

Emerging Models of Leadership & Governance

Combined Table/Small Group Feedback

Regional Gatherings

March 27, 2025

United States

Group 2

- 1. Between the 3 models, which one holds the greatest potential for meeting your community needs effectively at this time in your history?**

Having reflected on all 3 models, we like a combination of Models 1 and 3 because some aspects of both speak to the new form of governance we would like to see happen for FSA.

- 2. What do you like or value most about this model?**

We would like to combine the Wisdom Circles (from Model 3) and the Forums (from Model 1). The Wisdom Circles (WC) are more specific and more limited in content; whereby the Forums invite a broader perspective which enables greater communication, inclusivity (associates and partners in ministry), diversification, relationship building; but, more importantly utilizes the talents of our sisters.

We would like to have Regional Leadership elected in geographical areas

There are numerous things that would need to be fleshed out.

- 3. What additional modifications or suggestions can you offer to improve this model?**

The following questions/thoughts surfaced during our small group discussion

1. How is authority exercised in any of these models?
2. We need to define empowerment, responsibility and authority for each component of leadership: Congregational Leadership, Regional Leadership, and local community/cluster group/ Wisdom Circles and Forums.

**Tampa Group: Bernadette Schuler, Avril Chin-Fatt, Melissa Scholl,
Cathy Cahill, Colleen Brady, Kathy Keck**

1. We chose Model 3.
2. Simplicity of this model.
Flexibility in structure.
Variety of options in the Wisdom Circles: Topic-wise, how they organize themselves and the inclusion of Associates and Partners in Mission.
The key is communication, mutual responsibility and accountability on the part of all involved.
Wisdom Circles have the potential of leading us to “stand-with” in an outward thrust and inclusion of others in the Circles.
3. In addition to Congregational leadership (4), elect two more leaders with the option for part-time service.
Start with fewer Wisdom Circles (3).
Need to clarify the role of the Motherhouse local minister in relation to the Regional Minister in the US.
Interwoven in all aspects of this model are our Gospel values and Franciscan spirituality.

This feedback is from Allegany 1 – Facilitator – Mary Lou Lafferty
mllafferty@fsallegany.org Scribe – Gloria Oehl goehl@fsallegany.org.

#1. Between the 3 models we feel #2 holds the greatest potential because it lends itself to more inclusive communication and involvement of the membership. This leadership model is more open to modification. (see below)

#2. There is more involvement of the members, associates, and partners in ministry. It recognizes the need for experts in the area of finances, properties and whatever would arise. Each circle would be active – could be virtual or otherwise participated in. There also is the possibility of cross-cultural participation in the mission groups.

#3 – Eliminate all regions in light of the involvement of many opportunities for sisters in the unelected leadership circles. Maintain Congregation leadership since their primary responsibility is to observe the life and mission of the congregation.

The 4th circle could be labelled “optional membership forums” which could include focus groups, etc.

**Helen Roberts, Mary Augustini, Kate Moran, Ann Casserly, MM
Kimmins, Kathy Maire**

Three people did not have the printouts of the models, so conversation was somewhat limited even allowing time for them to find the handouts.

1. We chose model #3- Concerning the Wisdom Circles

The group felt is allowed for each individual to use specific gifts and talents.

2. What we liked or valued

It encourages each sister to contribute her gifts. Allows freedom of choice for specific interests. Opens the way for gifts of many sisters and associates to contribute.

3. Modifications or suggestions

Could allow for freedom to move from one wisdom circle to another.

Questions as to the need for Regionals in view of the limited number of sisters in specific areas.

Cindy M. facilitator, Liz S. scribe, Lucy C., Maria P, Gwen M, Kathleen S.

1. Among the three models, which one holds the greatest potential for meeting your community needs effectively at this time in your history?

ANSWER: Model #3, without ruling out incorporating components from models 1 & 2 which can assist in further developing model #3.

2. What do you like or value most about this model?

ANSWER: This model encompasses openness to all: the sisters, associates, mission partners, ministry partners and others. In addition, as stated in the narrative, this model includes the importance of shared responsibility, addresses the need for cross-congregational communication and contributions in decision-making.

3. What additional modifications or suggestions can you offer to improve this model?

ANSWER: The model needs to address vocations and completion. The position of Wisdom Circle Coordinator should be included in the center circle of the model diagram. The role of Wisdom Circle Coordinator needs to be developed and how these Coordinator roles interact with elected leadership and regional leaders. The issue of associates, mission and ministry partners as Wisdom Circle Coordinators needs to be addressed along with their role in non-elected congregational leadership. Each position's responsibility and authority needs to be clearly delineated. The issue of 4 elected congregational leaders and their respective roles should be determined/addressed/examined in light of the range of responsibilities elected leadership would be tasked with to see if more or less congregational leaders would be advisable. The need to educate sisters in the aging process needs to be addressed so that aging sisters have the knowledge needed to better adapt to the aging process. Also, those assisting aging sisters need to be educated well in the aging process to better assist aging sisters.

