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INTRODUCTION

Kerry A. Robinson, Executive Director, National Leadership Roundtable on Church Management

The National Leadership Roundtable on Church Management grew out of an important conference held at The Wharton School in June 2004 called The Church in America: Leadership Roundtable. Hundreds of Catholic luminaries from the secular world and the Church, with high levels of executive experience, met to discuss, assess, and contribute substantively to improve and strengthen the temporal affairs of the Catholic Church in the United States in order that the mission of the Church might be advanced more effectively. A seminal result of this gathering was a list of 48 recommendations for positively impacting the Church’s management, finances, and human resource development at the local, diocesan, and national levels. It is notable that this effort, from its inception, has concerned itself exclusively with the management, finances, and human resource development of the Church, focusing solely on the temporal affairs and is, in this focus, entirely non-doctrinal. Also notable is the strong emphasis on the positive, namely to identify what already works well in the Church and those examples of excellence in our Church that merit emulation.

In March of 2005, the National Leadership Roundtable on Church Management was incorporated, and on July 11 of that year the Board of Directors met for the first time in Washington, D.C. Three months later the Leadership Roundtable held its first annual membership conference, which brought together prominent U.S. bishops with nearly 200 senior-level Catholic executives from the philanthropic, corporate, educational, governmental, military, financial, and nonprofit sectors. Out of this conference emerged a Plan of Action for the Leadership Roundtable consisting of 21 specific objectives, informed by the original 48 recommendations, to be developed in service to the Church in the United States over the next few years.

The Leadership Roundtable’s second annual membership conference, held in June of 2006, focused on creating the conditions for financial health in the Church. Under that rubric five specific areas of focus were highlighted for further development in working sessions at the conference. They are Effective
Following the successful discourse on Church finances, the members of the Leadership Roundtable met on June 28–29, 2007, to focus on the development and promotion of top-quality human resource management in diocese and parishes. Entitled *Give Us Your Best: A Look at Church Service for a New Generation*, the conference explored ways to attract the best people to pastoral ministry in our parishes and dioceses, what conditions are required to retain them in ministry, and what provision is necessary to sustain their ongoing formation and career development. The conversation was informed by academic research, proven approaches from the worlds of business and nonprofits, and best practices from parishes and dioceses across the country. Specific topics covered are recruitment, marketing, vocations, compensation, investment, mentoring, education, formation, and professional ethics.

During this gathering, members of the Leadership Roundtable also reviewed the *Standards for Excellence: An Ethics and Accountability Code for Catholic Dioceses, Parishes and Nonprofits*. This code contains eight guiding principles in the areas of program operations, governance, human resources, financial management and fundraising. It contains 55 Standards that provide more detailed performance benchmarks for Catholic dioceses, parishes and nonprofits to strengthen their operations and become more transparent and accountable.

It is a testament to the constructive ethos of the Leadership Roundtable that everything that is developed is intended to be shared and disseminated openly and widely for maximum application. I hope you enjoy these proceedings, but more importantly I hope that they serve to stimulate your own imagination about what is possible, and what is productive and beneficial to the Catholic Church in the United States, especially in terms of your own parish, diocese, religious community, or Catholic nonprofit. Our Church and its leaders deserve our support, expertise, insight, and participation to achieve excellence in management and mission.
**OPENING PRAYER**

*Most Rev. Dale J. Melczek, Bishop of Gary*

My brother bishops, priests, dear religious, and lay faithful, we come together this morning as persons richly blessed, with gifts of life, faith, health, a deep love for the Lord and for His Church, diverse talents, and abundant resources. We share a common desire to offer ourselves, our gifts and experience, in the service of the Church.

Let us then bow our heads in prayer asking God’s blessings, especially the outpouring of the Holy Spirit, that our time together these two days might redound to God’s glory and the building of the Father’s kingdom, and the body of Christ, the Church. Let us pray.

We bless you, our loving God, and we praise your holy name. In your merciful providence, you sent your eternally begotten Son into the world to fully reveal yourself as love, to free us from the bondage of sin, and to enable us to live in your love through the gifts your spirit brings. As Jesus breathed his last on the cross, he established the Church to extend his love and to proclaim his Gospel of life, peace, hope, and reconciliation for all time and to all peoples.

Lord we thank you for calling us through faith and baptism to be living members of the body of Christ, and for entrusting to us the mission of your eternally begotten Son. We pray for our Holy Father, Pope Benedict XVI, and for bishops in communion with him. We likewise intercede for our priests and religious. We especially plead that you fill each one of us with the wisdom and guidance of your Holy Spirit.

Help us to use the gifts and talents you have given us for the glory of your name and the building up of the Church, which we so love. Remain with us throughout these two days. Guide us by the wisdom of your Holy Spirit. Unite us to yourself and to one another in the bond of love and keep us faithful to all that is true. Help us, through our time together, to lift up best practices for motivating our faithful to use their gifts in the service of the Gospel, and for recruiting the very best for leadership roles.

May we, your Church, be salt and light for all people, leading them through your Son and in the power of your Spirit to give you glory. We make our prayer now as always through Christ Jesus, our Lord.
I’m delighted to welcome everyone to our annual membership conference at The Wharton School. We come from many places across the country, and we represent a diversity of sectors. And we’re well aware of the extraordinary privilege and responsibility we have to be agents of change and a positive influence on the Catholic Church in the U.S.

I want to acknowledge and thank Bishop Dale Melczek, an early and steadfast advocate of the Leadership Roundtable, and the many other bishops across the country who have worked closely with us and invited us into their dioceses, who are attending this membership conference today and have done so in previous years, and who have engaged us in consultancy efforts, promoted and used our materials and resources, and served as advisors, advocates, and emissaries to their brother bishops. I also want to thank everyone from Cardinal Levada—who participated in our very first conference and is featured in our DVD series—and Archbishop Sambi, the papal nuncio with whom we meet and keep informed of our resources, to the 40 core bishops on our informal advisory council.

Thank you all for this collaboration and partnership in faith. I also want to acknowledge our incomparable host, Pat Harker, who is enjoying his penultimate day as dean of The Wharton School after many years here, before assuming the presidency of the University of Delaware on July 1st. Pat, on behalf of your fellow Board members of the Leadership Roundtable, I am deeply grateful to you for your tremendous hospitality. Being able to meet here has mattered, because it’s one more sign of how serious, credible, professional, and committed to managerial and financial excellence we are in all that we offer to the Church we love.

Next month will be two years since the Board of Directors first convened in Washington, DC. For some of us it feels as though it’s been a lot longer and, truthfully, many of us have been meeting, strategizing, deliberating, and, ultimately, conceiving the Leadership Roundtable on Church Management since the devastating sexual abuse crisis first captured our attention and broke our hearts in 2002. We have spent considerable time dealing with the challenge of language translation between the culture of business and the culture of the Church. And we successfully drew on both cultures to form a partnership of managerial and financial advisors in service to the Church.
In both of these cultures, the idea of family is strong. And when a family is suffering or in crisis, you do what you feel is necessary as a responsible and committed member to bring healing, reconciliation, vitality, and wholeness to that family.

That was our impetus. To do nothing would have been irresponsible. You have to have wisdom to know what you can affect, and you have to have the courage to act. You, the members of the Leadership Roundtable, have both. A tremendous amount has been accomplished in these two formal years of the Leadership Roundtable’s life, and I want to thank and congratulate you. In particular, I want to thank Geoff Boisi, who has been an exemplary Board chair.

Geoff and I have met weekly for the past two years to review the progress, strategic direction, challenges, and opportunities to enable the Leadership Roundtable to be of maximum service to the Church.

The Board of Directors has now met nine times in two years to advance the mission of service to the Church. That's a profound commitment. We have progressed significantly in all aspects of this important initiative, at a particularly critical time in our Church’s history. Your own sacrifice of time and your generous offerings of expertise, creative ideas, influence, financial support, energy, and dedication to strengthen the temporal affairs of the Church have been an inspiration and vital sign of hope to Catholics throughout the United States. We’ve also had an impact on Catholics abroad, including bishops from other countries who want to find out how they can avail themselves of our resources.

Over the past two years, we have assembled an exceptional group of senior-level executives and collectively advanced our relationship with the episcopacy by earning the respect and trust of many bishops across the country. We have conducted successful consultancy programs in the Archdiocese of New Orleans, the Diocese of Paterson (NJ), the Archdiocese of St. Paul-Minneapolis, and with national Catholic organizations. In each case, those efforts have yielded products, recommendations, or templates that have enjoyed wider application within the Church.

We have received positive press coverage, including front-page articles in The New York Times and The Boston Globe, and an op-ed by our treasurer, Tom Healey, in The Philadelphia Enquirer. We have given structure to our organization, formed committees and working groups, set in motion a plan of action, and methodically advanced its priorities. You’re all aware that we have produced seminal resources in service to the Church, including professionally produced DVDs and accompanying workbooks for parishes and dioceses to assess and improve their own management of human and financial resources.

We have also published A Parishioner’s Guide to Understanding Parish Finances, a simple but effective guide to getting a handle on the financial complexities and health of one’s parish. This afternoon we will focus on our newest resource, Standards for Excellence: An Ethics and Accountability Code for Catholic Dioceses, Parishes and Nonprofits. This is our fourth national assembly, and as we have done three times before, we are publishing and disseminating a full report on our deliberations for wider benefit. We also distribute all our materials on our web site, www.nlrcm.org, so they’re accessible by all.
Speaking of the web, we will officially launch tomorrow www.churchEpedia.org, our online clearing house of information and best practices for the Church, with hundreds of “knowledge documents” we are committed to growing and making available to all members of the Church in one freely accessible place.

After two years, we have a terrific foundation of record; a reputation for fidelity, respect, and competence; and a clearly important mission with concrete successes to point to. I look forward to moving to the next level with you. I hope that over the next day and a half you’re renewed in your appreciation of the difference you’re truly making in improving the management, finances, and human resource development of the Church—and that you’re eager for the next and even deeper level of engagement.

With that, let us turn to the conference itself and the subject at hand: Give Us Your Best: A Look at Church Service for a New Generation. Having focused on Church finances last year, we address human resource development this year and anticipate that management will be our overarching theme next year, thus completing our three core areas. We have a stellar group of presenters to lead our discussions, which are intended to be highly interactive and participatory.
People Management in Mission-Driven Organizations: Realities and Implications

Keynote Address

Thomas Tierney, Chairman and Co-Founder, Bridgespan Group

From a distance, running a nonprofit organization doesn’t look that hard to a business person. Maybe that’s because things always look easier from a distance. My conclusion now, after seven years of helping lead a nonprofit and serving other nonprofits and foundations in a variety of ways, is that running a nonprofit is every bit as difficult as running a business. I could even argue that it’s harder to achieve outstanding results in a mission-driven organization than in a business.

You may ask, “How could that be? How could it possibly be harder?” Well, there are some structural reasons that we’re all aware of. Let me focus on some of them.

First of all, nonprofits—the Church is a good illustration—are largely voluntary. People don’t have to give away their money. They don’t have to give away their time. They don’t have to donate their commitment. And they don’t have to work at salaries below market levels. Voluntary organizations require a different kind of leadership. Because their participants are motivated by passion and commitment, it’s a little hard to align them around “business” goals.

It’s not as if we’re going to double our earnings over the earnings of our competitors. It’s a little more complicated than that. We’re going to change lives. So the “alignment,” to use a business term, of an organization around objectives is complicated when the participants are motivated by passion.
In addition, in the nonprofit sector there is chronic underinvestment in what is often referred to as “organizational capacity.” One of the reasons for this is that there aren’t capital markets. Money doesn’t flow to high-performing organizations the way it does in the business world, so successful strategy is much more complicated to put into place.

Achieving sustained excellence in nonprofit organizations, I have come to believe, is tremendously challenging. Thus an imperative is to “bridge,” if you will, the best of the business and the best of the nonprofit worlds to create a kind of synthesis of best practices.

Interestingly enough, that’s what the National Leadership Roundtable on Church Management is all about. It’s motivating and exciting for me to be here today to address you as “bridgers”—individuals who are trying to bring best practices together from businesses and mission-driven organizations.

Let me say a word at this point about Bridgespan, so you understand the context for my remarks. Bridgespan is a nonprofit organization. We do general management consulting, and we also do executive recruiting because we discovered that mission-driven organizations are having a hard time finding talent. We have seven years of experience, and have served a few hundred organizations with a team of about 130 people. And we have a lot still to learn.

We work with the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation on their strategy, for example, but we also work with their grantees, and we do that with a number of foundations around the country. We bridge the business and nonprofit worlds. We bridge sources of capital and charities. We also bridge strategy and organization. The recruiting organization, which is called Bridgestar, and the Bridgespan consulting organization, create substantial content which we try to distribute from the few organizations we’re serving to the larger universe of nonprofit organizations. This is an essential element of our social mission.

With that as background, I’d like to share with you some of our observations about how nonprofit organizations seem to achieve outstanding results. And, consequently, what are the human resource implications of this?

For any organization—whether it’s a business, a foundation, or a charity—results seem to be generated by three ingredients: strategy, capital, and talent; and by two sets of resources: money and people, along with a plan for putting these ingredients and resources to work. It’s a pretty simple equation, in a way.

The purpose of strategy is to align organizations around certain goals in a way they can be achieved. What is the relative importance of strategy vis-à-vis capital and talent? Nonprofits tend to take the view, “We need more money. More money is always better.” And more money, I suppose, is indeed usually better.

But most businesspeople, if asked to prioritize strategy, capital, and talent, would say that talent is number one. Hands down. If you have lots of money and a mediocre team, you’re not going to do very well.

I’ve spent 25 years helping leaders develop strategies, and I can confirm for you that strategy just isn’t as important as talent. There are all kinds of illustrations of this. Jack Welch at General Electric was a
phenomenal leader of an organization that’s recognized as a talent-making machine. And there’s Warren Buffett, one of the best investors the world has ever known. He bets on people every time.

Jim Collins, author of *Built to Last* and *Good to Great*, also wrote a little monograph called *Good to Great and the Social Sectors*, which is really worthwhile reading if you haven’t done so. In that little book—and in *Good to Great* as well—he says that nothing is more important than having the right person in the right job. Or, as he puts it, knowing “who’s on the bus.”

Here’s my translation. The social impact of a nonprofit organization depends primarily on the capacity and performance of its people. This is not a very complicated idea, but it seems very important. Strong organizations are more apt to deliver great results.

Bottom line, results are a “who” thing. In the years since we launched Bridgespan, we’ve seen this over and over again. We’ve seen nonprofit executives who are burned out after spending three or four days a week just fundraising. That’s really hard. We’ve also seen, as we have in the for-profit sector to be sure, organizational mediocrity, perpetuated by the mindset, “We know we really ought to replace Harvey as the financial person, but he works so hard and he’s been here so long.” Even great organizations can experience these human vulnerabilities that aren’t easily addressed.

We’ve seen the need for quality management escalate—and we’ve seen organizations try for a year to hire a chief operating officer and not be able to find good candidates. So what’s going on? About two years ago, we started analyzing this question. And what we discovered is a little frightening. We found that the nonprofit sector—and this would include the Church, for sure—is colliding head-on with a fundamental shortage of management talent, a shortage of senior leaders.

This escalating leadership deficit, if you will, is going to be more profound and more pervasive than anything this country has ever experienced. If organizations such as the Catholic Church and other nonprofits don’t confront this issue, then they’re going to see their ability to achieve results, and to serve society, severely undermined. Business as usual simply won’t cut it in the next 10 to 20 years.

To put this leadership deficit in perspective, over the next decade nonprofit organizations (excluding higher education, health care, religious groups, and grass roots organizations with less than $250,000 annual budgets) are going to need 640,000 new senior leaders. And by that, I mean leaders who aren’t currently in the management pool.

How do you even calibrate that number? Within this universe of nonprofits, it’s 2.4 times the current number of leaders. To calibrate the need in a different way, these nonprofits would have to recruit 50 percent of every MBA graduating class from every MBA program in America for each of the next 10 years. Of course, this is neither practical nor desirable.

What’s going on? It boils down to a pretty simple equation. Demand for talent is increasing and the supply of talent is decreasing. The primary reason for the supply decline is that the baby boom generation we read about all the time is retiring. Another trend in the nonprofit sector is that people are leaving
management positions for staff jobs or jobs in the business sector. In the war for talent, nonprofit leaders are often finding better pay, better benefits, and better lifestyles in other places.

At the same time, the nonprofit sector is growing very quickly. This growth is not driven only by the amount of money going in. It’s driven by an increase in the number of organizations. The net number of nonprofits in the past 20 years has tripled. When you do the math, you see there have been about 100 new nonprofits every business day in America over the past few years. And, surprisingly, the bigger ones—those with $10 million and up—are growing at a faster rate than the smaller ones.

So, to recap, there are more nonprofits and larger nonprofits in America, growing faster than ever before in our history. This is coming at a time when the talent pool is shrinking which, in turn, is driving the leadership deficit.

Colleagues and even reporters have asked me: “You’re talking about a deficit in quantity. How about a deficit in quality? Are you suggesting the nonprofit sector has people who aren’t all that great?”

The truth is that this quantity deficit can easily turn into a quality deficit if we’re not careful. Recall my point that delivering excellent results in a nonprofit organization is every bit as hard, or even harder, than in a similar sized business; the nonprofits need outstanding leaders to achieve their goals. Thus, a quality deficit would be every bit as harmful as a quantity deficit.

The for-profit business world isn’t immune from these dynamics, either. But companies have some actions they can take to compete in the war for talent, beyond money and stock options and extensive professional development programs. Businesses, by and large, grow their own talent. In fact, our data show that two out of three senior people in business today come from inside their organizations. In the nonprofit sector, about two out of three come from outside, because nonprofits cannot offer comparable leadership supply and development opportunities. Which means that social service organizations often have to compete more fiercely for talent in the marketplace.

How, then, can this nonprofit leadership challenge be addressed? I have found that questions can often be more important than answers in sorting through complex problems. If you’re not asking the right questions, you don’t have any chance of uncovering the right answers. So, I’m going to pose key questions, and provide some points of view around each.

1. **What can be done at a Church-wide or system-wide level to create stronger organizations with the ability to improve human resources?** In other words, are there ways to create shared resources, shared knowledge, and shared services that can be leveraged over multiple constituents of the Church? That’s why what the National Leadership Roundtable is doing can be so important—because you are leveraging across large and small parishes and different kinds of organizations, and amortizing the cost of creating resources.
2. **What are the current and future needs for management talent?** For most organizations, if they’re growing at all and if they project how many people they’ll need in leadership jobs in five or ten years, the calculations will be stunning. When you take a really close look at growing organizations, you’ll find there’s usually a deficit in both leadership quantity and quality. This is not just because of future needs, but because when you think hard about succession planning, you find that you don’t have enough bench depth.

