather than having to exercise constant vigilance? Many of us who are white, able-bodied, cisgendered and male can do this, and many of the rest of us can't.

Case Study and Questions for Session #4: Challenging Oppression

“Here’s Some Advice: Forget the Chip on Your Shoulder”

Carl is a new candidate for ministry. Carl has been doing some field education work on disability justice and co-led a workshop at a chapter gathering of the Ministers Association at a UU congregation near his hometown. The content of the workshop went smoothly, but Carl and his co-presenter found many oversights and failures in providing accessible workshop spaces – features that should have been in place in any facility calling itself “Handicap Accessible” and which had been identified by the organizers in advance.

These issues meant that the workshop spaces were not accessible to Carl or to disabled members of the chapter. Carl and his co-leader lost time and energy trying to reorganize the session using different spaces. When Carl named “our ableist UU culture” in the large group session, he was met with a couple of gasps.

After the event ended, one of the ministers, Jim, praises Carl for his workshop leadership. Jim encourages Carl to apply for the parish internship at his congregation. Carl is enthusiastic and decides to ask Jim for some advice: “Who in the chapter should I approach about the issues we had with accessibility for this workshop?” Jim responds without answering the question: “Oh, was it that bad? I guess I’m just used to this group not wanting to just use the microphone. I hope you can let that go. It won’t help you move forward with your cause if you have a chip on your shoulder.”

Jim returns to talking about the internship application process. Carl gets into his car, exhausted by the day’s activities and the belittling of his concerns about accessibility, as if they were inconsequential or just for the disability justice workshop. Carl wonders to himself: “Jim seemed enthusiastic about my ministry potential, but I’m not sure he could be a supportive mentor. Who do I turn to now?”

Questions for Discussion

1. What is the role of the chapter in creating a space that is accessible for all members of the chapter?
2. What parts of the current guidelines would bolster Carl’s ability to address the ableist conditions of the chapter meetings? How do the proposed revisions help or hinder Carl?
3. What might Jim have done differently? How would the proposed Guidelines changes provide grounding for a different response?

Proposed Changes in Guidelines for Session #4: Challenging Oppression

From Ethical Standards

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).

From Expectations of Conduct

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.**

From the Standards of Professional Practice

II. Ministers' Expectations of Institutions They Serve

M. Staff Relationships

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 ~~not~~ 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

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.**
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.

From the Addenda

2. Tokenism

Tokenism in this context 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 paying more attention to the candidate's identity 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. Do I understand that the equitable inclusion of people of diverse identities and from diverse backgrounds:
 - a. provides opportunities for people who have traditionally 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?

(Sources include: “How to Avoid Tokenism.” Carol Howard Merritt, Christian Century, October 14, 2013. <https://www.christiancentury.org/blogs/archive/2013-10/how-avoid-tokenism>)

Feedback Question for Session #4: Challenging Oppression

Do the proposed revisions provide the needed grounding for accountability? Why or why not? If not, what would do so? Please reference specific paragraph numbers.

Session #5: Strengthening Emotional and Sexual Boundaries**3 mins Light Chalice/Opening Reading**

misconduct by gretchen haley

while i was away the weeds
 decided to stage a coup
 across the rocks
 and plants
 and trees
 where i'd spent whole days
 meticulously digging out
 the thistle
 unwinding the bindweed
 moving the rocks aside
 to get at
 each piece
 of cheatgrass
 conspiring with the rain
 the sun and my apparent
 negligence they made an
 unruly revolution
 like you they have never been good
 at boundaries
 an abundance of green
 brazenly
 draped itself
 over gray
 and white stones
 meant to mark space
 for breath and steps
 tiny tendrils stroked
 the sedum and
 whole stalks of
 goatsbeard turned up
 between the columbines
 danger
 can be
 so beautiful
 as i knelt
 in the wet grass
 and cut my fingernails
 into the dirt