Pat Tyre, Alba Luz, Odette, Miriam, Marlene, and Margaret Magee

1. Between the three models, which one holds the greatest potential for meeting your community needs effectively at this time in your history?

The group is leaning towards model 2.

2. What do you like or value most about this model?

- Model 2 is well organized and involves many people.

- Decentralized leadership with greater collaboration, cooperation with other leaders in Stewardship, Mission, Franciscan Community Life and with the Integration Team
- Each Mission circle will have authority and be able to carry out and communicate plans without having to go back to elected leadership
- Five or more in elected leadership would represent more interculturality and all do not have to be full-time leadership

3. What additional modifications or suggestions can you offer to improve this model?

- In the Franciscan Community Life narrative – include after the words “prayer, presence” and living the mission of the congregation...
- Add Vocational Ministry, (lay, married, religious life, men & women for our or other communities) to the Mission Circle
- In the Mission circle rename the small circles as being Wisdom Circles as identified in model # 3.
- In the Franciscan Community Life circle, the Life-Care Coordinators (plural) would be in each of our countries. Their role would be pastoral as well as healthcare professionals
- In the Stewardship circle clarify that the treasurers would be the General Treasurer, Regional Treasurer in Brazil and Treasurer in Jamaica
- In the Franciscan Community Life circle include a members’ forums which could be held regionally and/or congregationally
- In the Franciscan Community Life circle plan for assemblies both locally and beyond local geographic areas, to get to know and understand one another and the challenges we need to face together.
- In Franciscan Community Life circle and /or Mission circle include collaboration with other religious congregations, both women and men.
- In Franciscan Community Life circle be open to the possibilities of other religious and laity living with us.

- Have 2 Regional Minister in the US (one in the north, inclusive of PA, NJ, NYCity, New England and those outside the Motherhouse) and another in the south) and the Motherhouse Local Minister. The three would collaborate and work together as a team. Regional Minister term would be two or three years, renewable.

Allegany 2 Group, Scribe: Rosemary Higgins.OSF

1. We have chosen model three. It has flexibility. It is the clearest and more precise of the three. It is all inclusive and open to partners and associates.
2. The Wisdom circles provide the possibility to grow in openness to the Spirit. People have more of a voice and opportunities in decision making.
3. Fewer people in leadership; we prefer three. As a suggestion to improve this model, we would like to see the inclusion of Life-Care coordinators.

We believe that we only need one Regional Minister for all of the United States due to fewer numbers of Sisters.

Allegany 1 – Facilitator – Mary Lou Lafferty mlafferty@fsallegany.org Scribe – Gloria Oehl goehl@fsallegany.org.

#1. Between the 3 models we feel #2 holds the greatest potential because it lends itself to more inclusive communication and involvement of the membership. This leadership model is more open to modification. (see below)

#2. There is more involvement of the members , associates, and partners in ministry. It recognizes the need for experts in the area of finances, properties and whatever would arise. Each circle would be active – could be virtual or otherwise participated in. There also is the possibility of cross-cultural participation in the mission groups.

#3 – Eliminate all regions in light of the involvement of many opportunities for sisters in the unelected leadership circles. Remove the Integration Team since the primary responsibility of the Congregational Leadership is to

maintain the life and mission of the congregation. Put CL in the center of the configuration.

The 4th circle could be labelled “optional membership forums” which could include focus groups, etc.

Group: # 8 – U.S. Scribe – Clare Bertero _____

1. Between the three models, which one holds the greatest potential for meeting your community needs effectively at this time in your history?

Model # 3 – The choice of the whole group

2. What do you like or value most about this model?

The direct connection between sisters and leadership through the circles of wisdom

The four elected leaders and regionals are an effective number for our sisters

The mutual accountability and ownership of sisters

Strong and clear delineation in leadership of substantive matters

Potential of outreach and involvement through the wisdom circles

The participation in the work of congregational decision makings and future actions

of the circles

Wisdom circles imply connections to the issues of the real world

3. What additional modifications or suggestions can you offer to improve this model?

Leadership will determine number of wisdom circles

Add a wisdom circle for Franciscan spirituality

Wisdom circle procedures need for further development in this model

Brazil

REFLECTION QUESTIONS

Group 1

We had consensus on question number 3

Question 2: What do we like or value most about this model?

- It presents a clearer model, emphasizes open communication and improves relationships, and makes an interconnection through the assemblies
- The leadership of each Wisdom Circle is part of the leadership
- the reintroduction of regionals in the United States

Question 3: What changes and suggestions do we offer

- that the regionals need to have autonomy to decide on the affairs of their region,
- that the level of autonomy of the wisdom cycles needs to be defined
- which needs to include the wisdom cycle of vocational animation.