That’s why understanding the current situation of an organization and its future needs requires taking a very realistic look at people’s performance. This is admittedly hard for nonprofit organizations because performance often gets confused with commitment and caring. I remember talking to an executive director about their CFO who was performing so abysmally that a capital campaign was blowing up in their faces, and the institution was in danger of being shut down. Yet when the executive director was confronted about the clearly inept CFO, he said, “But Sylvia cares so much.”

That’s fine. Caring is necessary. It’s just not sufficient. In mission-driven organizations, we sometimes confuse caring with capacity, and commitment with real capability. A few years ago I co-authored a book with Jay Lorsch, a brilliant professor at Harvard Business School, called *Aligning the Stars*. It was based on research and teaching we had both done regarding the leadership of professional service firms. We concluded that sustained results depend upon the aggregate performance of individuals, and that to succeed, organizations must have a way to evaluate individual performance.

3. **How do you build feedback loops into the organization?** Let’s say you have a good sense of where your people are today, and you have a rigorous sense of your future needs. Formal performance reviews provide individual evaluation and learning that are vitally important. They provide discipline for an organization so it knows how it is doing.

I don’t know how many of you have had a really thoughtful, aggressive, constructive, and possibly negative performance evaluation. I have. And I can assure you, it’s not always much fun. Yet if those kinds of formal feedback loops don’t exist, organizations won’t get better.

There’s another kind of feedback loop that’s even more important: on-the-job training. Formal training programs are different. They’re expensive and, according to the research that Jay Lorsch and I did, they can often be a waste of money. Think about how many times you’ve gone off-site with organizations for three or four days and been handed a binder. How much do you remember six months later about what was in that binder? Technical training is fine, but I’m a little skeptical of general leadership training. What you really need is daily care, daily feedback, and daily coaching. People learn best on the job by mentoring one another.
So, how you go about building feedback loops—both formal and informal—into an organization is really important to your human resource effectiveness.

4. How do you establish or reinforce standards of performance excellence? It’s one thing to have feedback loops but it’s another thing to have feedback loops without standards. Sometimes nonprofit organizations have performance reviews, and you read through their files and find that everybody got an “A.” It’s kind of like the high jump where there’s no bar. You can’t learn when there’s no bar. You learn when you make mistakes, when you do and don’t clear the bar.

Who sets the bar, and how high should it be? One of the most profound differences I see between the for-profit and nonprofit worlds is that standards of excellence are self-imposed in the nonprofit world. In the for-profit world, there are benchmarks for excellence. For example, if same-store sales at Gap decrease relative to their industry peer group, that’s bad. There are many external benchmarks, including return on equity and other financial metrics.

How do you benchmark nonprofits? Lives saved? Souls saved? It’s kind of tough. The setting of the bar is done by the leadership of the organization as opposed to external constituents. If the setting is ambiguous, or if the bar is not set at all, you won’t get outstanding performance. Excellence is self-imposed because there are few marketplace dynamics to impose performance standards and continuous improvement.

If you want to build a strong organization, you have to be clear about performance standards. Here’s an observation I’ve made as a general manager. The real action in setting standards of excellence is at the extremes of the scale. What do I mean by that? Well, the top quartile of people will clear the bar without even trying. So, you move the bar up and they clear it again. You want to identify those folks, nurture and reinforce them, and put the next generation of great leaders in their proximity so they can learn from them. That top quartile is your coveted group.

Then you have the bottom quartile. Most organizations don’t know—or refuse to admit—they even have a bottom quartile. Understanding not just the top quartile but also who’s in the bottom quartile and how you can either improve them or move them out over time, is a path toward building a stronger organization.

5. That moves us from the internal to the external world, because sometimes you have to recruit from the outside. So, question five is, “How do you recruit outstanding talent?” In some organizations, recruiting is a core competency. Outstanding professional service firms such as McKinsey or Bain couldn’t have prospered decade after decade without extraordinary competency around recruiting. Most social service organizations, however, don’t have recruiting as a core competency. They haven’t even thought about it that way.
We did a back-of-the-envelope survey last year and discovered that 77 percent of executive directors of nonprofit organizations were hired through a friend. Very few of these jobs are ever posted on the Web, and very few pay enough to make it practical to hire search firms. It’s done strictly by word of mouth. Truth is, word of mouth may have worked over the last 20 years when we had a surplus of talent. But there’s a real question now whether we can recruit 640,000 outstanding new leaders for the nonprofit sector through just word of mouth.

So, how do we recruit into these organizations? I can tell you this: if you don’t have the front-end right—the recruiting decision process—it’s a real problem. If you’re an organization that defaults to commitment and caring, you better invite the right people onto the bus, because lots of times it’s hard to get them off the bus once they’re boarded.

Recruiting the right people requires an investment of time and, to some extent, money. The good news about recruiting externally—and I think the Church is doing an excellent job here, at least in some places—is that there are terrific pools of talent out there that our country is not tapping into. There are retired or soon-to-retire baby boomers who are potential chief financial officers and chief operating officers. There are also many young people who want to contribute, but who don’t always know how to go about it. Another intriguing pool of talent is moms who left their jobs to raise children. They’re often highly accomplished and well educated, and they now want to get back into the work force—but can’t find an on-ramp. They want to serve society, but may need flexible hours to do so. They’re looking to maximize their lives, not their money.

The five questions I’ve just posed relating to human resource management and talent development lead to a sixth and final question: “How do you allocate resources to effectively address these issues?”

If you’re not explicitly allocating resources—in terms of time and money—to these key questions, then you are in all likelihood just paying them lip service. How, then, do you allocate resources? The most important resource, actually, isn’t money. It’s time. If leaders such as yourselves aren’t putting time into addressing these issues, aren’t modeling these behaviors for others, then it just won’t happen. If you’re not walking the talk, then all the money in the world won’t achieve your objectives.

Indeed, the biggest mistake organizations make is that they don’t spend enough time up front defining what’s really and truly required to achieve their goals. For instance, they don’t spend enough time sourcing and recruiting the right people. When they bring in someone from the business world, they don’t spend enough time that first year “on-boarding” them. Again, this is not primarily a money problem; it’s a time problem.

Money, of course, is still a key ingredient. And one of the trickiest and most complicated issues in the nonprofit sector today is compensation. The laws of economics prevail here: demand is up, supply is down and, therefore, price in the form of compensation is increasing. The thing about money is that in the nonprofit sector, a little bit goes a long way. For example, if you could offer 10 percent more com-
pensation, that might move you to a higher level of employee. In the Church, you’re able to use volunteers and others who can certainly help you financially. But the money issue is still relevant, and to some extent an organization is going to get what it pays for. A culture of self-sacrifice can only go so far—especially in an increasingly competitive marketplace for talent.

To recap my remarks: the excellence of your organization is largely self-imposed. It’s you working to have the right people in the right jobs at the right time, and then leading in a manner that insures people work together to achieve shared goals. There will always be friction around resources. No general manager has enough time or enough money to do everything people think he or she should be doing. That’s never going to change.

As I reflect on all this, however, there’s another resource that’s more important, more leveraged, than time and money—and it’s free. That resource is courage. Courage is an essential ingredient. It’s the secret sauce to build a great organization.

Courage is the way to confront what Jim Collins calls the “brutal facts”: existing weaknesses, mediocre performers, your true future needs for talent. It’s the courage to collect and confront feedback at both organizational and individual levels. It’s the courage to say how you’re doing, even if it’s not what people want to hear. It’s the courage to take risks on people while holding them accountable. It’s the courage to experiment, to try new things, to innovate. It’s the courage to invest resources to achieve excellence, even when you don’t have abundant resources to invest.

I think the very existence of the National Leadership Roundtable on Church Management is evidence that this organization and all of you, its members, have that courage. You’re confronting those questions that need to be addressed in a healthy and meaningful way. I congratulate you on your accomplishments, and wish you the very best.
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James Davidson

When I was a young boy growing up in Great Barrington, Massachusetts, Saint Peter’s was my home parish and it had three priests, a pastor, and two associates. They ran the place. Except for one layman who worked part time as an organist and a choir director, there were no lay people in any leadership position.

Today, Saint Peter’s shares one priest with two other parishes in the adjacent town of Housatonic. It has four lay ecclesial ministers, an organist and a choir director, a cantor, an individual who coordinates religious education, and a pastoral minister who coordinates visitations to people who are homebound or in nursing homes.

What happened at Saint Peter’s is pretty typical of what’s happening across the country. Parishes have fewer priests and are more and more dependent on the lay minister. By definition, lay ministers are people who are trained for the ministry. They’re considered leaders in a particular area of ministry, work collaboratively with the clergy, and receive authorization from the hierarchy.

Fifteen years ago, there were about 20,000 lay ministers, about one for every parish. Now there are about 31,000—almost two per parish. My current parish at Purdue [University] has 12 lay ministers, and I know one parish that has 36.
With that as background, I’d like to pose four questions:

1. Who are these people?
2. How did they get into this line of work?
3. What’s their work like? and
4. What will the next generation of lay ministers look like?

The answers to these questions can be found in several recent studies. One is a national survey by David DeLambo, outlined in the book *Lay Parish Ministers*, published by the National Pastoral Life Center. The second, published by the Center for Applied Research in the Apostolate (CARA), is based on its study of Catholic Ministry Formation enrollments. The third is a book that I participated in, along with Chuck Zech, called *Lay Ministers and Their Spiritual Practices*, published by Our Sunday Visitor.

Let me briefly deal with the four questions. First, who are these people? Almost 90 percent of lay ministers are white, and about 80 percent are women. They are whiter and more likely to be women than the Catholic population in general. They’re also highly educated people who have been steeped in the Catholic culture. Eighty percent of them were raised Catholic and attended Catholic School; 60 percent are graduates of Catholic colleges and universities; 60 percent have master’s degrees, mostly in education and the liberal arts; and 60 percent have completed lay ministry formation programs.

How did they get into this line of work? Sixty percent served the Church in other capacities or in other places before moving into their current positions. Most of them said that they were recruited to their current ministries by a pastor or by someone else on the parish staff on the basis of their loyalty to the Church and their personalities and interpersonal skills, as much, if not more, than on the basis of their professional expertise.

What is their work like? Well, 40 percent of lay ministers are in religious education—the single largest category—and about a fourth are in some sort of pastoral administrative work. Another fourth are involved in youth ministry, music, or liturgy; the rest work in ministries that deal with very specific groups, such as migrants or people who are in nursing homes.

Studies also show that about 80 percent of lay ministers have job descriptions, which is more than in the past. In addition, 75 percent are working full time, which typically means about 50 hours a week rather than 40. Their median income in 2005 was about $32,500. If they were working full time, it was about $37,500. Their incomes range from about $31,000 for youth ministers to about $43,000 for music ministers. This represents primary income for men, women, religious and full-time workers, though usually it is secondary income for married women and part-time workers. When benefits are compared with those available in the private sector, it looks as though lay ministers are pretty comfortable.

Interestingly, 70 percent of this group looks upon their work as a calling, rather than as a career or a job. The average lay minister spends about eight hours a week in spiritual practices. Most of them
go to Mass and pray privately, and there are numerous variations in their styles of spiritual practice, from Eucharistic adoration to Tai Chi.

Also revealing is the fact that 80 percent are satisfied with their work; in fact, their greatest satisfaction comes from their spiritual activities and their work with parishioners. Salaries, job security, and relationships with the clergy are the biggest areas of concern. Indeed, pastors tend to see lay ministers’ work in terms of tasks that need to be accomplished by a staff member, while lay ministers tend to see their work in terms of relationships with parishioners and other staff. This difference doesn’t always get resolved, because less than half of lay ministers receive performance evaluations.

... what’s the next generation of lay ministers going to look like?

This brings us to our final question: what’s the next generation of lay ministers going to look like? To answer that, I’ll briefly cite five trends:

• First, as the number of women religious declines in the Church, there are also fewer women religious in lay ministry.

• Second, lay men and lay women who are replacing women religious are, on average, 12 years younger—52 years old compared with 64. So, the group is getting younger.

• Third, fewer lay ministers have a regular prayer life.

• Fourth, the demand for lay ministers has slowed somewhat, and so has the supply. Enrollments in lay ministry formation programs are down in the last five years.

• Fifth, people in formation programs are different demographically in several ways from the people who are currently lay ministers. About a fourth of the people in formation programs today are people of color, and about a third of them are men. The next generation of lay ministers is likely to be more diverse racially and represent a better mix of both men and women.

That’s just a quick glimpse of what’s to come, but I believe it will give us a start in our discussions today.
Considerable research has been done on priests, and I’d like to share with you some of the major findings.

First, a few statistics about priests. In 2006 we, the Catholic Church in the United States, had roughly 43,000 priests, of whom 67 percent are diocesan and 33 percent are religious. We had 431 ordinations in 2006, and we expect the same number in 2007.

The number of priests has dropped by about 9 to 11 percent per decade since the 1980s, and this trend shows signs of continuing. The decline in religious priests is greater than the decline in diocesan priests. The trend in ordinations has been gradually downward for some time, declining about 6 to 8 percent per decade. Possibly the downward trend in ordinations has stopped, but we won’t know for certain for a few more years.

Meanwhile, the number of laity in the United States is growing at an estimated rate of 12 to 14 percent per decade, partly as a result of immigration and the larger families of new immigrants.

Against that backdrop, I’d like to address four specific topics:

1. Is there a priest shortage in America?
2. What are the characteristics of today’s priests?
3. Has the self-understanding of priests shifted? and
4. How is priestly morale?

In answer to the first question, “Is there a priest shortage in America?” most people say “yes.” But we need to be clear about what is meant by “shortage.” There are three possible meanings for this term. The first is simply a matter of the number of laity per priest. Statistics show that in North America there was a 17 percent decline in the number of priests from 1985 to 2002 (the most recent data available). In the United States, the decrease was 16 percent, while in Europe it was 12 percent. But in Africa, there was an increase of 62 percent in the number of priests, an increase of 65 percent in South and East Asia, and an increase of 44 percent in Central America. Worldwide, there was no change at all.

Clearly, Catholicism is growing throughout the world, but the number of priests is not changing.
Let's look at changes in the total number of Catholics since 1985. In North America, this number is up 22 percent; in the United States, it's up 23 percent. In other parts of the world there's even faster growth. In Africa, the number of Catholics soared by 89 percent. For the entire world, it's up 26 percent. Clearly, Catholicism is growing throughout the world, but the number of priests is not changing.

Let's now consider the number of Catholics per priest. Note that in North America, there are 1,382 laity per priest. In the United States, the number is 1,375, and in Europe it's 1,374. But in Central America, the number of Catholics per priest is 6,763; in the Caribbean it's 7,983 and in South America it's 7,138. For the entire world, the number averages to 2,642 Catholics per priest. So, in global terms, the United States does not have a priest shortage. In fact, it has far more priests per thousand laity than most of the world.

These numbers raise an important question: Can each nation or continent afford a large priesthood? Having priests costs money, and poor nations cannot afford as many as wealthy nations. An exception is the Middle East, where very few Catholics live anyway. Apart from that, the priest-rich continents are also the wealthy continents. In all of them, the number of priests is high, but it's also declining.

A second way to look at the priest shortage is to start from the expectations of laity. If there's a change in priestly services, the laity feels it. Catholics in developed nations such as the United States have become accustomed to certain levels of priestly services and are concerned when there is a decline. Older Catholics accustomed to an abundance of priests in the 1950s and 1960s, for example, feel a shortage of priests. Young adults today feel it less. In other parts of the world where priestly services are lower, expectations are also lower.

The third definition of “shortage” derives from opportunities lost. It defines “shortage” as not having enough priests to do what is needed.

The third definition of “shortage” derives from opportunities lost. It defines “shortage” as not having enough priests to do what is needed. In such countries as Nigeria, Ghana, or India, with millions of people showing signs of readiness for evangelization, additional priests would be a big help. Using this definition, one would conclude that the whole world has a priest shortage. What Catholic community could not benefit from having more active, capable, and devoted priests working in it?

In my view, the whole world does have a priest shortage, and we should aim at doubling the number of priests in the world. Most American Catholics—both laity and clergy—would like to see more priests available. At present, though, not enough are being ordained. American seminaries are producing priests at between 35 and 45 percent of what is needed each year to keep the number of priests constant. Unless more are somehow ordained or brought in from outside, the Church will change.
This is a major change from the 1960s and 1970s, when seminaries were full of men in their twenties. Very few priests today are in their twenties or early thirties.

The second question, “What are the characteristics of today’s priests?” can be answered first in terms of age. According to a large 2001 survey, the average age of diocesan priests was 59 and of religious priests 64. Today, ordinations include many older men: the average age at ordination in 2007 was 35. This is a major change from the 1960s and 1970s, when seminaries were full of men in their twenties. Very few priests today are in their twenties or early thirties. In 2001, only 4 percent were 35 or younger.

About 16 percent of priests in America were born overseas. This number is destined to rise gradually since the percent born overseas in recent ordination classes is larger, around 30 percent. In addition to foreign-born men being ordained in our seminaries, about 270 priests are brought in from foreign countries each year. When this number is added to the estimated 120 foreign-born seminarians being ordained here each year, the total is about 390 international priests being added each year. The largest numbers are from Vietnam, Mexico, Poland, and the Philippines.

Research also exists on how well international priests are faring in American parishes. A major problem has been inadequate English, either because the priests never learned enough English or because they spoke it with a strong accent. A second problem has been inadequate orientation to American culture: when the priests do not understand American culture, their empathy with American parishioners is weak. The researchers concluded that orientation programs for international priests need to be improved.

The third question is whether the self-understanding of priests shifted. There have been two shifts in the last 50 years. During and after the Second Vatican Council, American priests shifted from what is called a “cultic model” of the priesthood to a new model called the “servant leader model,” and later they shifted back again.

Let me explain. The cultic model sees the priest as mainly an administrator of the sacraments and teacher of the faith. In this view, the priest needs to be celibate and set apart from other Catholics; his life is a witness to faith in God and an example of holiness. It stresses differences between priests and laity. By contrast, the servant leader model emphasizes that the priest is the spiritual and social leader of the Catholic community and, as such, must interact closely with the laity and collaborate with them in leading parish life. This model de-emphasizes the priest as distinct and set apart, exemplified by the preference of these priests not to wear the clerical cassock and collar.
Researchers have found that priests stressing the cultic model have stronger priestly identity and higher morale. They’ve also found that laity, on balance, prefer priests who hew to the servant leader model.

During and after the Second Vatican Council, the main self-understanding shifted to the servant leader model, and beginning in the middle 1980s there was a reverse shift to the cultic model, especially among diocesan priests and younger priests. The cultic model is strongest in seminaries today, which report they are receiving proportionately more applicants.

Researchers have found that priests stressing the cultic model have stronger priestly identity and higher morale. They’ve also found that laity, on balance, prefer priests who hew to the servant leader model.

. . . researchers have found that morale in the priesthood is as high today as at any time since it was first measured in 1970.

The fourth question is “How is priestly morale?” There are numerous articles about sagging morale, but researchers have found that morale in the priesthood is as high today as at any time since it was first measured in 1970.