pulling
 on every last one
 less meticulous this time more furious
 as if
 it was not their nature to go into forbidden places
 while the rain returned and the mosquitos swarmed i remembered your face
 when you saw i wasn't going to save you
 this time as if i was the one who had betrayed you
 my hands
 grew raw
 and numb
 as night took hold
 i worked to unbury the secrets
 the roots
 the radically selfish intentions
 the memory of what it felt like
 to be for a time
 wild and
 uncaught
 the hope i know
 they still harbor
 to try again
 i tried
 to kill
 every last seed
 so i could return safely
 to only the good of my garden
 to see unblemished
 the new blooms of deep blue on the salvia
 the baby peaches swaying in the gray sky
 untouched
 by the ground assault
 my son's fledgling oak tree
 promising
 a far-out future
 by the eighth bucket filled
 i had emptied
 every corner of the invaders
 my fingers ached
 i surveyed the carnage
 and cried
 it all looked so battered
 and bare just three hours
 after you confessed

what you had done i led the memorial
 where the daughter moaned perfectly
 from the front row
 the whole service from her gut
 wailing her grief while i kept
 my tears in check
 and whispered under my breath
amen.

Rev Haley explains her poem: Over the last few years, our congregation discovered and has responded to the professional misconduct of two of our professional staff. These were beloved ministers, our friends and colleagues, and it was devastating both for our congregation, and for me, personally. This poem is a reflection of my own personal grief and sense of betrayal, and also my understanding of how easy it can be for any of us, given the right circumstances, to violate boundaries - and how common. Like weeds in a garden in early summer - it can even seem for a time, beautiful. And, it is a reflection of how long-lasting the effects are, and how much work it takes to undo the damage - how in many ways, you can't go back, everything, as soon as the boundary is crossed, is already changed.

5 mins**Introduction to Topic**

Please distribute copies of the introduction to the topic and invite the group to read for 5 minutes. When finished, they can go right into journaling

5 mins**Journaling: self-reflection questions about topic**

1. What is your relationship to this topic?
2. Do you have personal experiences, either lived or witnessed first-hand?
3. What feelings come up for you as you engage this topic?

5 mins**Share reflections in pairs**

Please turn to a partner and share something you noticed during your journaling.

15 mins**Case study presentation and discussion**

Please distribute copies of the case study included following this outline. In groups of 4-5 people, please consider the case study and discuss it.

1. Do you think there is a boundary problem? If so, what are the boundary crossings you noticed and how might they lead to further issues? Or do you think that Sandra is within appropriate professional boundaries?
2. If you were the minister approached by Julie, and you agreed to talk with Sandra, how would the current guidelines help you? How would the proposed revisions help you?

5 mins Study proposed changes in guidelines relevant to topic

Following the case study, you will find the proposed changes in the guidelines relevant to the topic. Please distribute copies of these changes and give participants 5 minutes to consider them.

15 mins Small group discussion about proposed changes

What do you want your colleagues to know about the proposed changes, given your lived experiences with this topic?

5 mins Fill out feedback form for section relevant to topic

Following the proposed changes, you will find the questions from the feedback form that relate to this topic. Please distribute copies of the feedback questions and give participants 5 minutes to reflect on them. Invite everyone to share their feedback via the survey at https://www.uuma.org/surveys/?id=Guidelines_Feedback. Feedback is due February 1, 2020 to give the guidelines committees time to incorporate the feedback, share with the UUMA board, and get out to members in May in time to review the proposed revisions before Ministry Days.

2 mins Closing/blessing/prayer

“The Journey” by Mary Oliver

One day you finally knew
 what you had to do, and began,
 though the voices around you
 kept shouting
 their bad advice --
 though the whole house
 began to tremble
 and you felt the old tug
 at your ankles.
 "Mend my life!"

each voice cried.
But you didn't stop.
You knew what you had to do,
though the wind pried
with its stiff fingers
at the very foundations,
though their melancholy
was terrible.
It was already late
enough, and a wild night,
and the road full of fallen
branches and stones.
But little by little,
as you left their voice behind,
the stars began to burn
through the sheets of clouds,
and there was a new voice
which you slowly
recognized as your own,
that kept you company
as you strode deeper and deeper
into the world,
determined to do
the only thing you could do --
determined to save
the only life that you could save.

