

Fact Sheet for Presbytery Leadership Task Force Report

Composition of the Task Force

- Jackie Barker – FPOC
- Helen Gwanfogbe – At-Large member
- Michael Kim-Eubanks – MVL
- Rick Leong – NOM/COR
- Will McGarvey – CPM
- Tony Montalvo – At-Large member
- Leslie Veen – COM
- Lori Yamauchi – Personnel

Kaleidoscope Institute Leadership Team

- Julie Boleyn
- James Fielder

Process used

- Began each meeting agreeing to the “Respectful Communication Guidelines”
 - o R = Take **responsibility** for what you say and feel without blaming
 - o E = Use **empathetic** listening
 - o S = Be **sensitive** to differences in communication styles
 - o P = **Ponder** what you hear and feel before you speak
 - o E = **Examine** your own assumptions and perceptions
 - o C = Keep **confidentiality** (share **constructively** to uphold the well-being of the **community**)
 - o T = **Trust** ambiguity because we are not here to debate who is right or wrong
- The Task Force had 3 Zoom meetings leading up to a retreat time to consider:
 - o Characteristics of leaders that we admire
 - o What success would look like for this Task Force
 - o Moments and events that stick with each of us from the history of this presbytery
- Overnight Retreat in Berkeley to work on:
 - o Putting together a fairly comprehensive timeline of events + leadership models of the Presbytery of SF
 - o Noticing joys, heartbreaks, and throughlines in that timeline
 - o Looking for the values that were at work and perhaps should have been at work but were not in the various eras of the timeline
 - o Naming concerns that reviewing the timeline raised for group members
 - o Setting goals for what we wanted to be sure to include in the final product of the Task Force

- Distilling that all down in order to name leadership characteristics that the Presbytery of SF needs in its next leader(s)
- The Task Force had 3 further meetings via Zoom to continue the work in the following ways:
 - Reviewing the motion that brought about the creation of this Task Force to be sure that we were living out the hopes of the Presbytery for the work in which we were engaging.
 - Consider what changes would be necessary throughout the Presbytery to make a new leadership model successful since simply putting new leadership in place would not be sufficient to make the changes needed for us to be effective in our life and ministry together – suggesting changes to both the Standing Rules as well as the committee structure
 - Create job descriptions for the two transitional positions we are proposing

Questions received to date

- ***Why such a strong emphasis on healing?***
 In our conversations and in our review of the history of the presbytery, we named many times and events that have been traumatic for members of the presbytery and we continue to see the effects of these traumatic times in our life and ministry together today. If we don't address these traumas, we will continue to have difficulties working together for effective ministry in the Bay Area.
- ***Why say collaboration is important when the model appears to be hierarchical?***
 We noticed in our review of the history of the presbytery that times when there were unclear lines of accountability led to high levels of mistrust and disfunction within the presbytery. We wanted to make sure the model that we offered would address that issue in a collaborative, servant-leader way. We are not asking the presbytery to find a leader who is authoritarian, rather, we hope that the presbytery will find a leader who will bring people together in our joint work and inspire us to newness of life together.
- ***Did we consider other models? How many?***
 In our review of the history of the presbytery, we considered the various leadership models that have been employed in our past (solo Executive Presbyters, Co-Executive Presbyters, teams of Presbyters/Partners) as well as looking at models from other presbyteries that members of the Task Force are familiar with. We used these various models to consider what was helpful about them and what got in the way of good leadership when they were employed.
- ***What is the hoped-for timeline for rollout of the new model?***
 The Task Force does not think that a delay in rolling out the new leadership model would be helpful to the presbytery. Therefore, we have recommended moving to get a Transitional Executive Presbyter in place as soon as possible in the new year.

- ***What will happen with the current staff? Can they apply for the transitional positions?***
Can they apply for the long-term positions? Will they receive severance?
We envisioned that the current staff would be able to apply for any of these positions. We did not discuss severance pay since this was beyond the scope of our work. That is one of the many important details that will need to be addressed as we move forward.
 - ***How are we going to afford this?***
We are currently paying three full-time partners at a decent rate, including all the Board of Pensions benefits. The amount that we are putting forward toward that will more than cover the costs associated with the new proposed positions.
 - ***How will the Transitional Executives be trained?***
We did not discuss this. But we did envision that the work of the Task Force would need to continue into the transitional period. Many of the Task Force members expressed a desire to continue on helping with this transition. Perhaps, one of the roles they could play would be in the training of the new Execs.
 - ***How will we avoid having past dysfunction in the presbytery system derail our current efforts to move into fruitful future ministry?***
There is no guarantee against this, but in unearthing and acknowledging the dysfunction and trauma, the Task Force hopes that we can be cognizant of it as we move forward into whatever comes next, thereby not allowing it to undercut or curtail our good work together. This is something that we hope the Transitional Executive Presbyter will help us to address together.
- Additionally, the suggestions that we have made for updating and changing the Standing Rules as well as committee structures are made with this tendency in mind. If we leave our current structure in place and simply place a new leadership model on top of it, we are very likely to slide into our typical dysfunctional patterns and will end up back where we are today, seeking a new leadership model and a new way to engage in ministry together.
- ***What would the size of the new Council of the presbytery be? Would all of MVL and all of FPOC be a part of it?***
No, not all members would be a part of the Council. We envisioned the Council to be much like the Session of an individual church – made up of representatives from the different committees and working groups. So, MVL and FPOC would have a representative at in the Council but not more.
 - ***Is there a set number of applicants necessary for a search to be successful? If only one or two apply, will it be considered a failed search?***
We did not set a minimum number or applicants necessary. We do not want to discount the fact that God might bring exactly the right person to us and not many more. But we

also do not want the search committee to feel pressured to hire someone if the pool is small and the people in it don't meet our desired characteristics and abilities for our next leader.

- *How we will ensure that the search process will be inclusive and not insular?*
Our strong recommendation is that the Committee on Representation (COR) be a part of both the search for the Transitional EP and Transitional Associate EP as well as for the longer-term EP and Associate EP. We want to be sure that the leadership of the presbytery is reflective of the widely multicultural character of our presbytery.