More specifically, research has compared priests with other American men of comparable age and education and concluded that the level of morale today is roughly the same for priests and the other men. In fact, the trend from 1970 until today has been rising morale. For example, on surveys asking priests if they are thinking of staying or leaving, the percentage saying “I will definitely not leave” rose from 59 percent to 79 percent over the period 1970 to 2001. The main increase in morale since 1970 has been among younger men. In fact, their morale today is as high as that of the older men.

Nowadays, priests quickly become pastors after ordination. A 2005 survey of men averaging seven years after ordination found that 54 percent of the diocesan priests and 18 percent of the religious priests were already pastors. Of these, 36 percent of the diocesan priests and 20 percent of the religious priests were responsible for more than one parish.
... the biggest problem today is lack of candidates for the priesthood.

As for the main problems facing priests today, a 2001 survey found the three biggest to be (1) the way authority is exercised in the Church, (2) too much work, and (3) unrealistic demands and expectations of lay people.

As I see it, the biggest problem today is lack of candidates for the priesthood. We need a doubling of ordinations to keep the Church going as we know it. If that fails, we may be forced into some changes we don’t want. Meanwhile, the job of being a priest has become harder. For one thing, the American Catholic laity is more affluent, more educated, and more culturally aware than ever before. As a result, lay expectations of priests are higher—and this presages more changes ahead.

### Table 1: World Data on Catholic Membership and Number of Priests

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Total membership (millions)</th>
<th>Change in membership (percent) 1985–2002</th>
<th>Change in priests (percent) 1985–2002</th>
<th>Catholics per priest 2002</th>
<th>GNP per capita (US $) 2002</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North America</td>
<td>78.8</td>
<td>+22</td>
<td>–17</td>
<td>1,382</td>
<td>35,390</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>65.5</td>
<td>+23</td>
<td>–16</td>
<td>1,375</td>
<td>36,110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Europe</td>
<td>279.9</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>–12</td>
<td>1,374</td>
<td>17,730</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oceania, Australia</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>+31</td>
<td>–12</td>
<td>1,732</td>
<td>19,960</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central America</td>
<td>123.5</td>
<td>+26</td>
<td>+44</td>
<td>6,763</td>
<td>7,580</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caribbean</td>
<td>25.4</td>
<td>+33</td>
<td>+27</td>
<td>7,983</td>
<td>7,980</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South America</td>
<td>306.6</td>
<td>+27</td>
<td>+24</td>
<td>7,138</td>
<td>6,970</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Africa</td>
<td>137.4</td>
<td>+89</td>
<td>+62</td>
<td>4,694</td>
<td>2,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle East</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>+21</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>1,189</td>
<td>6,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Asia, Far East (including Philippines)</td>
<td>107.5</td>
<td>+54</td>
<td>+65</td>
<td>2,473</td>
<td>4,540</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>World Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,070.3</strong></td>
<td><strong>+26</strong></td>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,642</strong></td>
<td><strong>7,590</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: GNP per capita data are from the *World Population Data Sheet 2004*, published by the Population Reference Bureau, Washington, DC. All other data are from the *Statistical Yearbook of the Church*, published annually by the Vatican.
Sr. Mary Bendyna, RSM

We’ve already heard about lay ministers and priests. My goal is to tell you about men and women religious, as well as deacons and parish life coordinators.

There are approximately 82,000 men and women religious in the United States today. That’s about 13,500 religious priests, 5,000 religious brothers, and 63,500 religious sisters and nuns. In the mid-1960s, when those numbers were at their peak, there were 23,000 religious priests, 12,500 religious brothers, and 180,000 religious sisters and nuns. So it’s clear there’s been a considerable decline. I think it’s important to recognize that the numbers of the 1960s were the exception, not the norm. If you look at the trends of the 1940s, 1950s, and 1960s, you see that the numbers increased significantly. Ever since then, however, they’ve declined just as rapidly.

One-third of all priests in the United States are religious order priests, compared with almost 40 percent of priests in the 1960s. At least over the short term, the proportion of priests who are religious priests is likely to continue to decline. At the theologate level, about one-quarter of the seminarians are from religious institutes, and the average age of seminarians in ordinance is older for religious priests than it is for diocesan priests. By the same token, the ratio of religious brothers to religious priests is also declining. In the mid-1960s, about 35 percent of men religious were brothers. Currently, it’s about 27 percent.

The median age is probably in the late sixties for religious priests, approaching seventy for religious brothers, and in the mid-seventies for women religious.

As for racial and ethnic backgrounds, men and women religious are overwhelmingly white. New priests—the few that we have—tend to be more racially and ethnically diverse, and are more likely to be from outside the United States. We also know that religious priests are more diverse than even diocesan priests, and are more likely to come from outside the United States than diocesan priests or diocesan seminarians in ordinance.

On the question of educational backgrounds, almost all men and women religious have bachelor’s degrees, most have at least one master’s degree, and many have doctorates. Many of those undergraduate and graduate degrees are in disciplines other than theology.

A misconception that many people have is that religious brothers are less educated and less capable than religious priests. That’s not the case. In a recent study we did about religious brothers in the United States, we found that two-thirds have master’s degrees and about one in eight has a doctorate.

What kinds of ministries do men and women religious pursue? The highest numbers are still in education, with significant numbers in other kinds of pastoral ministries, social service ministries,
and health care. About one-third of religious priests are in parish ministry. For women religious, less than one-third are in full-time compensated ministry.

Clearly, the decline in the numbers of men and women religious in ministry has far-reaching implications for the field. Those who replace them tend to be less educated and have had a very different kind of formation.

The number of deacons in the United States has grown steadily since the Second Vatican Council authorized the restoration of the diaconate as a permanent order of ministry. There are currently more than 16,000 permanent deacons in the United States, another 2,000 in diaconate formation programs, and nearly 1,000 in aspirancy programs for the diaconate. About 80 percent of deacons, as well as diaconate candidates, are white and about 15 percent are Hispanic/Latino.

As for their educational backgrounds, a little more than half of deacons have at least a bachelor’s degree and about one in five has a graduate degree. Those ordained to the diaconate participate in a diaconate formation program before ordination, but there has been considerable variation in the admission requirements, as well as in the program requirements for the diaconate, that may change in the coming years.

Let’s talk for a moment about parish life coordinators. There are currently more than 3,500 parishes in the United States—out of a total of 18,600—that have no resident priest. Approximately 600 parish life coordinators serve these parishes, up from about 270 in 1993. In the mid-1990s, about 65 percent of these parish life coordinators were religious sisters. The proportion of religious sisters has since declined, and is likely to continue to do so. But although the number of religious sisters serving as parish life coordinators is going down, the number of deacons and lay men and women in that position is increasing.

I’d like to offer a couple of concluding thoughts. First, I think we need to be very careful that we don’t confuse vocation/ecclesial status (that is, a priest or a man or woman religious) with a particular ministerial role. Are we recruiting to a vocation to the priesthood, religious life, or the diaconate, or are we recruiting to a particular position in the Church? I think we often confuse the two. I am a Sister of Mercy regardless of what job I have. Not all men and women religious are necessarily in ecclesial ministries. People are not called to religious life because they want to serve in a particular kind of ministry.

...while there’s been a big decline in numbers, particularly among religious, I think it’s important to recognize that there are actually more people, depending on how you count them, serving in ministries in the Church and in Church institutions today than ever before.
My second point: we don’t know a great deal about vocations these days, especially vocations that relate to religious life. There’s been a lot of speculation about what’s happening in terms of vocations, but very little data.

Finally, while there’s been a big decline in numbers, particularly among religious, I think it’s important to recognize that there are actually more people, depending on how you count them, serving in ministries in the Church and in Church institutions today than ever before. We previously heard a number of 30,000 parish ministers, and that number doesn’t include Catholic school teachers, hospital chaplains, campus ministers, and people who work in diocesan and national offices. And let’s not forget the volunteers serving in all kinds of Catholic institutions, including colleges and universities, hospitals and health-care institutions, and social service agencies.

The nature and the type of people who are engaged in ministries may be changing, but there are still people out there to do the important work of the Church.

So, although we tend to see a lot of decline, it’s important to note there have also been many gains. The nature and the type of people who are engaged in ministries may be changing, but there are still people out there to do the important work of the Church.

Arturo Chavez

I’d like to share a few thoughts about who the next generation of Church leaders will be from a Hispanic perspective, keeping in mind that “Hispanic” is a wholly invented term that categorizes people from 63 or more different countries and various levels of acculturation within the United States. Some of us have roots going back 500 years or more in this country, while others of us came just yesterday.

There is great diversity among us. We comprise about 13 to 18 percent of the U.S. population. Most of us are of Mexican origin, and, since 1960, Hispanics account for over 70 percent of the growth of the Catholic Church in the United States. Put another way, 30 to 38 percent of the Catholic Church in the United States is Hispanic, and that may grow by 20 to 50 percent. As you also know, Hispanics are leaving the Catholic Church in droves. It’s not just because of the zeal of our Evangelical and Protestant brothers and sisters, but because of the lack of welcome in some of our communities.
Hispanics are a very young group in the United States. Over half of us are under the age of 25 years and of that group, most are under the age of 18. So it’s clear to us that today’s Hispanic ministry is a youth and young adult ministry.

What I’d like to focus on today is the fact that Hispanics are a very young group in the United States. Over half of us are under the age of 25 years and of that group, most are under the age of 18. So it’s clear to us that today’s Hispanic ministry is a youth and young adult ministry. And if we don’t recognize that, then we really miss the boat in terms of mentoring and forming future leaders.

In June 2006, over 4,000 young Latino and Latina leaders from around the country gathered at Notre Dame [University] for the first-ever youth *Encuentro*. For those of us who have been involved in youth and young adult ministries for years, it was a wonderful moment in our Church history—a chance to see young people from around the country who are very enthusiastic about their Catholic faith, asking the bishops and the Church to walk with them as young Catholics as they seek to make a real difference in this country. The bishops will soon be responding to the concerns raised by the young people at that event. I think all of us in our communities need to listen to those voices—voices that we often ignore.

When we talk about “leadership” in the Hispanic context, we need to really define what we mean by the term. Culturally, Hispanics tend to be very collectively oriented, and so when we talk about leadership, many of them shy away from the subject by saying, “Oh, I’m not a leader.” To define for young people what a leader is—and, more specifically, what it is in the Hispanic context—it’s very important to root that definition in service leadership within the community.

...how will Hispanics offer leadership, not just to other Hispanics, but to the whole Church regardless of culture, regardless of language?
...how will Hispanics be bridge builders in our multicultural communities so that we can help other cultural groups find a home, and find a welcome, as the bishops are asking us to do?

In *Encounter and Mission*, the U.S. bishops bring to the surface two central questions facing Hispanic ministry today. First, what kind of model will Hispanic leaders offer the Church, especially in a time of increasing diversity? And second, how will Hispanics offer leadership, not just to
other Hispanics, but to the whole Church regardless of culture, regardless of language? It’s not just mentoring Hispanic leaders for other Hispanics, but for all people. So, how will Hispanics be bridge builders in our multicultural communities so that we can help other cultural groups find a home, and find a welcome, as the bishops are asking us to do?

A few other important questions are the following: How do we manage to build unity in the midst of our diversity—not in spite of it? Also, how do we welcome the stranger among us? And, just as importantly, how do we help communities be good “welcomers”? In other words, how do we help them through the fears and the natural anxieties that occur when we’re faced with change? That’s very difficult for anyone, and it’s particularly difficult for communities that are seeing a rapid change in their demographics.

Another great challenge is the educational level of Hispanic leaders.

Another great challenge is the educational level of Hispanic leaders. Only about 11 percent of us have a bachelor’s degree, which tells you how many of us have a master’s or doctoral degree. We have to find creative ways to bring that level up quickly. But beyond book learning, we have to find ways to instill in our young people a desire to bring their formal education back to the barrios, back to their communities, in the service of the Church. Too often, we educate our young people and then they disappear altogether from the community.

. . . leadership formation is not just a case of translating into Spanish, or any other language, for that matter. Instead, it has to be rooted in the methods and the processes that are culturally relevant to that group.

Here the bishops have been very wise and very challenging, as we saw in *Co-Workers in the Vineyard of the Lord*. In this document, they state that leadership formation is not just a case of translating into Spanish, or any other language, for that matter. Instead, it has to be rooted in the methods and the processes that are culturally relevant to that group.
Recruiting the Very Best for Church Service

Panel

Bishop Blase Cupich (Moderator)
Susan King
Bill McGarvey

Bishop Blase Cupich

I have been asked to address the question of how we are going to attract future leaders and where they will come from. It occurs to me that the first thing we need to do is be very real about the situation. I believe that we are living in a kind of culture of illusion that seems to steer us away from taking a hard look at some very sobering numbers and statistics. So what I want to do today is first to give you a dose of reality, show you some trends, and make you aware that we do have a looming crisis that we now must vigorously address. I do this not to make people panic or become discouraged, but rather to spur us on to take adult responsibility for the situation.

As a way to get you into that mindset, it would be helpful for you to think back to 1992, when the bishops first took decisive actions through the United States Conference of Catholic Bishops (USCCB) to establish procedures and norms for responding to the sexual abuse of minors by clergy. Most dioceses like my own responded with clear procedures and policies, but not all. One of the major failures in 1992 was that the norms from the USCCB were not mandatory for all dioceses as they are now. Just think how different things would have been if that had happened! Of course, this would have meant mobilizing and informing the Catholic community, informing them of the seriousness of the problem and the need for mutual accountability.
Had we made a major effort . . . to inform our people of the real situation and aggressively asked their help in dealing with the problem, many of the scandals, financial hardships, and—most importantly—the recurring abuse could have been avoided.

Instead, 10 years later, in 2002, our people were stunned by the seriousness of the problem and asked, “Who let this happen?” Yes, people knew that there were problems, that some priests were involved in this kind of depraved activity, but they thought it was being handled and they did not know its extent, which became clear only over the course of time. Had we made a major effort as a Church in this nation to inform our people of the real situation and aggressively asked their help in dealing with the problem, many of the scandals, financial hardships, and—most importantly—the recurring abuse could have been avoided.

My fear is that in the not too distant future, when the effects of the shortage of Church leaders really hit us, people will again be asking, “Who let this happen?” People know that there is a shortage of priests, and they see here and there some effects, but they do not know how dramatically the decline in numbers will escalate as large classes of aging priests retire. We owe it to our people to be honest and frank with them and invite them to take up with us the responsibility of finding new leaders for the future. After I review with you some of the statistics and trends I will share with you some of the data that we have about those who are coming into the seminary so we can make our recruiting efforts more effective.

So, what is the real situation? Well, the total number of priests has fallen dramatically—from 58,632 in 1965 to 42,528 in 2005, a decline of almost 30 percent. During the same period, the Catholic population grew from over 45 million to nearly 65 million (Figure 1).

Seminary enrollments have fared even more poorly (Figure 2). The total number of theology students has plummeted from just over 8,000 in 1967–68 to 3,300 in 2004–05. College seminary enrollment shrank from 13,400 to 1,200 during the same period. As for retention rates in theologates, the statistics show that of the 519 seminarians who were in their fourth year in 2004–05, only 450 were ordained. So, even in the last year, we lose up to 13 percent of an ordination class.

As for the age range of seminarians, the vast majority are in the 30-and-up age group, with only 29 percent between the ages of 25 and 29. When I was ordained in 1975, almost everyone was between 25 and 29. According to seminary enrollment numbers for 2004–05, 2,579 students were U.S.-born, and 729—or 22 percent—were foreign-born.
Figure 1: Priests, Parishes, and Catholic Population: 1965–2005


Figure 2: Seminary Enrollment Trends: 1968–2005

Priests serving multiple congregations comprise another revealing statistic. The fact is, priests are serving well, but they’re being asked to do a lot more. Of the 42 percent of priests in this country involved in parish ministry, 10 percent serve multiple parishes. Moreover, nearly 60 percent of all parishes today are served by priests assigned to more than one parish.

When people see these numbers, they’re really stunned. I share them with you not to discourage you but to say that it’s time we wake up and take responsibility and ownership for this issue of vocation to the priesthood. People need to see that there’s a problem, and that it’s significant.

Taking corporate responsibility, first of all, means joining together in prayer on a regular basis and publicly. In my diocese people know by heart a prayer for vocations, which we say every Sunday at all parishes’ Masses as part of the General Intercessions. We also need to speak to parents and families about encouraging vocations and the need to call their sons to be generous with their lives. When I was the rector of a seminary in Columbus, Ohio, up to a quarter of the seminarians were struggling with the fact that their families were opposed to or not supportive of their vocation. That was unheard of in my day.

Perhaps with smaller families today parents are concerned about not having grandchildren if their son responds to a vocation in the Church. Others think that the priestly life is just too hard. They don’t want their family members to take on the job. We have to address that issue candidly as adults and talk to parents about how they should not be afraid for their sons, that a vocation to the priesthood is a blessing. This means having an adult conversation with parents.

Given the magnitude of the problem, how do we recruit?

A bishop friend of mine told me once that all he wants on his tombstone is, “I tried to treat you like adults.” I think that’s what this conference is about, treating each other, treating our people like adults by giving them full information and inviting them to take corporate responsibility for the challenges we face, for the challenges that we can work on together.

Given the magnitude of the problem, how do we recruit? Well, let’s look at what’s working. We’ve heard some of it already. The military has been a really good source for recruiting, and some
important work is being done there. The role of the priest as recruiter is really important, too.
Eighty percent of those ordained over the last five years have stated they were recruited by another
priest. But only a third of our priests do recruiting. That's why the Bishops’ Conference and the
Vocations Committee put together a program called “Fishers of Men,” in which we gather people
together and encourage them to tell their stories of how they became priests so that they’ll have the
confidence to do the same thing with young people, with parents, and with others in their commu-
nity. Priests haven’t been willing to share those stories, or at least they haven’t been given the oppor-
tunity or the venue to do so. The “Fishers of Men” program is designed to help accomplish that.

We also see that we’re getting older candidates to the priesthood, with an average age of 35.
Sometimes we give up on students or candidates we may have had on our radar screen, but failed
to track. We need a tracking system for those who have expressed an interest in our vocation, but
who may have gone off to college or to graduate school. Many of them come back. We see that in
the statistics. Many are multicultural, as well. We need to look for ways in which we can hone our
message to those specific populations.

When it comes to recruiting, we should also be looking at people who have been actively involved
in parish life and the liturgy. Nearly 75 percent of those who are ordained have been involved in
their parish. They may have served as an usher, or been in youth ministry or some other kind of
ministry involved in the parish catechesis.

Here’s a more detailed profile of those ordained. Ninety-five percent are Catholics from birth. Fifty
percent attended Catholic elementary schools. Sixty percent were college grads before entering the
seminary, and 20 percent earned graduate degrees. Typically, they first considered the priesthood at
17 years of age. So again, we need to track those young people and look for ways in which we can
begin encouraging and recruiting at that age.