Introduction of the Topic for Session #5: Strengthening Emotional and Sexual Boundaries

As ministers, we are charged with meeting the needs of those we serve above our own needs. There will be times when we are attracted emotionally, romantically or sexually to persons whom we serve. That is not the problem. It will happen. But we need to always be able to note that attraction to ourselves, while being clear that it is one upon which we cannot and will not act. It is at such times that it becomes clear how important it is to cultivate authentic friends, peers in whom we can confide and who will help us have the courage and strength to what our faith and calling demand. In the absence of such friends, a trusted supervisor, spiritual director, prayer group or partner, or therapist become vital. Ideally, we have such friends and maintain some of these other relationships and resources.

There may also be times when we feel an attraction to a member of the staff. This could be a layperson or a colleague. This is especially problematic when there is an imbalance of power. But entering into a romantic relationship with any member of the staff also takes the focus away from where it belongs: on the mission and well-being of the congregation or other setting. This is true both for those in the relationship and those being served.

One way to think about our role and discerning our acceptable options, is to consider the fiduciary responsibility of the minister. We most often think of fiduciary responsibility in terms of finances, but the term has broader implications than that.

Fiduciary responsibility is a legal term that means that it is our responsibility to promote the best interests of others, rather than our own. It is a simple concept and offers an easy litmus test when we are considering an action that is questionable. Ask ourselves “Would this action, should I take it, promote the best interests of others, rather than my own?” Sometimes we forget that, as ministers, our actions are not private but have an impact on our communities, our congregations and our families.

Darryl W. Stephens reminds us that:

Professional relationships differ from personal relationships in their degree of reciprocity. Ministerial relationships are asymmetrical: the pastor is there to serve the needs of the parishioner.¹

He then offers five key questions to ask ourselves when contemplating an action:

- 1-How would this look, or be received if it were public knowledge?
- 2-Is it in the best interest of the congregation (or institution)?
- 3- Is it a legitimate function of ministry?

¹ Darryl W. Stephens, “Fiduciary Duty and Sacred Trust” in Professional Sexual Ethics, A Holistic Ministry Approach, Patricia Beattie Jung and Darryl W. Stephens, ed/

4-Does it include collegial accountability and supervision?

5- Does it do no harm?

These are sound basic tests of appropriate boundaries, be they financial, relational or sexual. We can write them on our doorposts, office bulletin boards, and most importantly, on our hearts.

Case Study and Questions for Session #5: Strengthening Emotional and Sexual Boundaries

“Sandra and the High School Youth Program”

Sandra is one of three staff members at Hampstead Hills’ Justice4Families, a social justice organization founded by a multi-congregational partnership. Sandra is known for being a dynamic and well-respected leader. She is forty-four, graduated from a seminary Master’s program, and has two elementary-age children with her spouse. This is her fourth year as a youth advisor of the senior and junior high youth.

Sandra has developed very close relationships with many of the youth. Hamstead Hills’ parents are pleased that the youth group is growing under her leadership. They appreciate Sandra’s being available to her youth-group members any time of day or night via telephone, text, or Facebook. It is common knowledge that the organization’s youth consider her to be a friend. Sandra is also very affectionate with some of the youth, often greeting them with a full-body hug whenever they meet. “I know it makes them feel loved,” she explained to the office administrator, Julie.

Aside from her two co-workers and the youth at Justice4Families, Sandra doesn’t have any close friends, and the administrator grows concerned when Sandra shares a story about texting with a couple of the youth leaders at “odd hours” about their personal problems. Just before an outreach event, Julie decides to confide in a UU minister on the Board of Directors of the organization that she’s worried that Sandra’s boundaries might be a problem.

1. Do you think there is a boundary problem? If so, what are the boundary crossings you see and how might they lead to further issues? Or do you think that Sandra is within appropriate professional boundaries?
2. If you were the minister approached by Julie, and you agreed to talk with Sandra, how would the current guidelines help you? How would the proposed revisions help you?

Proposed Changes in Guidelines for Session #5: Strengthening Emotional and Sexual Boundaries

From Ethical Standards

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

From the Standards of Professional Practice

II. Ministers' Expectations of Institutions They Serve

G. Personal or Romantic Relationships

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.**
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.~~

Feedback Question for Session #5: Strengthening Emotional and Sexual Boundaries

Do the proposed revisions provide the needed grounding for accountability? Why or why not? If not, what would do so? Please reference specific paragraph numbers.