Group: 2

1. Of the three models, which one has the greatest potential to meet the needs of your community effectively at this moment in its history?

The group unanimously chose No. 3, as they believe this model has the greatest potential to meet the current needs of the congregation at this moment in its history.

2. What do you like or value most about this model?

All the participants liked this model best because it offers more openness, fluidity, greater participation with circles of wisdom, and dialogue for decision-making.

3. What modifications or additional suggestions can you offer to improve this model?

Some suggestions from the group:

-That the final decision-making power rests with the elected general leadership, with the other leadership bodies being consultative.

-That the elected general government be made up of: 1 General Minister, 1 Associate Minister, and 2 Councilors, with one or two members from Brazil.

-That in the circle of wisdom on continuing formation, initial formation be added.

Group 03

1º) The Leadership approach of group 01

2º) Inclusion of all countries

- Participation of members / Associates / Lay people

- Focus groups

3º) - Adding one more member to the elected leadership

- Inclusion of Brazil, USA, and Jamaica (two members of the regional leadership automatically being part of the congregational leadership chosen by the council itself).

Group 04

Answer:

1. Leadership model 1, because it broadens participation and is more functional.

2 . Participation of Sisters from all Regions in Leadership. - Holding forums focusing on issues of congregational interest, making collective decisions, and creating more meaningful connections between us. - It deepens relationships.

3. We suggest adding 03 more members to the leadership, with representation from the regions.

Group 5

Answers.

1. We chose model 03

2. We feel that we are included in model 03, because it is clearer, simpler, more flexible, with the possibility of greater participation in decisions, more functional to current realities (church, mission). We need to be aware of the culture of each country.

3. We have 3 observations for change.

* Only 3 elected leaders in the leadership core.

* Include initial and continuing education in the wisdom core.

* Stipulate the minimum and maximum number of wisdom cycles, as well as the minimum and maximum number of members in each cycle.

Group 6

Of the 3 models, we chose model 3

What do you like or value most about this model?

Comprehensive participation.

Shared responsibility.

Inter-congregational communication.

The region participates in general decisions.

The model fits our reality.

Openness to innovation, flexibility for necessary changes.

Unity in diversity.

Autonomy for the regions.

3. Changes or additional suggestions...

Regional leadership: United States, Jamaica, and Brazil elected in their regions;

Add continuing education and initial education.

Jamaica

6 Sisters: Scribem, Rose Chang, Email: roseychang43@gmail .com

1. Between the three models, which one holds the greatest potential for meeting your community needs effectively at this time in your history?

MODEL 1: 1 Sister

MODEL 2: 3 Sisters

MODEL 3: 2 Sisters

2. What do you like or value most about this model?

MODEL 1: General Leadership/ governance is clearly defined.

MODEL 2: a. stresses lay collaboration as part of the structure of government.

b. emphasizes connection among ourselves as members and among others, exercising co-responsibility.

c. inclusion of CFO members.

MODEL 3: a) inter-connectedness between elected and regional leaders.

b) Wisdom Circles: this brings the wisdom of all members to governance;

c) Inclusiveness, honouring the contribution of each member.

3. What additional modifications or suggestions can you offer to improve this model?

i) MODEL 3: Include a Wisdom Circle relating to Life in Community/OSF Charism/Spiritual development in our current situation.

ii) Question: How will Regional leadership in the US be determined?

Bolivia

1. Between the three models, which one holds the greatest potential for meeting your community needs effectively at this time in your history?

Model 1

2. What do you like or value most about this model?

More sisters will be participating in community issues

More open and inclusive

Inclusion of laity

Assemblies would bring sisters together more since we are so far apart and fewer

Being present and community with one another is shown in this model

3. What additional modifications or suggestions can you offer to improve this model?

Maintain "building a bridge with one another"

All three models have some good points that could be combined in one model

Questions About the Models from the U.S.

Group 2/Tampa

Model # 1:

1. *The draft mentions “associate members,” an our group wanted to know about the inclusion of “Partners in Ministry/Mission.”*
2. *Model # 2:*
3. *Page 5 under “Leadership,” suggests that the “Regional Leadership would serve a term of one year...”. Our group felt that this is too short a time to serve as Regional Leaders.*
4. *Questions raised:*
5. *Could Regional Ministers be the Councilors, elected at Chapter?*
6. *Would the Life-Care Coordinator be a sister or a lay person? Who would this person report to? Regional Leader or Congregational Leadership?*
7. *What responsibilities would a CFO have? Is this person for USA only or for Congregation? Will this person’s responsibilities spill over into some of the things that current leadership are responsible for to free leadership up for other things?*
8. *In this model who is responsible for updating FSA guidelines and Bylaws of the Board of Directors?*

Model 1:

1. The draft mentions "associate members," and our group wanted to know about the inclusion of "Partners in Ministry/Mission.