Recruitment that takes a personal rather than a multimedia approach has proven to be more effective.
... impress on all Catholic people the need to take corporate responsibility for this whole issue of recruiting priests. We all have a stake in the outcome and if we want the best, we must work together to call on our youth to be heroic.

A few concluding thoughts. It seems to me that there is a good deal of discussion today about the rights of everyone in the Church. That is a good discussion to have. But we also need to see that rights come with responsibilities. What I am suggesting here is that we begin a concerted effort to impress on all Catholic people the need to take corporate responsibility for this whole issue of recruiting priests. We all have a stake in the outcome and if we want the best, we must work together to call on our youth to be heroic. There is heroism in our young people. They want to do the best. They want to give something back. They want to contribute. I think we need to speak to them about the need to do that. We need to ask them questions like, Who's going to be there to baptize the children of your generation? Who's going to bury your parents? Who's going to carry on the work that priests do, the work from which you, in your youth, have benefitted and grown to love?

I want to also mention the need to support and invest in our priests today through ongoing education. Not only will that support let them know how much we value what they do but it will also say something to possible recruits, to young people about how we will value them in the future as clerics. Young people don’t want to be recruited as cheap labor. And they don’t want to be recruited just to fill holes and spots. We have to invest in them and give them a strong sense of themselves based on formation as an ongoing and vital part of their lives.

All of this that I am suggesting will require a broad grassroots effort in parishes and schools, perhaps with the help of vocational committees. It will require people coming together, and all of us acting as a concerned community. Above all, though, it will require corporate ownership if we’re going to recruit and call the best possible candidates to serve the Church.
I come to you today as a journalist. But I’m also a member of the Carnegie Corporation on the side of the business that involves the dissemination of ideas—a side that Andrew Carnegie himself considered as important as the grants he made. At issue here is the concept of how we get complicated research and scholarship into the marketplace of ideas. Not an easy thing to do in the era of Paris Hilton and a rapidly changing news environment, as evidenced by The Wall Street Journal changing hands.

It’s because of my media and public relations background that I was asked by the Leadership Roundtable to try and wrap my mind around a critical and timely issue for the Church: recruiting young people. Intertwined with that is the even broader issue of how we communicate as a Church. Regardless of the process—fundraising or recruiting—communicators are key people. The truth is, you can’t fundraise if you don’t have a communication plan, and you can’t recruit if you don’t have a communication plan—if you don’t represent something.

Let me put on my journalist’s hat for a moment, and examine the story frames we’ve seen over the last few years with regard to the Catholic Church. Shrinking priesthood and sisterhood...closing of parish schools...fewer city churches and parishes...sex abuse scandal...embezzlement of funds. Not what I would call very good story frames for the Catholic Church.

The irony is that all this has occurred amid another frame we don’t hear much about. And that’s the growth of the Church. Along with the shrinking priesthood is the fact that more people are Catholics today than ever before. And that’s a pretty good story. We’re doing something right.

That growth prompts some other important questions—namely, where is our base increasing, and what are we doing to reach out to those key segments? That’s really the critical issue on my plate today. What are we saying? Who’s saying it? How consistently are we saying it? And is somebody in charge of the message?
the real challenge for the Church today is to communicate its vision to a new generation of Catholics using the kinds of digital tools they’re familiar and comfortable with.

I don’t profess to know the answers. What I do know, though, is that we’re not doing these things nearly as well as we should. I think the real challenge for the Church today is to communicate its vision to a new generation of Catholics using the kinds of digital tools they’re familiar and comfortable with.

One of the biggest stories I covered as a journalist was Pope John Paul II’s trip to the United States in 1979. Along with many other journalists, I covered his every move across the country. It was a national story, and a local story. Above all, though, it was an amazing story. Yes, Pope John Paul was a rock star, and all of us journalists were infatuated by the man and his charisma.

But there was something else about Pope John Paul II. It was his authenticity, which probably arose from his experience during the Cold War. There was an urgency, a “now,” to everything the pope said. He was a visionary. He talked about freedom in the context of his experience in a Communist world. He talked about the dignity of the individual. He talked about diversity in the Church, and how to make that very real. He was truly the global pope.

I don’t want to ever cast Pope John Paul II in a PR light, but the fact is, he had a group of people who thought about this vision and how to articulate it to the world—and that came through very strongly. The Church was showcased in Africa, in Asia and in Latin America. It was a Church that we in the Irish and Italian neighborhoods didn’t see all the time. It came across as a young Church and a growing Church. World Youth Day is obviously one of the outgrowths of that.

Pope John Paul II was speaking out all the time. He was saying something very important. People were listening to him. He was often talking through the lens of his Polish experience. He translated ideas to a very big public. There was a campaign atmosphere to the kinds of things the pope did. It gave journalists like me a chance to cover something. Clearly, there was something going on there. That’s how you go about communicating a vision.

Where does that leave us today? Sometimes I think there’s a vacuum, especially when we get to those frames of what’s been covered over the last few years in the Catholic Church.
There are ways of expressing some of the urgent national issues that are on people’s minds. It seems to me, however, we don’t often hear about these issues.

Immigration is obviously an issue that’s been prominently in the news for the last year. Some bishops have been very courageous in their pronouncements about a role for immigrants in our society. We do a lot of funding in the area of “immigrant integration,” as we call it. But in the case of other important issues, how well are we communicating where we stand? We certainly have opportunities to get the message out as a Church every Sunday. There are prayers for the faithful. There are ways of expressing some of the urgent national issues that are on people’s minds. It seems to me, however, we don’t often hear about these issues.

Aside from immigration, another issue that’s urgent for the Church is public service by the so-called millennial generation. This young generation talks about public service as something that’s incredibly important to them. They want to serve in places like Africa and South America. On a personal note, my own daughter has spent the last two Easters in Honduras working in a medical brigade that’s organized by a sister. This is Catholic missionary work. This is true service.

We know that members of the millennial generation want meaning in their lives. And our business, too, is all about meaning and spirituality. We need to find a way to really tell that story.

Is that part of the message we’re communicating? And is it tied to the larger Church? We know that members of the millennial generation want meaning in their lives. And our business, too, is all about meaning and spirituality. We need to find a way to really tell that story.

The pope is a very important spokesman and unifier for the entire Church, but we need other spiritual spokespeople. Who do we have in the American Church today? We have the bully pulpit, and we have convening power. The bishops also have the ability to bring various groups together in a way that integrates the work of the Church. I think we need someone who brings all of us together to reflect on what Pope John Paul II did when he traveled around the world and shined the spotlight on the Latin American Church, the African Church, the Asian Church. Who is going to be that spokesperson in our community?
The cardinal in Washington once asked me to be part of a committee to think about communications. The question on the table then was, Should we get involved in this new thing called cable television? Well, cable’s almost passé now. We’ve moved swiftly into the digital world, and the question no longer is “Should we get involved?” We have to, especially if we want to reach all the technologically astute young people who are out there. It’s not just, “Are we in *The New York Times*?” We have to be speaking and working in all the new communication dimensions. I think we have resources that can help us do that.

Of course, that’s not the only area where the Church is going to have to adopt modern-day tools and strategies. There’s the recruitment of priests. Many of us at the parish level are talking about how we cluster and how we share resources.

And as this conference has helped drive home, the laity is getting more involved. The Catholic laity, as Kerry Robinson said earlier, has responded to the pain it felt after the sexual abuse scandal. Rather than say, “I’m not involved,” it felt compelled to say, “This is the Church I love. I am involved.” That is a resource we really need to tap into.

Who are our Catholic rock stars? I think we need to identify some of those people not from among the clergy, but from among the laity—people who feel a commitment to the Church and can communicate its vision in effective new ways.

What are some other resources? To answer that, let’s think for a moment about who’s helped to put Africa on the map. There’s Tony Blair, there’s Bill Clinton with his Global Initiative, and there are pop stars like Bono and Angelina Jolie. Who are our Catholic rock stars? I think we need to identify some of those people not from among the clergy, but from among the laity—people who feel a commitment to the Church and can communicate its vision in effective new ways. As part of that, I think we need new strategies for getting our message out there. In sum, we need a good sense of what the vision is, and then creative strategies to get us there.

We are a diverse Church and we have to prove that we are the faces of tomorrow. We are a deeply spiritual Church whose real power lies in prayer. We’re not a Church of “no,” we’re a Church of “yes.” I think we’re often positioned in the wrong place. I think the Church really wants to talk in specifics, not just in platitudes. The Church wants to connect to things that people know are real, such as public service and building a better world that they truly care about, and how it can help them accomplish those goals.
If we’re not saying where the Church is today, if we’re not framing it, if we’re not filling in the vision, then someone else is.

I’d like to close with this thought—and challenge. If we’re not saying where the Church is today, if we’re not framing it, if we’re not filling in the vision, then someone else is. That’s a frightening thing for everyone who’s involved in engaging the larger public. I don’t think you want only journalists painting the picture of where the Church will be tomorrow. We have to do that job ourselves.

**Bill McGarvey**

My goal today is to describe for you, at least anecdotally, what it’s like to be on the frontline of talking to young adults about faith, spirituality, God, and the Catholic Church.

Some of you have probably been dismayed by the fact your kids, grandkids, nieces, or nephews are disaffected from the Church, don’t go to Church, and aren’t interested in the Church. Hopefully this will put a little bit of a perspective on those concerns.

While I don’t claim to have any answers, I can give you a bit of a framing device for what young adults are thinking about based on what we see at BustedHalo. We talk to a lot of non-Church people, but we also talk to a lot of people who were Catholics or disaffected Catholics or lapsed Catholics.

In case any of you haven’t been to BustedHalo.com, we’re an online magazine for spiritual seekers owned by the Paulist Fathers. I can’t take credit for the name BustedHalo, though I feel very blessed to have inherited it. Younger people relate to the fact they aren’t perfect. There’s a sense of being a sinner, a sense of how can I enter a Church or a spiritual discussion and not be exposed as a fraud since I’m not perfect. That’s where the name BustedHalo resonates very strongly with this group.

Since I have worked in magazines, when I became editor-in-chief of BustedHalo three years ago we changed the site significantly to give it more of a magazine feel. BustedHalo is particularly geared to 20- and 30-somethings, though about 40 percent of our readers are outside that realm. A lot of them are over 40. What’s interesting about the group we target is that many of its members are often “spiritual,” but not “religious.” In other words, they may have grown up with some sort of faith formation, or in some sort of institutionalized church setting, be it Catholic, Jewish, or Protestant, but they may not identify with that institutional setting anymore. But they still believe in something beyond themselves.
This generation of spiritual seekers has a decidedly consumerist attitude about faith.

This generation of spiritual seekers has a decidedly consumerist attitude about faith. They basically live in a gargantuan marketplace of ideas, unlike any previous generation has known, and their choices are infinite. As confirmed consumers, they vote with their feet, and they vote with their pocketbooks. Many of them are very well educated, worldly people, who are involved with the secular culture at large. We also know they generally lead more unsettled lives than previous generations, and they will not have the same career for their entire lives.

They’re marrying later and will move around more. They’re also in an instant information, instant gratification culture. As an aside, my managing editor, Mike Hayes, is publishing a book called Googling God, due out this fall, which will be the first BustedHalo book on the Paulist Press. In it, he describes this demographic, and how it seeks God.

... when people ask me, “Are you a Catholic site,” I say “Yes, we’re owned by Catholics and inspired by Catholic tradition,” but my really big challenge with BustedHalo is to try and be relevant.

There's enormous competition today for their attention, as any marketer will tell you. That’s why when people ask me, “Are you a Catholic site,” I say “Yes, we’re owned by Catholics and inspired by Catholic tradition,” but my really big challenge with BustedHalo is to try and be relevant. It’s being able to address questions like, Why is faith relevant, Why are religious organizations relevant, Why isn’t faith a complete waste of time?

We get many e-mails at BustedHalo telling us, “I can’t believe you can actually talk about homosexuality and women’s issues and still be a Catholic.” There’s the feeling that the very notion of having questions or doubts about their faith is somehow not acceptable in a faith community. That really blows my mind. Why bother believing at all in faith institutions?

I like to tell people in talks I give that when I was in high school at St. Joe’s Prep here in Philadelphia, one of the things the Jesuits taught me was that you don’t have to check your brain at the door of the Church. Your intelligence, curiosity, insight, and questions are gifts from God that you always bring with you.
Today, young people have the power of the electronic media to help them ask—and often answer—questions. They’re incredibly media savvy. In fact, I don’t know anybody under the age of 30 who buys a newspaper anymore. They get their information online. They have loads of options, and tend to use them all.

Why isn’t this group attracted to the Church? Actually, let me flip that question around: Why hasn’t the Church shown an interest in them?

So, my next question is, Why isn’t this group attracted to the Church? Actually, let me flip that question around: Why hasn’t the Church shown an interest in them?

The typical sequence after high school for many young Catholics is to enter college campus ministry where they often have great experiences. After that, they’re out in the world at 21 or 22, with no real structure to support them in a spiritual sense. There is a gargantuan chasm, I believe, between youth and the next milestones in life: marriage and baptism. The assumption has always been, “well, if they wander from the Church after college they’ll come back full force when they get married or baptize their children.”

I’m not so sure we can count on that. There are a lot of choices out there and a lot of reasons for people not to come back. This raises the question, How aggressive has the Church been with its limited resources in talking to young adults? Father John Cusick in Chicago has been at the forefront of talking to young adults to try and integrate faith into their lives. I believe a credibility gap exists in the minds of many young people. One obvious cause is the sex abuse scandal. That’s been talked to death, but it’s still very real. We can’t expect the wounds to have been healed, or the mistrust or the skepticism to have just disappeared.

Some other major PR issues that speak to the topic of communication come into play. In an age with so many media venues around us, where everything is parsed and sliced to death, the Church is one of the worst organizations I’ve seen in terms of communicating. Indeed, it often doesn’t communicate at all.

I know some people who are heads of diocesan communications departments, and they’re good people who work extremely hard. As a whole, though, the Church is far behind in its ability to send a message. Some of that I believe is fear. I know that a lot of people in archdiocesan offices are afraid of the news media. Even Cardinal Egan in New York, where I live, is not a big fan of talking to the media.
Many of these young people are skilled and savvy individuals, and know how good organizations work. Unfortunately, they don’t see their Church working the same way.

It’s a sad thing and, to a lot of young adults, an embarrassment that in this day and age of proliferating media the Church responds so poorly. Many of these young people are skilled and savvy individuals, and know how good organizations work. Unfortunately, they don’t see their Church working the same way. And it makes it difficult for them to own up to these things and perhaps come back to the Church when they think there’s something broken there.

They also have issues and concerns over the Church’s position on issues of sexuality. We have a relationships column called “Pure Sex, Pure Love,” by Dr. Christine Whelan that is one of the most popular spots on our site. And what we hear all the time is that young adults feel the Church has a tin ear for issues of sexuality, the role of women, and other sensitive issues. They feel the Church hasn’t dealt very honestly with these things. There’s a mistrust, and that’s a frightening thing to them.

In saying all this, I feel a little like Chicken Little. But truth is, the sky is not falling. It already fell. I really mean that in a hopeful way. It’s not such a bad thing that the sky has fallen. It means we can now build back from the embers. We can build back trust, we can build back love, we can build back our institution.

... all Church is local, all faith is local, and all religion is local.

What I’ve learned in my three years at BustedHalo—and this is the first time I’ve ever worked for the Church—is that all Church is local, all faith is local, and all religion is local. The Church in Philadelphia, or Los Angeles or Boston, can be crumbling, but if I like my pastor, if I think he’s a decent human being and he’s been good to me, then I’m fine. I’m still a Catholic.

I can’t overstate how important that concept is. I’m a little concerned, though, that we have only a limited amount of time to keep our young people around and feeling that way. Just because they haven’t fled in great numbers as a result of the sex abuse scandal doesn’t mean that the Church’s credibility isn’t fractured in their eyes, nor does it mean that, going forward, commitment to their Catholic faith will be anywhere near as strong as in earlier generations. The landscape is already changing.
There are parallel realities at work here. A real disconnect exists in terms of the hierarchy and the clergy who deal with one reality, and the laity who are operating on an entirely different, non-intersecting plane (by way of example, a lot of 20- and 30-something Catholics wouldn’t have any idea who their bishops even are). That’s not a good sign for our community, and I think we have to seriously explore that situation.

Several years ago I heard a priest in New Jersey give a talk where he said that he knows and has met many people who remain Catholic in spite of the institutional Church. If that’s the case, if people are feeling the pain emotionally and psychologically, then what’s the prescription for change?

Since I don’t want to leave everyone today feeling angry and wounded, I’d like to suggest several steps that might help attract the next generation of Catholic faithful.

First of all, if you’re not on the web, if you’re not doing podcasting, if you’re not on YouTube or social networking sites, then you’re not talking to young people. And that’s a real missed opportunity.

I was at a conference recently and I heard an individual who was head of communications for young adults say, “My bishop won’t let us have a web site because he’s afraid somebody will say something terrible in the name of the Church on the site.” I totally understand that fear because we hear it at BustedHalo sometimes. We challenge people to try to move beyond that fear with proper editorial oversight.

... the overwhelming need is to do media well.

Generally speaking, the overwhelming need is to do media well. That’s a big problem. We’re dealing with a media-saturated generation. They know good media. And if you don’t know what you’re doing, they can sniff you out quickly. You won’t have any credibility with them. They’ll think that you’re pandering to them. So you have to do media well.

I would also suggest that the Church do a much better job at welcoming. You can’t believe how important that is. We had a story on BustedHalo about a woman from Notre Dame who came to New York and went to 19 parishes before anybody even welcomed her. And even the 19th wasn’t exactly a warm welcome. I don’t think that’s Notre Dame’s fault for giving her too high a bar. I think that’s our fault in many ways, and it urgently needs addressing.

I think before you can preach at, you have to listen to.
My final piece of advice is to listen. I think before you can preach at, you have to listen to. And don’t just listen to the “new faithful” (as some are called on the far right) whose tone is often chastising and punitive, or to the voices on the far left who only seem to want to critique the Church. Yes, those constituencies exist, but they are very small and very vocal slivers to the left and right of the people who are in our churches each week. Most of us in the pews on Sunday are in the middle. We’re trying to do the best we can. We’re trying to raise kids, to be successful at our jobs, to be decent human beings. If anything, I think the sex abuse scandal underscored for these people how little listening the institutional Church was really doing. Listening in earnest, in a really heartfelt way, is critical.

“I’d like to conclude with a thought from a Paulist friend of mine when he was in formation. One of the most important things an older Paulist said to him was, “Don’t ever forget how you can listen into existence somebody who is disaffected from their faith.”

I found that to be very powerful. It means listening before we speak. And when listening, hopefully understanding. There’s no better key to communicating with a new generation of Catholics.
Before getting to the topic at hand, I’d like to note two ironies that are on my mind.

