

## *Recommendations to the Board of Trustees 06/11/18*

As chair of, and board liaison to the Leadership Development Committee we would like to make several recommendations to the Board of Trustees for the year ahead. Underlying all else we would like to encourage trust among and between our two respective entities. We would echo the findings of the Covenantal Congregation Task Force in supporting and nurturing trust within and at all levels. Our intention is to highlight areas or potential areas where the development of future leadership candidacies can and should be more fluid.

We recommend that as first order of business for the new board for 2018/2019 that you find candidates for the Safe Congregations Response Team. There is currently only one voting member (rather than three). The current member is a caregiver for a spouse with significant health issues. A new member should be added as soon as possible and the task force team brought to full strength as soon as is feasible. If candidates do not come forward, consideration should be made for filling from within the board, as has been done in the past. It could be challenging should the congregation face a safety incident with SCRT in its' current state.

Consider, since the LDC as well as the board are within the confidentiality circle with signed agreements, to have SCRT inform the chair directly issues that would recommend against candidacy. This would prevent advancing a questionable candidate unnecessarily.

Clarify that SCRT should either approve caution or reject a candidacy. To the LDC chair or the board if LDC presents the candidate for consideration. A rejection would be a background check that gives appropriate pause. A second reason is that there is a behavior contract in place. A caution would indicate further consideration because there has been a behavior contract in the past or an investigated incident that would urge further deliberation. Beyond that we should support those positive people who have the desire and ability to best serve our community as a whole.

Ultimately we believe that it is in the interests of LDC and the board and UUCGT as a whole to present candidates without controversy.

The process of informing a potential candidate of not accepting their candidacy should be spelled out specifically.

Finally, the board with LDC input and coordination of the policy committee should evaluate the timeline that is in place for the entire process. This process has

been modified several times and it does not quite fit. Part of what is at issue is that SCRT clearance of potential candidacies was inserted on top of an older time line. Additionally the matter of nomination from the congregation should be considered. We believe that this should be maintained but routed through LDC and SCRT for evaluation. It would be a good time to define what the process is and why.

We recommend that the board continue to have a liaison with LDC and that the President of president elect should be considered. It is invaluable to have close working relationships between these two bodies.

Respectfully Submitted,

*Joe Cook &  
Karl D. Love*