Model 2

1. Page 5 under Leadership suggests that the" Regional Leadership would serve a term of one year..." Our group feels that this is too short a time to serve in that position.

2. Questions raised:

a. Could Regional Ministers be the Councilors elected at Chapter?

b. Would the Life-Care Coordinator be a sister; or could it be a lay person? Who would this person report to? The Regional Leader or Congregational Leadership?

3. What responsibilities would a CFO have? Is this person for the USA alone or the whole Congregation? Will this person assume some of the responsibilities that current leadership are responsible for so as to free leadership up for other things?

4. In this model who is responsible for updating FSA guidelines and Bylaws of the Board of Directors?

Group?

1. How is home care and hospice in partnership with us?

2. Does the CFO qualifications include a background in our values and mission?
3. Is a life care coordinator a decision making position or an advisory position

Regarding the model, number three:

1. How do the administrative tasks work in model three. That is: what are the nuts and bolts of the administrative staff.

Group: Pat Tyre, Alba Luz, Odette, Miriam, Marlene, and Margaret Magee

Questions for 1st model:

- Is there the potential for lay participation, Partners in Mission and other professionals? How and where do you envision there roles?
- How does the Members Forum become an essential element of this model?
- How many elected members will there be all together?
- What is the weight of recommended?
- What is the role of Regional Leadership in forums? Why only Congregational leadership mentioned?
- Regional/local focus groups – Who and how would they be initiated?
- Local Assemblies 0 could they be in person and on Zoom?
- Where do clusters and local communities fit in this model?

Questions for 2nd model:

Stewardship: Is the role of partnerships consultative or deliberative?

Board of Directors (BOD): Shows that treasurers are members of the BOD, does that mean local community treasurers?

BOD: responsibilities – is it really oversight? Who makes the decisions? How are members of the BOD chosen? Elected or appointed? Who will interview?

How is the Integration Team selected? Is it a decision making body?

Do the sisters at large participate in Stewardship and decision making?

Regionals: Is one year term too short?

Question for 3rd model:

- Regional leadership: what responsibilities would be shifted from Congregational leadership to Regional leadership?
- Do the Wisdom circles have authority to design, develop and carry out processes, programs, etc, without having to check or get permission from leadership?
- Is there any forms that allows members to participate together?

Group: Kathie Uhler, Pat Klemm, Ann Casserly, Helen Roberts, Kathy Maire

Questions on model #1:

What is the understanding of "There may be some level of authority/responsibilities existing in these assemblies".

Why does Congregational leadership need to be present at all forums?

What are the levels of authority for Regionals and Congregational leaders?

Does Allegany need a Regional minister?

Model #2

Is it realistic to have so many in leadership given our resources?

What are the dimensions of authority allocated to Life and Mission circles?

Model #3

Why 4 in elected leadership?

#3 – final suggestion on putting CL (Congregational Leadership) in the Center of the diagram.

Questions About the Models from Brazil

Leninha

The Proposal doesn't give certainty to the form of governance;

.closed, reduces

who is a member of the forum;

Inconsistent proposal

2nd Proposal

1. Where is the elected Regional leadership;

2. Shared leadership? Circular?

3. What is the integration team?

. Who is part of it?

. How is it set up?

. What is its function?

3rd Proposal

Whether wisdom circles can be modified or completely replaced. Who can suppress or create others?

What is the connection between elected leadership and wisdom circles?

losita

Our group needs clarification on the 3 models, model 3 seems best. We need clarification for choosing models

Group 3 Sr. Janet Scribe Sr. Barbara
Reflection Questions on Models of Leadership

1. We chose Model #2
2. We liked that LIFE and MISSION are in the center of the diagram.

We were satisfied with the strong inclusion of associates, members of various levels, lay partners, and others.

We like the idea of a Life-Care Coordinator.

Liked the inter connection of circles showing co-responsibility.

Liked the FUTURE circles demonstrating on going life.

We appreciate the specificity of this model.

Thought the location of the LEADERSHIP circle was one of four ...not dominant.

Liked the question "Where do I fit in?"

This model includes so much of what we have discussed .

The large brown circle has broken lines showing permeability with all the internal circles.

3.. Modifications and suggestions

We need clarification as to why we need 5 elected leaders -maybe we need fewer especially if we are adding a level of regional leadership in USA.

We question the duration of regional leaders because one year may be too short.

Does criteria for membership in the Integration team need to be developed?

We need a description of the role and responsibilities of the integration team.

We have strong appreciation of having a Life-Care person but question its position in the circle.

The associates belong in the Franciscan Community Life Circle.