First, two of this country’s top executive search consultants, Paul Reilly, of Korn Ferry, and Gerry Roche, of Heidrick & Struggles, are with us again this year. At last year’s Roundtable they spoke to us about performance evaluation. This year they are in the audience listening to me speak about their field of expertise—attracting and retaining top executive talent. You figure it out.

The second irony I notice is that in all our discussion yesterday about the demographics behind the priest shortage and statistics related to other aspects of ordained and non-ordained ministry in the Church, it became clear that women dominate the ranks of those who are staffing parishes and running religious education programs in the Church today. It is obvious (and I make the point now to turn your attention to an ironic dimension of the priest shortage) that there has never been an ordained priest who is not the son of a woman. If the Church continues to let women be underappreciated and further alienated, not to mention letting them experience real or imagined instances of injustice, there will be further erosion in that support from a mother that most of us who are ordained will recall receiving when we thought about becoming priests. This is an irony that could perhaps become the topic for further discussion at a future Roundtable.
I look upon excellence . . . as a goal without a goal line. . . . you don’t have to be ill to get better. We should always be thinking about getting better. That’s the goal: better. . . . the best can always get better. So how do we retain and motivate the very best for Church service?

Yesterday, Tom Tierney spoke of “sustained excellence”—“achieving sustained excellence in non-profits . . . is tremendously challenging,” he said, but “that’s what the National Leadership Roundtable . . . is all about.” Strategy and capital are important, he acknowledged, but talent is even more important.

I look upon excellence—“sustained excellence”—as a goal without a goal line. I’ve often remarked that you don’t have to be ill to get better. We should always be thinking about getting better. That’s the goal: better. Better people, better organizations, better performance. Even if we attract the best talent, the best can always get better. So how do we retain and motivate the very best for Church service?

I have an organ transplant theory for the selection of talent to universities. My theory suggests that, in the case of selecting higher education executives, you can have a healthy, vital organ out here ready to be transplanted into the body academic, which has an immune system called tenure. If that “organ”—the candidate for a presidency, academic vice presidency, chief financial officer—does not acculturate or enculturate, as a physical organ must when transplanted into a human body, a rejection mechanism will set in and the healthy, vital organ will not last.

... chemistry is important; it has a lot to do with a successful placement.

Executive search experts like Gerry Roche and Paul Reilly will tell you that chemistry is important; it has a lot to do with a successful placement. They do not recommend incompetent candidates—the technical competence is not in question. Presuming the competence to be there, the successful selection will prove to have been the right “fit,” the match-up will reflect good “chemistry.” These objectives—fit and chemistry—are not always easy to measure in advance of a hire. When I was a university president hiring, say, an academic vice president or chief financial officer, I would call the president of the institution where the candidate was presently employed and ask the person to whom the candidate was then reporting, “If you were coming here to take my place, would you want to bring him or her along with you?”
That question would sometimes draw a long pause over the phone from someone who had earlier written a glowing letter of recommendation. In one case, the response was prefaced with the comment, “Well, there is that drinking problem . . .”

So, if you are going to retain talented people, the chemistry has to be right. Often it is chemistry, not competence, that explains terminations or separations from employment.

Within Church organizations we should think of ourselves as men and women on a mission. The mission will motivate. It will attract good people. But the mission has first to be articulated and then internalized by those already on board.

The promise of participation—real participation in decision making—will serve to motivate prospective partners. But you have to deliver on that promise.

Clarity of purpose and vision for the organization will motivate others to join.

Think of leadership today in our Church in America. There are many qualities necessary for good leadership, but here are three that are essential: availability, accountability, and vulnerability. I’d say those three are essential for any good leader anywhere, but reflect for a moment on how appropriate they are for the Christian leader who should model his or her leadership on the leadership of Christ. He made himself available to those He led; He was accountable to all, even his enemies; and He was vulnerable to the point of losing his life so that we might live. He said it so well himself: “. . . the Son of Man came not to be served, but to serve, and to give his life as a ransom for many” (Mt 20:28).

The good leader belongs (and should see him- or herself) at the center of a circle, not on the top of a mountain. Robert Greenleaf caught it in the title, Servant Leadership, of his book published 30 or 40 years ago, but still useful for our purposes and very much worth reading.

Tom Tierney spoke yesterday of courage as an essential ingredient in Church management. I link courage with competence and can’t help recalling what the famous Jesuit theologian John Courtney Murray used to say to his Woodstock colleague Father Walter Burghardt in those pre–Vatican II days when Murray’s work on religious freedom was under scrutiny from the Vatican: “Courage, Walter; it’s far more important than intelligence.”
I tend to think of courage and competence as joined at the hip. And in these days of welcome discussion about more cooperation of laity with clergy, I have to say that I see an imbalance of competence in lay-clergy cooperation. This imbalance runs in both directions. Some of the clergy, including the hierarchy, are no match on the competence scale with emerging lay collaborators. And indeed some willing lay partners don’t have sufficient competence within their own areas of specialization to be of genuine help when they offer their services to the Church.

Excellence presumes being very good at what you do. It also implies . . . that you can get better.

We have to shoot for excellence on the part of all collaborators. We have to hold ourselves to high standards of excellence. Excellence presumes being very good at what you do. It also implies, as I’ve noted already, that you can get better. Remember, “better” is a goal without a goal line.

I thank the Leadership Roundtable for convening us, and hope it will keep encouraging us to move onward and upward.

Geno Fernandez

I’ve been asked to give a business person’s perspective on talent, based on my experience at McKinsey. To that end, I’ll touch on four themes that I think are particularly relevant to the work of all of us:

1. the development and training of talent,
2. the importance of a successful value proposition,
3. the time spent on training, and
4. the importance of rigorous evaluation.

1. The development and training of talent is paramount. We did a study not too long ago at McKinsey as part of an effort called “The War for Talent,” where we interviewed 15,000 fairly senior executives in 125 of the top 500 companies. We asked them, “What is your most important or challenging concern in running your company?” Fully a third put “finding talent” in the number one slot. And 95 percent put “finding the right people to do the job” in one of the top three spots.
... the greatest companies ... are the ones that have a strong talent culture, that focus their agendas on attracting, retaining, and developing the right people.

I’m sure it’s no surprise to anyone in this room that the greatest companies—that is, companies that deliver the highest return to their shareholders—are the ones that have a strong talent culture, that focus their agendas on attracting, retaining, and developing the right people. Whenever these companies have a meeting where topics such as strategy or capital are discussed, talent is always on the agenda. Often it’s the number one item.

One question I would pose to our Church is this: How often in diocesan councils and in parish life do we sit down and talk honestly about the people we work with, and whether we have the right people in the right jobs? It’s a difficult conversation for many of us—but one that needs to take place.

2. A successful value proposition is critically important. The value proposition has to be communicated to everyone in the organization, and they have to be able to answer the questions, “Why am I here?” and “What is distinctive about our work?”

The Church has perhaps the most exciting mission of all: proclaiming the good news of the Gospel.

Here I think the Catholic Church has a lot of things going for it that businesses don’t always have. The Church has perhaps the most exciting mission of all: proclaiming the good news of the Gospel. And I think that every member of the Church—whether they’re parish workers, diocesan workers, or full- or part-time volunteers—has to understand that they’re an integral part of that exciting mission.

Creating a value proposition also means creating excitement about the leadership of the organization. The classic example here is GE’s legendary Jack Welch. He took an extraordinary amount of time interacting with people, particularly the next generation of GE managers. These weren’t managers necessarily reporting to him, but managers 10 layers down in the organization. Everyone knew Jack. He was such an inspirational person that at the end of the day, he created a lot of loyalty—and a lot of equity for GE.
The other thing there has to be real excitement around is the day-to-day work.

I really believe that the Church and its membership are eager to have these heroes in our bishops, in our priests, in our lay workers. We want them to do well. Remember the era of Fulton J. Sheen, the American archbishop and Jack Welch–like figure for the Church? His charisma was in his inspirational leadership.

The other thing there has to be real excitement around is the day-to-day work. How do you create that level of excitement around the Church’s value proposition, the proclamation of the Gospel? And how do you create that excitement in a secretary who’s answering the phone in the office of a parish or a diocese?

The answer is that the Church has its spiritual rewards, and I think it’s important for all of us to convey the excitement and the fulfillment that are inherent in each of our roles as contributors to the good of the Church. The greatest companies, of course, are able to create a level of excitement around tangible rewards, such as compensation and stock options. The Church doesn’t have those kinds of advantages, and I think it has to look at its compensation system and see whether it’s appropriate for attracting the kind of talent it needs in the dioceses and the parishes.

3. An extraordinary amount of time is spent on training by companies that motivate and retain their people. From the beginning of our tenure as business analysts, all the way through the higher levels of partnership, an extraordinary investment is made by McKinsey in our formal training. In fact, McKinsey people spend, on average, six weeks out of each year in various training activities. At these events, the value proposition is enforced. The culture is inculcated. Excitement is built.

I think part of the reason that we’ve been able to build such a strong culture and strong sense of mission and values is because of this disproportionate time spent on training. This begs the question: How much time does the Church spend on training its ministers, as well as laypeople? Does it spend the right amount of time trying to bring forth the values and the excitement we talked about earlier?

I’m well aware there are “baby bishops” camps that many of you have attended. When I was a seminarian, I remember taking care of some of you who are in this room today at such a camp at Notre Dame. There’s a difference between that experience, however, and the strong emphasis on yearly training and continuing education that I think needs to happen more in the Church.

I’m going to suggest two mechanisms that may help deliver the value proposition. The first—and I believe the one most relevant to the Church—is apprenticeship and mentorship. It turns out that people learn best from role models. They can learn from books and so forth, but they learn best
when they interact with people. At our firm, no one gets to stay in a role unless they’ve actually proven their ability to fill it. Somebody teaches them, and then they’re watched closely as they do it for the first time. After they’ve mastered the role, it’s their turn to teach someone. So you don’t actually get to be an engagement manager or associate principal or partner in the firm without demonstrating the capabilities required for that role.

... two mechanisms ... may help deliver the value proposition. The first ... is apprenticeship and mentorship.

The second mechanism is feedback and coaching—an area where I think the Church is particularly weak. Feedback is essential to giving people the motivation to do better. None of us likes to receive negative feedback. But if we could create a culture where people could turn around and get immediate, honest feedback from their co-workers on their performance and find out what they could be doing better, it would be quite helpful in changing behaviors.

4. **Rigorous evaluation is pivotal to any high performance organization.** Let me give you a very personal example. Ten months ago, I was diagnosed with Hodgkin’s lymphoma. It was a life-changing event for me. I’m in complete remission now, and was able to return to work at the beginning of this month. The first thing that happened on my day back was my evaluator called me and said, “I’d like to have a conversation with you.” And I said, “You know, I haven’t been working for the last six or seven months. I’ve been battling cancer.” To which he replied, “Well, we still need to talk about what you can do better through the next six months.” He said it with slight tongue in cheek, but the point is clear: the evaluation culture is deeply ingrained in high-performance companies like McKinsey.

One way the Church can think about evaluation is to look at people along two dimensions. First is their performance, which is how well they’re executing their skills; second is their potential, which brings into play questions such as whether they have the right intelligence, the right values, and the right gifts that can be used.

Generally speaking, people fit into one of four buckets. The first is that they’re in the wrong job if they have low skills and low potential. Within the Church, how many people are legacy employees because Father happens to know them? They’ve been in their role for 20 years, and it would be very difficult now to change them. One of the things that’s very different about professional service firms is that when you’re in that low-skills/low-potential bucket, you’re informed of that immediately, and given the chance to redeem yourself.

The second bucket is that of low performance but high potential. These are people you want to keep your eye on, because they’re potentially your next generation of leaders. You can afford to move them across the grid a little bit. Then there are people you’ll use in a very different way. They are your third bucket: high performance but low potential for improvement. They tend to be the solid
pros—and every organization needs them. They’re never going to advance very far, but you can’t really get by without them. Identifying who in your parish or diocese are the solid pros is quite important.

“Adversity has the effect of eliciting talents which in prosperous circumstances would have lain dormant.” I think that’s particularly relevant to the situation today in the Church. . . . It’s now up to the Church, and to us as its members, to take the lessons from high-performance organizations and apply them creatively in ways that both motivate and ensure the success of our people.

Finally, there are the high-potential/high-performance people. There aren’t that many of them out there, which is why they’re golden. They’re the people who should be your counselors, your chancellors, the ones you turn to for advice.

The great Roman lyric poet Horace once said, “Adversity has the effect of eliciting talents which in prosperous circumstances would have lain dormant.” I think that’s particularly relevant to the situation today in the Church. There are many dedicated and highly talented people out there who are willing to help the Church, even in these times of adversity. It’s now up to the Church, and to us as its members, to take the lessons from high-performance organizations and apply them creatively in ways that both motivate and ensure the success of our people.

Sr. Mary Edward Spohrer

When John Eriksen asked if I would be part of this panel today, he said, “Sister, you’ve been in religious life for many years. It seems to me that religious sisters have done quite a good job of training and retaining Church leaders. Would you share your experience with us?”

My presentation this morning, then, will be from the perspective of the 850,000 women religious worldwide currently involved in Church ministry. I’ll talk a bit about one specific culture within ministry—that of religious life—a culture where the heroism required is having the capacity to “leave everything and follow Christ” more closely throughout one’s life. It involves the integration of mission preparation and life transformation.
Religious formation—or formation for a Church ministry within the culture of religious life—calls for a radical life commitment to the Church and to the world.

Fifty years ago, when I entered my religious community, we had a retreat led by Father Thomas Burke, a renowned Jesuit and master in prayer. What he told us has framed my ministry through 50 years. “Postulants,” he said, “to fall in love with God is the greatest of all romances.”

“It’s about calling forth in every human person their desire to be more . . . for fulfillment.”

This morning at breakfast, people were sharing stories of how they met their husbands or wives. I couldn't help but think that our commitment to Church ministry parallels this experience as well. It's about calling forth in every human person their desire to be more, to become more, their desire for transcendence, for fulfillment.

For every person, the Church minister reflects the God-quest. Religious publicly profess it. God is not only enough for you and for me, God is more than enough for any of us. Our formative process is based on the hunger in the human heart, the desire to give one’s entire life and being to God in the service of the Church for the world, for the sake of the world. That’s where it starts.

It’s prophetic and, by essence, it’s perpetual. When we take vows, the formative period is long, ranging from at least four years up to ten or more. And this involves continuous, 24/7 formation in prayer, contemplation, social analysis, theological reflection, an inward journey of self-knowledge, and the experience of building relationships first with one’s God and oneself, and then with other persons, institutions, society, and the entire universe.

Formation takes place within the faith community—a community that has a clear focus, a vision, a mission, and goals that are continuously renewed because the life form requires continual feedback and evaluation. Clearly, there’s a power to be drawn from the faith community. Isn’t that, too, what our parishes, our dioceses, and our places of ministry are about? We must encourage the building of the faith community so that formation and integration can take place through relationships rooted in faith.
Actually, women religious (even before Vatican II) were very well prepared professionally for ministry.

Religious communities have “built-in” mentors. Within the formation process, people are appointed to mentor the new members, the new candidates, the new ministers. During that time, a lot of conversation takes place as people in a comfortable, loving environment are able to face their vulnerabilities and to grow. Examining one’s conscience—that is, reviewing one’s choices in the light of the Gospel—occurs daily. We form covenant communities that are truly life-giving, where members are honest enough with each other to share their strengths and weaknesses, their successes and failures in ministry, and to give and receive advice. We live intergenerationally and multiculturally, with the richness of a wide variety of life-experience and education.

Actually, women religious (even before Vatican II) were very well prepared professionally for ministry. I see this reflected all the time in my work within the diocese. Women religious are taking on more diverse and distinctive leadership roles within global ministry, not only in the Church and for the Church, but also as the presence and voice of Christ in the midst of the world. We follow a proven way of holiness; a spirituality that is defined very clearly in our constitutions.

In recent times, more communities are welcoming lay associate members of all kinds. We are growing by leaps and bounds through this interaction, through our invitation to the laity to join us in mission. This is a wonderful avenue of recruitment, which extends well beyond ourselves.

Our formation involves personal growth and development that is symphonic: intellectual, emotional, spiritual, artistic, physical, and social. There are built-in structures for active participation, for shared responsibility, and for accountability. We believe in regular assessment and are able to call each other to the terms of our covenant, to the rule of life we have embraced, to the spirituality in which we have offered our life, and to energy in mission. In my particular community, the charism, or Spirit-gift, is very clear. It is what our foundress bequeathed to us in 1849 as the spirituality of our institute: a joy, energy, and enthusiasm in works of charity—for the life of the world. This joyful energy flows from our intimacy with Christ in the Eucharist.

We’re a very strongly Eucharistic congregation with a specific Gospel lifestyle. We take vows, which really identify our consecrated life in the Church. Our vow of chastity is a vow of relatedness by which we develop a single-hearted passion for God and passion for humanity, and live in nonviolent intimacy with all others to love as Jesus loves. Through our vow of poverty, we claim a life of mutuality, of justice, of interdependence, of reverence and availability for all life.
Our vow of obedience references what we heard about yesterday—a “listening heart.” All of our decisions and leadership successions are discerned in a communal commitment to prayerful listening. We are committed to cultivating a posture that listens to God in all of life, and that responds in the light of the Gospel and the common good.

All of this leads to personal and, hopefully, societal transformation through the coming of the reign of God in our time. Women religious are highly organized. We are networked widely. We’re working together more and more. We’re constantly evaluating who we are, what the signs of the times are, what changes must be made, and what will attract new members. Ultimately, it is Christ who attracts new members to Church ministry. It is Christ who calls.

With regard to retention, some people do move on. Statistics show that many people have moved out of specific religious communities. I’ve found, however, that sisters who have moved out have continued to do tremendous service to the Church. Others who left have gone to a strictly contemplative, cloistered community. They’ve chosen to be divorced from active participative ministry in order to support full ministry of the Church through continual prayer and penance.

As a religious, I fully resonate with the goals and the philosophy of the Leadership Roundtable. You deeply mirror what women in the Church are all about, as well as our hope for the future.

Religious congregations have leadership succession plans. There are regular elections, with the time frame clearly expressed in their constitutions. The community names the qualities that they feel they need in their leaders, and then matches these qualities with the gifts of members who offer themselves in service. This is all done in a spirit of discernment and prayer during which the new leadership emerges. It’s a cyclical process.

In conclusion, I’d like to point out that women religious have become more and more “round-tabled” in their structures, processes, and life-form. As a religious, I fully resonate with the goals and the philosophy of the Leadership Roundtable. You deeply mirror what women in the Church are all about, as well as our hope for the future.
Let me conclude with a poem:

**In Search of a Round Table**
*Chuck Lathrop*

It will take some sawing
To be roundtabled.
Some redefining
And redesigning,
Some redoing and rebirthing
Of narrow long Churching
Can painful be—
For people and tables.
It would mean no daising
And throning,
For but one king is there
And he is a foot washer,
At table no less.

And what of narrow long ministers
When they confront
A round table people,
After years of working up the table
To finally sit at its head,
Only to discover
That the table has been turned around?

They must be loved into roundness
For God has called a People
Not “them and us.”
“Them and us” are unable
To gather round; for at a round table
There are no sides
And all are invited
To wholeness and to food.

At one time
Our narrowing churches
Were built to resemble the cross
But it does no good
For building to do so,
If lives do not.
Round tabling means
   No preferred seating,
   No first and last,
   No better, and no corners
   For “the least of these.”
Roundtabling means
   Being with,
   A part of,
   Together and one.

Amen.

Janice Virtue

For the last decade at Duke Divinity School, we’ve been thinking about what it means to educate and form people for a lifetime of ministry. We realized that the average age of our incoming divinity student is 22. When they graduate, they’re 25, and they have more than 40 years to serve in congregational and ministerial life. It made us rethink what it means to educate, to form for this whole lifetime. My remarks today will reflect what we’ve learned in the last few years about what breeds success.

The capacity to lead is not a miracle pill that’s granted with a diploma. It is something that requires education and development over the lifetime of ministry, over the lifetime of service.

Our best success comes when we think and act developmentally, when we focus on education and formation for a lifetime. The capacity to lead is not a miracle pill that’s granted with a diploma. It is something that requires education and development over the lifetime of ministry, over the lifetime of service. Unfortunately, what frequently occurs in my world is akin to a relay race. A young person is formed in a congregation, gets handed off to a college, discerns a call to ministry, gets handed off to a seminary, finishes their seminary degree, and gets handed off to a congregational system.
In that type of relay race, the partners don’t work very well together. In the course of 40 years of service, a young person turns into an older person who is frequently left to figure out how to do the work on their own. We found that if we work with people over time, if we intervene at pivotal moments in their life of ministry, then we have the capacity to keep a career growing and building all the way through to retirement and beyond.

We also believe it’s important to work continuously with people. . . . We need ongoing formation and development.

This approach requires paying attention to this whole business of assessment and feedback. For the average Protestant clergy, the feedback they receive at the end of a Sunday morning is typically, “sweet sermon” or “nice message.” Not something to really build on. So we focus on assessment: How do you get real feedback on real performance? We focus on challenge: How can you be even more of an instrument of God’s mercy in this world? We focus on support: How can you enhance the development of friendships, the development of structures that encourage and enable people to continue to grow?

We also believe it’s important to work continuously with people. If we really want to change habits and behaviors, if we really want to develop capacity, then we need more than a two-day seminar. We need ongoing formation and development.

Our best success comes when we align development with the passion and vision of people. I agree with Tom Tierney’s assertion yesterday that calling and commitment alone are not sufficient for fruitful leadership. I would argue, though, that calling and commitment are necessary if we’re going to sustain the unique vocation of the Church in the world.

. . . calling and commitment may well be our greatest advantage in the marketplace.

Indeed, this calling and commitment may well be our greatest advantage in the marketplace. I don’t want to downplay the realities of the economics of ministry. But we all know that this God we serve is a pretty compelling taskmaster, and the calling and commitment to serve Him may well be our trump card in the marketplace. I’ve seen plenty of men and women religious give up marketplace benefits for the privilege of serving in our Churches. We’re certainly willing to give up something when God gets a hold on us. We show our most success when we build on that calling and commitment.
We’ve been most successful when we’re focused on talent, not on problems. Too many leaders of our organizations find they spend the bulk of their time dealing with what Tom Tierney called “that bottom quartile” of performers. They are putting out fires, addressing problems, trying to resolve long conflicts, spending 80 percent of their time focused on problems.

In places where leaders have decided to spend 80 percent of their time and energy shining a light on talent, shining a light on where God is at work in good ways, where excellence is emerging and just needs a little more help to grow and spread, we’ve seen great things happen. It’s simply a shift of focus from problems to talent and excellence.

We’ve learned that we need to set the bar high. I’ve yet to meet anyone who’s given their life to the Church who wants to do a bad job, who wants to be a bad pastor, who wants to be a bad educator. We’ve found success when we set the bar high. This means we need to provide appropriate education and development to help people achieve those high standards. This scares some people. There is resistance when you begin to set the bar high and you focus on talent.

Fortunately, we’ve learned how to counter that resistance, how not to give in to it, how not to change our plans or to lower our standards simply because there’s a resistant culture. When we’ve set the bar high, we’ve given the right education and development opportunities to people, and we’ve seen them go beyond the standards we set. So I would definitely encourage you to set the bar high.

We’ve been successful when we’ve focused not only on the “what” and the “how” of leadership, not only on competencies and skills, but on the “who” of leadership. We can’t assume that everyone knows how to do fiscal management or strategic planning and all the things that leaders need to do. But there is a deep connection between our inner life and our outer work, and one of our tasks is to help leaders tend to that inner life/outer work journey.

Earlier this week, I was with 15 United Methodist bishops in a leadership development program that Duke Divinity School designed for them. And I asked them, “What do we need to do to retain and motivate the very best Church leaders?”

Invest in young leaders—and prepare for resistance from the not so young.

Here, in a nutshell, is what they said: “We’re a graying denomination. We have a graying clergy. Invest in young leaders—and prepare for resistance from the not so young.
Connect these young leaders to each other. Listen to them. Mentor them and build relationships with them. Set the bar high, encourage creativity, risk failure and protect them from the resistance they will encounter."

All across the world, in faithful men and women, in organizations such as this, God is at work to bring about the transformation of the world. Our job is to tend to what God is doing, to join what God is doing in that excellent way, and to bring others along with us.

Our best success comes when we remember that it is God and Jesus Christ who show us the more excellent way. All across the world, in faithful men and women, in organizations such as this, God is at work to bring about the transformation of the world. Our job is to tend to what God is doing, to join what God is doing in that excellent way, and to bring others along with us.
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William Daly

During this discussion, we’re going to take a look at salaries paid in dioceses and parishes and compare them with salaries paid in nonprofit organizations and the counterparts of Catholic parishes in Protestant denominations.

The sources of our information include the National Diocesan Salary Survey, which covers approximately 100 Catholic dioceses, or about 60 percent of the total number of Catholic dioceses in the United States; the Salary Survey of Catholic Charities Agencies, which covers about 90 Catholic charities; the Wage and Salary Survey of Catholic Parishes, which was conducted by NACPA (the National Association of Church Personnel Administrators) for the first time in 2005; and The Laborer Is Worthy of His Hire, a survey of priests’ salaries and benefits that’s done every three years.

For comparison purposes we’re going to use data from other workplaces. Most of these data will come from two surveys: Compensation in Nonprofit Organizations, which covers about 1,600 nonprofits, and the National Church Staff Compensation Survey, whose database includes about 800 mostly Protestant parishes. The Metropolitan Benchmark Compensation Survey was used to fill in a couple of gaps.
Let’s look at the findings, beginning with the diocesan salary data and how they compare with the nonprofit data (see Table 1). All of the data we show here, by the way, are administrative because it’s hard to get matches for ministry positions in the nonprofit sector.

### Table 1: Comparison of Diocesan and Nonprofit Organization Salaries, 2005

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>National diocesan salary survey data</th>
<th>National nonprofit salary data</th>
<th>Difference (percent)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chief Financial &amp; Administrative Officer/ Director of Finance</td>
<td>87,290</td>
<td>Chief Financial Officer</td>
<td>86,108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accountant</td>
<td>37,361</td>
<td>Accountant</td>
<td>41,215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director of Development/Stewardship</td>
<td>77,063</td>
<td>Director of Development</td>
<td>68,174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director, Annual Giving</td>
<td>56,414</td>
<td>Annual Fund Manager</td>
<td>49,316</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director, Communications &amp; Public Relations</td>
<td>59,448</td>
<td>Director, Communications &amp; Public Relations</td>
<td>64,832</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catholic Newspaper Editor</td>
<td>54,649</td>
<td>Editor, Periodicals</td>
<td>56,386</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director, Information Technology/ Computer Operations</td>
<td>68,941</td>
<td>Director, Management of Information Systems</td>
<td>64,475</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director, Human Resources</td>
<td>67,404</td>
<td>Human Resources Manager</td>
<td>60,548</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive Secretary to Bishop</td>
<td>36,772</td>
<td>Secretary to Chief Executive Officer</td>
<td>38,869</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive Director, Catholic Charities</td>
<td>87,451</td>
<td>Chief Executive Officer, Social Service Organization</td>
<td>88,636</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case Worker (BA, BS)</td>
<td>29,572</td>
<td>Caseworker II</td>
<td>30,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building/Grounds Superintendent</td>
<td>42,155</td>
<td>Building Superintendent A</td>
<td>42,565</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average difference</strong></td>
<td><strong>1.2</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: NACPA, 2005.

You get a sense of the difference between the two types of organizations. You see that the Catholic data are a little ahead of the nonprofit data in some job categories, a little behind in others. On average, for the 12 positions listed, we’re 1.2 percent ahead.

There’s another way to look at these data, and that’s by size of organization. As you would expect, the larger organizations pay more than smaller ones. That’s particularly true for top leadership positions, such as CFO and the executive director of Catholic Charities. In both cases, there’s about a 30 percent difference between what a small diocese and a large diocese pays for these jobs. For other positions—such as accountant, director of development, and Catholic newspaper editor—the difference isn’t as significant, though there is some. In the case of lower-level positions such as professional or support staff, the differences all but disappear between small and large dioceses.
Clearly, based on these numbers, work needs to be done by small dioceses to increase their salaries to make them more competitive.

Let’s turn now to the parishes, beginning with the position of pastor, where the difference is huge when you compare Catholic with Protestant and nonprofit. Since we were trying to make a comparison between what a true full salary is, we included in the Catholic priest data housing, food, and automobile expenses. In other words, everything a person might pay if they were getting a normal salary. I should add that the way Catholic priests are paid varies greatly in this country. The figure of $40,600 (see Table 2) is strictly a salary estimate. Regardless of the exact number, though, it’s evident that the Catholic Church is far behind the Protestant and nonprofit sectors in its salary to pastors.

Table 2: Catholic Parish, Protestant, Nonprofit Comparisons, 2005

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Catholic</th>
<th>Protestant</th>
<th>Nonprofit</th>
<th>(percent)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pastor</td>
<td>40,621</td>
<td>86,119</td>
<td>79,350</td>
<td>-50.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Manager</td>
<td>48,880</td>
<td>52,600</td>
<td>52,739</td>
<td>-7.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development Director</td>
<td>44,775</td>
<td>46,700</td>
<td>49,961</td>
<td>-7.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director, Religious Education</td>
<td>44,447</td>
<td>45,100</td>
<td>48,590</td>
<td>-5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilities/Maintenance Supervisor</td>
<td>36,090</td>
<td>39,400</td>
<td>38,691</td>
<td>-7.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office Manager</td>
<td>15.01</td>
<td>15.58</td>
<td>15.73</td>
<td>-4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bookkeeper/Account Clerk</td>
<td>12.82</td>
<td>13.94</td>
<td>13.90</td>
<td>-7.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretary</td>
<td>11.78</td>
<td>11.68</td>
<td>12.90</td>
<td>-4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Receptionist</td>
<td>10.84</td>
<td>10.72</td>
<td>10.87</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Custodian/Maintenance Helper</td>
<td>10.82</td>
<td>11.49</td>
<td>10.78</td>
<td>-2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kitchen/Cafeteria Worker</td>
<td>9.63</td>
<td>9.76</td>
<td>8.89</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: NACPA 2005.

... wage and salary pay by Catholic dioceses is pretty comparable with the nonprofit world. Parishes, on the other hand, are definitely behind what Protestant churches and the nonprofit sector pay.
Let’s look next at a group of ministry and administrative positions. What you see when you look at the Catholic column, which reflects wage and salary data for parishes, is that it trails Protestant and nonprofit by roughly 7 percent in 2005. A similar situation exists with support staff positions. Catholic parishes are behind, though not as much as with ministry and administrative positions.

In summary, our data show that wage and salary pay by Catholic dioceses is pretty comparable with the nonprofit world. Parishes, on the other hand, are definitely behind what Protestant churches and the nonprofit sector pay.

A just wage really has three elements. The first is the living wage. . . .
Second is the equitable wage. . . . Finally, there’s the proportional wage.

Besides surveying parishes and dioceses, NACPA also creates and distributes general tools for helping organizations to address pay issues. In particular, over the last 10 years, we’ve been looking at that part of Catholic social teaching that addresses the concept of a just wage. A just wage really has three elements. The first is the living wage, which is focused on the lowest pay range for adult workers, ensuring a floor that provides for basic needs. Second is the equitable wage, which addresses how wages are paid at all levels of the organization to all employees. It tries to ensure that everyone is paid fairly, in accordance with good human resource practices. Finally, there’s the proportional wage, which addresses how salaries paid to people in the highest pay ranges impact the organization’s ability to pay a living wage in the lowest pay ranges. Too much going to pay increases at the top can take away and make it difficult to keep the lowest wages at a living wage.

Let’s look a little more closely at the equitable wage, since it impacts everybody. There are three forms of equity that we’re dealing with. First is internal equity, which works to ensure that jobs with comparable responsibilities and comparable skills are placed in the same pay range. In other words, people having equal responsibilities and skills are placed in the same pay range as other people with those responsibilities and skills. NACPA has created an internal equities grid, or sample, which is included in one of our publications, The Parish Pay Manual. We encourage dioceses to use this sample to create guidelines for all their parishes. Some have done that.

Next we have external equity. External equity works to ensure that the organization’s pay ranges are comparable to what similar employers are paying, and again, we publish sample guidelines for various jobs in The Parish Pay Manual. We would encourage dioceses to use this to develop their own guidelines, adjusted to their cost of living.
Individual equity works to ensure that organizations treat individual employees fairly in setting salaries.

Finally we have individual equity. Individual equity works to ensure that organizations treat individual employees fairly in setting salaries. It’s important that once you’ve done these other things—developed internal equity schemes and developed external equity pay ranges—that you treat employees and individual employees fairly, both in applying the system to them and also in continuing to work with them. That means setting individual hiring rates correctly; placing employees in a range that doesn’t cause problems with employees already in that range; and providing annual pay increases that make sense and are fair. Another sound piece of advice is to make equity adjustments if people fall behind—adjustments that are based on their performance.

Clearly, NACPA has done a lot of work in the important field of just and fair wages, and we encourage organizations to take advantage of our research and recommendations.

Linda Bearie

I’d like to speak a little bit today about how the Church culture affects compensation, and how we view compensation. We’ve spoken about it over the last several days, about the tradition of workers who have been called to ministry in the Church, primarily as clergy and religious men and women. We have a tradition of poverty in the Church; compensation was never really an issue. Those of us who joined the Church provided ministry out of a sense of service and love of God and our fellow human beings. There was honor in that sacrifice. Our real compensation was that we expected yet another star in our celestial crown.

I don’t think we’ve moved entirely beyond that construct. We understand that in this culture, a wage for many of our clergy is not going to cover their essentials. This is also true for lay employees who have to provide for their own medical care and retirement. I don’t think many of the clergy who are leaders in our Church truly understand what it takes to raise a family and handle co-pays on medical care and all the other rising costs.

It’s not really a lack of good will, but a lack of experience that colors the way compensation is treated in our Church today. And because we don’t have experience, there’s not a lot of confidence about how to manage compensation. Also, I don’t think we’ve been very good at educating our parish-
ioners about the true cost of ministry, that is, good, vital ministry where we encourage and engage lay ministers in our Church.

There’s a tension between external equity and the internal values of the Church that we must learn to translate.

Another factor that I believe impacts compensation is the values that we espouse and live. Truth is, the mission we pursue in our Church is not the mission of many organizations. We have different values. A good compensation system is a reflection of the values of an institution. In the corporate world, for instance, people who make money and handle money earn money. In the Church, our overriding value is that we take care of people. We take care of souls. The secular world doesn’t value that in its compensation system the same way the Church does. It’s evident in the difference in pay between a CPA, for example, and a social worker.

We know we cannot exploit people. That’s not what we’re about. We’re here to pay a just wage, to try and get the best and the brightest to work for the Church and live their lives without having to worry about just scraping by.

There’s a tension between external equity and the internal values of the Church that we must learn to translate. We may need to adjust and pay external equity for some of our jobs, or a little more than external equity for others.

In the Diocese of San Jose, we strive to meet a five-to-one compensation ratio. In other words, our highest paid employee is not paid any more than five times our lowest paid employee. We know we cannot exploit people. That’s not what we’re about. We’re here to pay a just wage, to try and get the best and the brightest to work for the Church and live their lives without having to worry about just scraping by.

The second big compensation issue in the Church concerns internal equity. When I did a survey in the Diocese of San Jose in 1992 in anticipation of putting together our parish compensation program, I went out and I interviewed all the pastors about the benefits and the compensation they provided. I got some rather amusing responses. I asked one of the pastors, “What do you provide in terms of sick leave?” His response was, very seriously, “When they’re sick, they leave.” The second
interesting fact I learned was that the highest paid individuals in almost every parish were the maintenance people.

One of the questions that we face is, How do we create at the same time an internal equity and a market equity when our values are intrinsically different from those of the market? We struggle with that. It’s one of the things we have to work on.

The third major compensation issue is tied to budget. Where are we going to get the money to pay just wages? It’s an established truth that in a good, solid professional ministry that creates a vitality within a parish, money will follow that vitality. That means when parishioners truly understand the costs of supporting that ministry, they’ll be more willing to contribute.

Years ago when we began moving away from the model of nearly all Catholic schools being run by religious women and men, we asked ourselves, How are we ever going to afford lay leadership in our educational system? In fact, we’ve made that transition quite well. In the Diocese of San Jose, we pay lay-equivalent salaries to all of our religious. Therefore it doesn’t become an issue if we lose a sister and have to start paying for a lay person, because the sister was already making a lay-equivalent salary.

. . . in a good, solid professional ministry that creates a vitality within a parish, money will follow that vitality. That means when parishioners truly understand the costs of supporting that ministry, they’ll be more willing to contribute.

I’d like to comment briefly on the implications of not having a good, healthy compensation system at both the diocesan and parish levels. I think we need to have a system that honors the professionalism of our employees.

Not to have such a system is a statement in and of itself. It says we’re not paying respectful attention, that we haven’t done our research. It says we haven’t done what we need to do to create a system that pays respectful attention to your education, your background, and your contributions.

When it comes to compensation, I think what occurs is a conspiracy of mediocrity at the parish and diocesan levels on the part of both the leadership and employees. Let me give you an example. I had a pastor once say to me, “I don’t pay that person enough to evaluate them. They’re basically my volunteer.” If that’s the case, then where do you set the compensation bar? I know intuitively that I’m paying them too little, and they know they’re not being paid enough. But we don’t have any benchmarks; we don’t have any information. How do we deal with that?
In San Jose, we have a committee of ministers, business managers, pastors, and parochial vicars from our parishes who contribute to the annual updating of compensation information. The interesting thing is that there are probably 10 other dioceses that have parish compensation guidelines, and we’ve borrowed liberally from them. This is mandated in our diocese. The parishes have to pay on these scales. The other important piece is that we have a compensation program based on merit-based pay and increases.

... education about compensation is absolutely essential at the diocesan and parish levels, and professionalism is absolutely essential.

Let me close by saying that I think education about compensation is absolutely essential at the diocesan and parish levels, and professionalism is absolutely essential. We need to start paying respectful attention to this entire area if we’re going to honor the hard work and dedication of our employees.

Dennis Corcoran

I feel like a rare bird when I say I am married with four children and I work full-time for the Catholic Church. There aren’t many people in the country that can make that statement. I am privileged. I also want to single out the spirit of the Leadership Roundtable, and by that I mean the men and women in parishes throughout the country who have offered their competencies to help our parishes. I personally owe a debt of gratitude to those people, who in the spirit of the Leadership Roundtable took me under their wing and said to me, “I know that’s what the Church does, but why don’t you try it this way.” I’d like to think I’ve been gifted with an ear to listen—and to have the courage to try some of those things.

I feel like a rare bird when I say I am married with four children and I work full-time for the Catholic Church.

Another piece of advice I’ve picked up over the years that has served me well both professionally and personally is this: when the horse you’re riding on dies, get off. When we’re talking about how
the Church is going to pay for its expenses, you and I have to convince those Catholics who are no
longer sitting in our pews that the horse we’re riding on isn’t dead. If we can’t do that, we’re always
going to struggle with the ability to pay for anything.

I believe around 40 percent of the parishes in this country operate in the red every single year. They
would consider our conversation today totally irrelevant because they struggle just to pay their bills,
ever mind how to afford the very best. But I desperately believe that the horse we’re riding on is a
filly that can win the Preakness. While that might be a shock to many, I believe it can be done, and
is being done in many of our parishes across the country.

Whenever I’m preparing for a talk or working on a project, I pray to the Holy Spirit for a scripture
I can use as kind of a mantra. Let me share with you the scripture I came up with on this project.
It comes from Joel, Chapter 3: “May your daughters and sons prophesy, your young dream dreams,
and your old see visions.” If we’re going to examine how we pay for our expenses, we have to get to
the level of being able to prophesy, to dream dreams and, certainly, to enable our old to see visions.

...we as a Church have to call forth and recruit the very best people
out there.

I also want to affirm Tom Tierney’s idea that our best resource is the talent and the energy of the
people who work for the Church. I believe the corollary is that we as a Church have to call forth and
recruit the very best people out there. Then we have to consider the fact that we’re talking about
many different levels, given the nature and culture of our organization. If I’m a parish minister, for
example, I also better be an enabler and an animator for those who want to volunteer.

...we are faced with a fundamental question as a Church: Are we
ready to commit to the very best lay ecclesial ministers at the same
level we’ve historically committed to the religious and the ordained?

We indeed want to draw forth the very best people—including secretaries and administrative
staff—who wish to share their time and talents with the Church. And that certainly includes those
who fit into the category of lay ecclesial ministry. Let’s not dream that our parishes are going to be
better off just because we have a lot of paid people working there. That would be doing everyone a
disservice.
When we consider the question of how are we going to pay for this, we have to decide if we’re going to be part of a paradigm shift—an educational shift—involving parishioners. In this regard, conversations with people in the pews can often be disheartening because they have little or no knowledge of how a parish operates. And if they don’t understand how that structure works, they can’t dream the kind of dreams that would inspire them to help pay for improvements in our Church.

Thus, we are faced with a fundamental question as a Church: Are we ready to commit to the very best lay ecclesial ministers at the same level we’ve historically committed to the religious and the ordained? In the past, we’ve always figured out how to pay for them. Let me draw on my own experience to illustrate the point. I was a communication studies major at a state college when I was 18 and 19 years old. It was the parishioners of the parish where I was doing volunteer music ministry who called me forth initially. The pastor then called me forth all the way through a graduate degree in Church ministry. That’s how I started out.

Are we willing to undertake a paradigm shift and invest in the best and brightest in terms of wages for lay ecclesial ministry?

So, we’ve figured out ways as a Church to pay for this kind of vocational expense (education) in the past. The question now is, Are we willing to undertake a paradigm shift and invest in the best and brightest in terms of wages for lay ecclesial ministry?

If we are willing, then the issue becomes, how do we pay for it? In the spirit of Joel, Chapter Three, let me rattle off a couple of things I think are important. The first is that we have to look at benefits. Another personal example: there are five dioceses in New Jersey, and it takes three hours to drive from one end of the state to the other. Yet each of those five dioceses has a different benefit plan, different healthcare providers, different pension plans. When you’re moving from one diocese to the other, as I just did, it’s a nightmare. I had no idea the change was going to be so extreme.

Housing must also be an important part of any discussion of compensation. I had 21 people reporting to me for the years I was pastoral administrator, and the biggest variable when comparing income from one part of the state to the next was housing costs. Actually, the Church figured out that problem a long time ago. When priests or nuns joined a parish, it didn’t want to have to pay them what it would take to live in areas that can include some pretty expensive real estate. That’s why within the borders of the parish are rectories and convents.

But how are we going to house the lay ecclesial minister? Last time I checked, lenders will only give you a mortgage for twice your income, or maybe slightly more depending on where you go. Looking at the salary numbers we saw today, tell me how people can afford to live in most areas of New Jersey on that kind of pay? You’re not going to find the very best and the brightest under those conditions.
I’ve been saddened over the last 10 years to see parish after parish sell convent and religious brothers’ residences, as if trying to attract the very best was not even an issue. We did it to pay for other things. But if we had stayed focused on the need for topflight talent, we would have said, “You know what, there’s going to be new talent coming along that we should be offering that housing to.” That would help solve the salary problem because for most of us, affordable housing is the biggest expense. I believe we certainly need to look into this situation.

Another item worthy of consideration is what we refer to as “premium services.” Let me preface my remarks by saying I know no one in the Church likes to hear this term. But the fact is, premium services—even in the Church—increase revenues. And they increase it across the board. When people are being serviced at a high level, they’re willing to pay a higher level for that service. We can say, that’s not right, it should change. But as my grandmother used to say, “It is what it is.”

I think we need to be attuned to those areas of the parish that have a vested interest in a premium service. When I heard from someone in the choir or in youth ministry, for example, that they needed better, then better always had a way of finding our doorstep. What do I mean by that? When someone told me they needed more and better in a particular area, I would go to them and ask if they were willing to pay for it. And every single time, those people said, “Absolutely. I’ll get other people who I know feel this is important, and we’ll close that budget gap.”

My experience has been that most parishes look at the difference between cost and budget and say, “Isn’t it a shame we can’t afford that person.” And they let them walk out the door. What they should be asking is, “How can we make this happen?”

Here’s an example. Our parish wanted a new choir director because people were always complaining about the music. I found a really talented person, but there was a pretty significant gap between what they were asking for and our budget. So I had a meeting with the choir and said, “How badly do you want the best and the brightest music director?” And you know what? The choir on their own made pledges to close the gap. We did indeed hire the best and the brightest choir director and, more importantly, we found a way to pay for him. Now, our only problem is figuring out where to put people on Sunday mornings because we have standing room only turnouts.

My experience has been that most parishes look at the difference between cost and budget and say, “Isn’t it a shame we can’t afford that person.” And they let them walk out the door. What they should be asking is, “How can we make this happen?” Clearly, it can happen when people have the passion and the determination to make their Church better.
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Appendix A

Covering the Bases: Ethics, Credibility, and Trust in the Church

Fay Vincent, Former Commissioner, Major League Baseball

I’ve learned over the years that the best way to start any talk is with a story from that eminent American philosopher, Lawrence Berra. We know him as “Yogi.”

This is a true Yogi story. A ball player by the name of Larry Doby had died. Some of you may remember that he was the first black player in the American League. He was a great friend of mine, and I attended his funeral. Sitting next to me in the church pew on the left were Phil Rizzuto and Berra, and on my right was the great right-hander from the Dodgers, Ralph Branca.

As we sat down, Ralph said to Yogi, “It’s really nice of you to come to Doby’s funeral.” Yogi leaned across me and said, “Ralphie, I come to your funeral so you’ll go to mine.” He absolutely said that.

I’m not an expert on any of the subjects you’re talking about at this conference. The one thing I can relate to, however, is leadership. So I thought I’d forget all the small issues that brought you here—like the problems of recruiting clergy and governance in the Church—and talk about baseball, the big stuff. And the way I’ve decided to do that is to step up to the plate with Vincent’s Ten Commandments of Leadership, and illustrate each with a baseball story.

The First Commandment: Things are seldom what they appear to be. When in doubt, act decisively.

Here’s the story that goes with it. The Brooklyn Dodgers, managed at the time by one Casey Stengel, come to Philadelphia to play at a tiny ballpark called the Baker Bowl. Starting that day for the Dodgers in right field is a player named Hack Wilson. On this particular day, Hack’s recovering from a monumental case of overindulgence, brought on by the night before. Pitching for the Dodgers is Walter “Boom-Boom” Beck. Boom-Boom is having a typical Boom-Boom day, and out
of the dugout comes Clarence Casey Stengel to remove him. But Boom-Boom doesn’t want to be taken out. He starts stalking around. He won’t give Casey the ball.

Meanwhile, in right field, our hero Hack, his head still spinning, decides while this conference is taking place to go over and lean up against the right field wall. Well, the wonderful thing about the Baker Bowl was that the outfield wall was lined with tin which, on a hot day, would really heat up. You can imagine what happened when Hack walked over. The wall was emanating great warmth, and when he put his head up against it, he went out like a light.

On the mound, Boom-Boom and Casey are still having it out. Finally, Casey demands the ball. Boom-Boom spins around and fires it into right field. The ball clangs off the tin wall in right field, and good ‘ole Hack springs to life. He runs over, picks up the ball, and fires a strike to second base. Casey stomps back to the dugout. When he gets there, he says to the guys, “Look, don’t none of you say a word when Hack comes in. It’s the best play he’s made in two weeks.”

The moral of the story? Things are seldom what they appear to be. When in doubt, follow the Hack. Act decisively.

The Second Commandment: Even if you’re in a position of authority, you seldom have all the facts.

Durwood Merrill, the great American League umpire at five foot six and 280 pounds, looked more like a running guard for Oklahoma. I went into the umpire’s room one day, and Durwood said he had to tell me a story. In his words, it went like this:

You know that pitcher Nolan Ryan? I remember this game in 1976. I’m a rookie, getting the chance to umpire at home plate with Ryan on the mound for Anaheim, and the Yankees in town. Man, was I excited. I’m gonna ump with the great Nolan Ryan pitching.

So, the game starts, and Mickey Rivers is the lead-off batter for the Yankees. ‘Ole Nolan fires that ball, and I hear a whoosh, then a pop, as it hits the catcher’s mitt. I call, “Strike one.” Here comes the second pitch. I hear that whoosh again, and I hear the pop. But you know what? I never saw the pitch. It was that fast. So, I’m standing there thinking, what am I gonna do? At that moment, the catcher, Andy Etchebarren, yells at me, “Ump, do something. Call the pitch, call the pitch!”

Well, ‘ole Mickey backs out of the batter’s box a little bit. Everybody’s looking at me. And I said, “Oh, what the hell. Strike two.” With that, Mickey turns to me and says, “Don’t feel bad, ump. I didn’t see it either.”
The Third Commandment: *Leadership is politics. Identify the good people early on, and act accordingly.*

Here we go back to Casey Stengel. Casey was a bit of a philosopher, and one day he pointed to the 25 players on his team and said, “A manager knows at the outset of a season that five of those players will like him, and five will hate him. The challenge is to keep the two groups from getting together.”

Think about that.

The Fourth Commandment: *If someone is out to get you, get out of their way.*

The [Cincinnati] Reds had their all-star Roy McMillan starting at shortstop, and Rocky Bridges, a seldom-used player, at second base one game. They’re playing the Dodgers, and Gil Hodges, the team’s great first baseman, gets a single. Rocky tells this story of what happened next.

Here’s Hodges on first. I’m playing second. I don’t get to play much—I’m a little guy—and McMillan is at shortstop. Carl Furillo hits a ball into the hole between short and third for the Dodgers, and McMillan goes over to field it. I go to second anticipating a double play. I can hear Hodges—all six foot two and 215 pounds of him—barreling in from first. He sounds just like the 5:15 out of Grand Central. I knew I had to get out of there, but there’s a problem; McMillan can’t get the ball out of his glove. It was stuck. So here I am, standing at second base, with this freight train Hodges headed right for me—ka-chum, ka-chum. Finally, I yell over to McMillan, “Hey, big guy. If you ever get that ball clear, throw it to first. I’m getting the hell out of here.”

So, the principle is very clear: When someone’s out to get you, get the hell out of the way.

The Fifth Commandment: *Even if you’re the boss, don’t guess what’s coming.*

Mickey Mantle struck out over 1,700 times in his big league career. You might ask yourself, “How could Mickey Mantle remember one particular strikeout?” Trust me, he remembers. These are his words:

The Dodgers had the Yankees on the ropes, three games to none, in the ’63 World Series, with the great Sandy Koufax pitching game four. The Dodgers are ahead, two to one. I come up to bat in the ninth inning. Koufax gets two strikes on me. I know the next pitch is going to be a fastball, and I’m standing there thinking, I know I can hit Koufax’s fastball. I’m Mickey Mantle. In fact, I was trying to figure out how far I was going hit it. At that, ’ole Sandy winds up. I’m ready for that fastball. Instead, he lets out with the greatest left-handed curveball I had ever seen. The ball went way out, then came way back in. I was totally frozen. I didn’t move. I just leaned back and yelled, “No, no, no!” And the umpire yelled back at me, “Yes, yes, yes!”

So, if you’re the boss, don’t guess what’s coming. Even to leaders, the curveball is humbling.
The Sixth Commandment: *If you make a mistake, adjust. The same mistake twice is unforgivable.*

I’m with Ted Williams and Yogi Berra at the Baseball Hall of Fame in Cooperstown, and Williams says to me, “Did I ever tell you about the pop fly I hit against [the Yankees’] Allie Reynolds?” I had heard the story, but not from him. So I told him I’d love to hear it. He calls Yogi over, and lets loose with the following story:

Reynolds was a hell of a pitcher. He had already pitched one no-hitter this particular season, and was on the verge of a second playing against us. It’s the ninth inning, two men out, and I’m the last guy up. Reynolds is a fastball pitcher. I figure I’m going to get a hit. There won’t be two no-hitters with Ted Williams at the plate. Now, I very seldom swung at a bad pitch. But here comes a Reynolds’ fastball, right up under my chin. I swing and pop it straight up. Yogi is catching. He staggers around under the ball, and drops it. Actually drops it. So I get a second chance. So what does Reynolds do? He throws me the same pitch, maybe a little harder. And you know what? I swing and pop it up again. Yogi staggers around again, but this time Reynolds comes running in yelling at him. He catches the ball, and that’s the end of the game. A second no-hitter.

With the story over, Ted Williams turns to Yogi for assurance, and says, “Didn’t it happen?” And Yogi pipes up, “Oh, it happened. You want to hear my side of it?” I said, “Sure, Yogi.” So he continues:

When I dropped the first ball, [Yankees manager Casey] Stengel motioned for me to go out and talk to Reynolds. Reynolds was stomping around. He was hot. I wasn’t going out there. He calmed down enough to throw another pitch, and Williams hit it straight up. The next day the papers made a big deal about what a great scene it was, Reynolds running in to encourage me to catch the ball. Well, that’s not what happened. You know what he was yelling? He was yelling, “If you don’t catch that ball, idiot, I’m going to kill you!”

Yogi didn’t make the same mistake Williams did. He adjusted—and had no regrets.

The Seventh Commandment: *If you have the proper strategy, execute it. Don’t play around with alternatives.*

Bobby Thompson hit the single most significant home run in baseball history off Ralph Branca in the 1951 playoff game between the Giants and the Dodgers. Branca’s a great friend of mine, and he tells this story:

About six months after he gave up the home run, He goes to a sports dinner, and an eight-year-old kid comes up to him and asks, “Mr. Branca, what pitch did you throw to Mr. Thompson, and why did you throw it?” Ralph patiently says to the youngster, “Sonny, I knew I could get Bobby Thompson out with a curveball. But first, I wanted to throw a fastball up under his chin, move him back. Unfortunately, I got the fastball out over the plate, and he hit a home run. And you know what—I’ll never get over it.”

A little later that evening, Ralph gets another tap on the shoulder. It’s Sal Maglie, a great pitcher for the Giants and the Dodgers. He’s also curious about what he threw to Thompson, and asks,
“Weren’t you going to get him out with the curveball?” Ralph answers, “That was the plan. I knew he couldn’t hit my curveball.” And with that, Maglie throws his arms up in the air and says, “Look, if you’re gonna get him out with a curveball, throw him the curveball.”

Fifty years later, Ralph told me that simple piece of advice is still ringing in his ears. And it bears repeating: If you have the proper strategy, execute it. Don’t fool around with alternatives.

The Eighth Commandment: First impressions of people are risky. Don’t confuse style with result.

We can’t seem to get away from Yogi Berra. At the time of this next story, he’s a 17-year-old kid fresh from St. Louis, playing in Norfolk for the Yankees’ farm team during the war. He’s a dumpy-looking kid playing left field—if you can imagine Yogi out in left field.

In Norfolk during those days, a bunch of guys in the Navy went over at night to watch the Yankees’ farm team play. And they made fun of this little Italian kid in left field. They loved to razz him from the stands. One night as they’re driving home after the game, one of the guys, Freddy Hutchinson, who later became a tough old manager, says to his buddies in the back seat, “Hey, I got a question about that funny-looking kid in left field.” And they all said, “Yeah, Freddy, what is it?” And he said, “When are they going to get him out? He’s hitting .800.”

Freddy had it right. First impressions are risky. And if you use them to make judgments, you may confuse style with substance.

The Ninth Commandment: Sometimes your role in an organization must be secondary. You either accept the role or you move on.

Johnny Peske, a star with the Red Sox, asked me one day if he had ever told me about his “problem” as a ball player. I said “No,” and he proceeded to tell me the following story:

I was a hell of a hitter. But I batted just before Ted Williams, and the whole idea behind my role was to get on base for Ted. So whenever the count was three-and-oh or three-and-one, I always got the take sign from the coach. It used to drive me crazy because three-and-one is a hitter’s pitch. That’s the pitch you want to swing at.

One day we’re playing the Yankees. I’m up at the plate with a couple of guys on base, and the count goes to three-and-one. The pitcher throws me a fastball. Talk about a cripple. I couldn’t swing at it, of course, and the count goes to three-and-two. Next pitch, he throws a curveball that nobody could have hit. I strike out. I storm into the dugout, kick over the water, throw the bats. I’m doing a real tantrum. ‘Ole McCarthy, the manager, doesn’t say a word. Finally, I calm down, and McCarthy comes over and says, “Young man, I’ll see you in my office when the game is over.”

Reluctantly, I enter his office after the game, sit down, and here’s what he tells me: “Kid, on this ball club, the big guy, Williams, does the hitting. Your job is to get on base. He’ll drive you in. That’s the
way it’s going to be. You might not like it. But if you’re telling me you can’t do that job, then tomor-
row morning I’m shipping you off to St. Louis."

I got up and walked out without saying a word. It was clear I was never going to get the pitch I want-
ed to hit. But McCarthy made his point. If I wanted to be a member of the team, I had to know my
place—or go to St. Louis.

The Tenth (and final) Commandment: Never confuse brilliance with a bull market. Your genius
may depend on the performance of others.

Warren Spahn, one of the greatest pitchers ever, played for Casey Stengel in Boston when they had
a terrible team, and later on played for Casey with the Mets when they had a terrible team. In
between, Casey managed the Yankees, where he won all sorts of pennants and World Series.

I’ll always remember Warren Spahn’s comment about that relationship. “Think about it,” he said. “I
played for Casey before and after he was a genius.”

I’d like to conclude with some personal thoughts on Church leadership today. First of all, I’m a mem-
ber of a parish, like most of you. And at our particular parish, we found out the pastor can’t account
for a million and a half dollars. He allegedly wrote checks to cash for five hundred thousand of that.
This tells me we have a serious problem. And it’s not just that a theft possibly occurred, but that our
bishop seems unwilling to deal with the situation. I wrote the bishop and suggested that he use the
Leadership Roundtable to get some help. There’s no other institution in America that could get away
with this.

When I was a young man working for the SEC, I knew who the bad guys were. They were in the corpo-
rate world. Today, if the government believes that the Church is unable to deal with its problems—just
like corporate America with its runaway CEOs and with excesses—then the government will step in.
That’s not what we want. Either the Church gets its act straight, or guys who are smart and tough and
aggressive—like I was with the SEC—are going step in and get involved because they believe the Church
is unwilling to do the right thing.

My final point is this: There’s going to come a day when negligence, inattention, carelessness, stupidity,
if you will, will constitute a crime. We’re very close to it in the corporate world. And it will extend to the
Church, so that people will be indicted for things that you and I thought were just negligent. Mark my
words, it’s coming. And anyone who’s on the board of an institution with fiduciary responsibilities—
and I’m one of them—had better be careful. Because if the argument can be made that more attention
could have prevented a problem, then someone’s going to have to pay the price. The corporate world
is showing us what’s going to happen in the nonprofit world.
He pointed out that fourth base in baseball is not called fourth base. It’s called home. Why is that? Because home resonates so powerfully with all of us. . . . Home is the Church. . . . Baseball is about getting home. The Church is about getting home.

A friend of mine used to say that baseball is a perfect metaphor for life. He pointed out that fourth base in baseball is not called fourth base. It’s called home. Why is that? Because home resonates so powerfully with all of us.

Home is the Church. Home is the struggle to get around the bases, to get back to where you started, to count, to matter. If you get stranded on second base, you don’t matter. You don’t count. It’s only when you come home and your family, or fellow ballplayers, rush out to greet you, that you matter. This is what it’s all about. Baseball is about getting home. The Church is about getting home.
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Standards for Excellence: An Ethics and Accountability Code for the Catholic Sector

Kerry A. Robinson, Executive Director, National Leadership Roundtable on Church Management

As you’re all aware, one of our areas of focus is developing practical and helpful tools so that the Church can improve the management of its human and financial resources. It’s not enough to simply lament that things could be better. We must bring wonderful minds together to examine the problems and come up with solutions based on research, templates, guidelines, and advice that is practical for the Catholic Church.

To that end, we have identified an incredible document called Standards for Excellence: An Ethics and Accountability Code for the Non-Profit Sector, which was developed over a number of years by the Standards for Excellence Institute in Maryland. We have entered into a licensing agreement with the Institute because we believe their document could be profoundly helpful when applied to running the temporal affairs of a religious nonprofit organization such as the Church.

I want to pause for a second to thank Peter Berns and Amy Coates Madsen, who are with us today, from the Standards for Excellence Institute. They have been a delight to work with. As part of our licensing agreement, we have been given permission to apply the Standards — through the lens of canon law — to Catholic diocese, Catholic parishes, and Catholic nonprofits in the United States. It’s almost a miracle that we were able to do this. Making it possible was an extraordinary team staffed by Michael Brough from the Leadership Roundtable and a committee chaired by Sr. Pat Mitchell. We were also able to enlist the services of several canon lawyers, most notably Fr. John Beal from the Catholic University of America, who sits on our Board, and Barbara Anne Cusack, Chancellor of the Archdiocese of Milwaukee.

Specifically, Fr. John reviewed and adapted the document in light of canon law. After considerable work, he overcame my initial concerns by informing me that not only did the Standards not contradict canon law, in fact the Standards — if implemented and adhered to — actually strengthen and fulfill canon law.
In the Standards for Excellence, I believe we have something that is enormously helpful and valuable in addressing so many of the challenges we’ve spent the last two years identifying. We plan to officially launch the Standards, which are now in draft form, as our next valuable resource for the Church, and would like to hear your ideas on how they can be most effectively implemented.

Let me make a couple of points about the Standards themselves. First of all, they comprise eight guiding principles and fifty-five standards, and are intended to serve as benchmarks. We certainly don’t view ourselves, the Leadership Roundtable, as imposing these principles on the Church. Rather, they are a tool that we’ve taken great pains to ensure is compliant with canon law, and that holds all of us to the excellent standards our Church deserves. Just as importantly, the Standards for Excellence, when implemented, will go a long way toward removing many of the obstacles that tend to trip us up as dioceses, parishes, or Catholic nonprofit organizations.

It’s important to note that under the terms of our licensing agreement, the Leadership Roundtable must demonstrate that it is in fact compliant with the very standards we are urging the Church to adopt. At first, I must confess, I was a little nervous about how much work that would entail. But I can now tell you, it was a privilege to be able to sit down with this document and methodically—with the Leadership Roundtable staff and the Board—tick off all the areas where we were already compliant. It was tremendously affirming for us, as I trust it will be for the many dioceses, parishes, and nonprofits out there.

As for the areas where we were in some way deficient, the Standards for Excellence gave us the impetus to make the necessary changes and adjustments to ensure that we become compliant. In short, they have made the mission of the Leadership Roundtable and its day-to-day operation so much easier and more effective.

We really owe a huge debt of gratitude to the members of the Leadership Roundtable, the Board, and the Management Program Committee—all of whom worked so hard on this document. You have provided us with a wonderful resource that will make a big difference going forward.
Rev. J. Donald Monan, S.J.

I’ve been with the Leadership Roundtable since its beginning, and I don’t think there’s anything we’ve done that’s more important than publishing the *Standards for Excellence*. If our whole purpose is to help the Church professionalize its institutions and fulfill its financial, management, and personnel obligations, then this document becomes a small miracle.

On the other hand, some people may perceive the *Standards* as a threat. They tend to see “administration” or “management” as vague words; they don’t know exactly what they mean. Through the succinct document we’ll soon be introducing, however, you know exactly what’s being called for by these institutions. It’s being proposed by people who are respected, not only within the business world, but also within the ecumenical world, as evidenced by the efforts of Fr. John Beal and those who assisted him. For those reasons, it’s a document by which people can be judged on whether or not they’ve fulfilled their professional obligations.

So, in launching the *Standards for Excellence*, I think we must be very sensitive to the way the document will be received. We must make sure our efforts aren’t seen as trying to impose something from the outside, but rather as a sincere attempt to help the Church fulfill its obligations.
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Best Practices Awards

Francis Butler

Last year, the Leadership Roundtable honored lay leadership in the Archdiocese of Boston for its new level of financial reporting and for the amazing work it did to simplify and explain the Archdiocesan financial picture. We like to think the recognition we gave the Archdiocese of Boston, and the response it engendered on the part of parishes there, was at least partly behind the recent announcement that the Archdiocese will be completely out of debt next year. That’s quite an achievement.

Our focus last year, of course, was on financial practices, and the National Leadership Roundtable on Church Management Best Practices Awards were tied to that program. This year, the honorees reflect our emphasis on human resource development.

Our first honoree is the St. Vincent de Paul Society of Baltimore. Many of you already know a great deal about this organization. The national director, Roger Playwin—who’s here tonight—has been with us from the very beginning, and we’re so grateful to him.

The Society of St. Vincent de Paul is, fittingly, an association founded by laity. In 1833, eight men gathered together at the Sorbonne to begin this work and to formulate plans for a society whose object would be to minister to the needs of the poor of Paris. The mastermind of this project, which helped the history of modern charity, was Fredric Ozanam, a brilliant young French lawyer.

The St. Vincent de Paul Society of Baltimore is one of the first Catholic organizations to go through a process of accreditation with the Standards for Excellence Institute. It meant that they subjected their organization to eight guiding principles and 55 standards developed as performance benchmarks for nonprofits to strengthen their operations. We want to applaud their outstanding commitment to excellence that all this work reflects.

So it’s with great pleasure that I confer the Leadership Roundtable’s highest award to the St. Vincent de Paul Society of Baltimore for its compliance with the Standards for Excellence. To accept the award, John Schiavone, the Society’s executive director, will be accompanied by Stephanie Archer-Smith, the deputy director.

John Schiavone

Thank you very much. We are very deeply appreciative of this recognition. I have to say I’m a little uncomfortable being recognized for something I didn’t consider that extraordinary. However, Michael Brough thought our example might spur others to pursue and achieve Standards for Excellence certification. We certainly hope that’s the case.

Michael also asked that I spend a few minutes talking about our experience with the Standards. It was three years ago that we set as one of our strategic planning goals validating to our volunteers, our donors, and the general public, that we were a nonprofit organization that maintained high standards of excellence for operations and governance. We also wanted firm guidelines for achieving that.

I have to say that one of the challenges of obtaining certification is simply inertia—organizational inertia. An organization has to make it truly a priority and commit the resources and the work or the effort will languish.

I thought about pursuing certification for a number of years. I knew it was a good idea, but you get into a day-to-day operations mode and it tends to get pushed aside. It wasn’t until we had actually set certification as an objective in our strategic plan with a firm deadline that it became a priority.

Someone has to devote or designate resources to make it happen—or it won’t. Some parishes and dioceses have a lot further to go than others. I felt like we were probably 70 percent there already, but still needed that little push to get it all the way.

I can definitely attest to the value of this program. It puts the organization in the mode of constantly striving to achieve best practices and excellence in whatever we do. It’s a great tool for self-assessment and improvement. But actually earning the seal of certification, I think, is a great motivator and an important visual sign for any organization. I was very surprised after we got the seal to see how many people commented on it. Whether they learned about it through our newsletter, our Catholic newspaper, or whatever, they were impressed by it. And that includes donors, volunteers, and agency colleagues.
It was a source of pride and a morale booster for our management, staff, and board. We now use the seal wherever we can—on our letterhead, our web site, our annual report, our newsletter. At the end of every e-mail any staff member sends out is the postscript: “Proud to be recognized with the Seal of Excellence for excellence in governance and management.” It’s a constant, visible sign of what we strive to do as an organization in the pursuit of excellence. It says we’re an agency that people can place their trust in. That’s incredibly important to us, and I know to all of you, as well.

When I was young, before I would say goodnight to my mother each night, she would say, “Did you take your vitamin?” It was as if that 250 milligrams of vitamin C was somehow the miracle cure for everything.

I didn’t realize it at the time, but my mother was really practicing a form of preventative health care. By the same token, I think following best practices in terms of governance and management constitutes good, preventative health care for an organization. All organizations go through periods of good health, okay health, and illness. Just like the human body. Periods of sickness are inevitable. I think by taking good care of our organizations we won’t necessarily eliminate problems, but we can make our problems less frequent and less severe.

On a closing note, I think we all need to challenge our Catholic diocese, parishes, and organizations to simply “take their vitamins.”

Francis Butler

Our second honoree is the Center for Social Concerns at the University of Notre Dame. This coming year marks the 25th anniversary of the founding of that center. There’s a lot to celebrate.

The Center has engaged the hearts and the minds of Catholic college-aged people like no other place on the planet. It represents community-based research and learning, with the emphasis on Catholic social tradition in programs and courses. Ten percent of the students at Notre Dame do something after graduation in the field of public service. They work as school teachers in underserved areas. They serve as tutors. They work with the homeless. They’re community organizers. You can find them in Appalachia, in medical clinics, in urban areas. You can find them around the globe in Africa, the Middle East, Asia.

Center Director Father Bill Lies, who unfortunately could not be with us tonight, puts it this way: “The Center is in the business of transforming lives.”

The Center is a powerful catalyst for volunteerism with over 80 percent of the students at Notre Dame participating in programs of service. It is in the business of experimental learning and works cooperatively with many organizations around the globe—including religious orders, the National Bishops Conference, the Catholic worker movement, and colleges and universities—to propel some of the best and the brightest of our younger generation of leaders into Church and community service. We can think of no finer organization to lift up as a case of best practices in human resource
development than the Center for Social Concerns. It exemplifies the kind of enterprising vision that we’ve alluded to throughout this conference.

So, it again gives me great pleasure to present the National Leadership Roundtable on Church Management Best Practices Award to the Center for Social Concerns. Receiving the award will be our good friend, Father “Monk” Malloy.

**Rev. Edward Malloy**

This recognition has my personal history closely connected to it. When I was an undergraduate student, I heard a conversation down the hall in my dorm about a service project going on in Latin America during the summer-time. Because I was a scholarship athlete, I had the ability to use my summer that way. So I ended up going to Mexico, Peru, and Mexico again in three successive summers. At the time, the group that sponsored us was just a discussion group. After we came back and started to get the campus energized about our work, one thing led to another; over the years an office in the student center was opened and, eventually, a dedicated facility for the group that became known as the Center for Social Concerns. The Center now has 13 full-time employees, and has just received a grant to double the size of their facility, which they will share with the Institute on Church Life.

What I’ve discovered in the course of all of this is that the connection between Catholic social teaching and the kind of whole-person instruction we try to provide our students is critical. It’s often difficult to convince faculty that this is not a soft activity. But the more they’ve been inspired by what the students report when they return from their service, the more they’ve become engaged themselves. And as a result, we’ve tried to develop a model that gives students opportunities not just during the school year, but on vacation time, in the summer, and after graduation.

Clearly, the Center for Social Concerns has become a vehicle by which talent is recognized, and by which Catholic Christians are motivated. It enables us to draw a connection between a life of faith and a life of service. So on behalf of all of the wonderful people who work there, and the many students past and present who have benefited tremendously from their Center-sponsored engagements, I say thank you very much.
During this working lunch, I’d like to give you a preview of an exciting new product the Leadership Roundtable has developed.

One of the questions I heard from people who worked in small groups yesterday—especially with respect to the Standards for Excellence—was, “How are we going to deliver this?” I heard similar questions about the dissemination of best practices.

The answer, in a word, is networking. One of the greatest things I’ve experienced since joining the Leadership Roundtable is the networking of groups and people from all over the country. We decided to take further advantage of that power by creating a web site that could help us convey and share with the world the growing base of best practices knowledge and resources the Leadership Roundtable has compiled.

So, with a lot of hard work, we developed a web site that we’re launching today: churchEpedia.org. ChurchEpedia, as the name suggests, is a virtual encyclopedia of best practices in Church management, finance, and human resources. Just as importantly, it’s the vehicle by which the Leadership Roundtable will electronically deliver examples of best practices to parishes and dioceses across the country. On this site, you’ll find documents and supporting materials on the Standards for Excellence, for example. You’ll find many other categories of best practices, as well, with supportive material from about 275 organizations and initiatives.

Before I provide a short demonstration of churchEpedia, let me thank two people for their exceptional work. The first is Michael Costello, the Leadership Roundtable’s Director of Operations, who has been fantastic in supporting the development of churchEpedia. And the second is James Tatad. When I reached the ceiling of my technological capacity, I began looking for an intern with computer skills. I called Frank Macchiarola at St. Francis College in New York, and within 24 hours he had the names of
three great candidates for us. After interviewing each, we had the honor or hiring James, who graduated from St. Francis this spring. Much, if not all, of the credit for getting the site off the ground goes to James.

A couple of quick points about how churchEpedia.com works: as you can see, we tried to make it consistent with the Leadership Roundtable’s mission. It therefore addresses management, finance, and human resources. When you click on any one of those headings, you get a simple display showing the many products the Leadership Roundtable offers. We also have what we’re calling our “headlines” in best practices, which could be new studies from the Center for the Study of Church Management at Villanova University, for example, or other case studies that we found informative and potentially useful to the Church. We also have an area known as “Data Central,” which will become like Bloomberg News Service. There are wonderful information services out there, like CARA, and we hope to serve as a convenient point of access for this wealth of information through Data Central.

Another component we consider to be extremely important is feedback. ChurchEpedia is very much a data site; it will grow, and it will change. There will be things you like, and things you don’t. So one of the features we’ve included in our new site is, “Tell us what you think.” We would very much appreciate your thoughts and constructive criticisms.

The final area I’d like to cover briefly is interactivity. We want our site to be truly participatory so that everyone—members, nonmembers, people you know, even people you don’t know—have an easy way to submit examples of best practice to the Leadership Roundtable. We have three best practices committees—finance, management, and human resource development—that have agreed, in addition to their regular responsibilities, to serve as reviewers of all submissions.

As we look ahead, we’re encouraged by just knowing there’s a lot of good material out there. I think one of the weaknesses within the Church is that there’s no central clearinghouse for all this information. Unless you’re a director of human resources, say, and know precisely where to find it, you may never know about these valuable resources.

Our goal at the Leadership Roundtable is to provide easy access to all this good information through a single portal that’s constantly growing, constantly getting better. With the launch today of churchEpedia.org, we believe we’re well on our way toward that goal.
I want to thank all of you for your incredible leadership and your active participation, not only over the last couple of days, but since we began this mission a few years ago. I can’t tell you how inspiring it is to me personally and for all of us who are working on your behalf daily. I’d be remiss if I didn’t acknowledge and thank Kerry Robinson, John Eriksen, Michael Costello, Michael Brough, and all the folks on the Leadership Roundtable Board who have worked so hard to pull all of this together. I view all of you as the entrepreneurs of the Catholic Church.

I think we’ve had very high quality presentations over the last couple of days, but we still have a lot of wood to chop as a group. We’re going to persevere at that task, and hopefully feel that the contribution we’re making in terms of the quality of the work we’re turning out is worthwhile. It’s been very gratifying to hear some of the comments that have been made to us over the last couple of days. It sounds as though we’re making some significant progress at the foundational level, and at the programmatic level. People not only appreciate what we’re doing, but they’re starting to use it in a growing number of ways.

I’m also extremely thankful for the leadership of the bishops and other members of the Church hierarchy and the clergy present in this room, particularly those who are leading large institutions and organizations. Your leadership is indeed important because it allows us to address various issues and problems from a bottom-up and a top-down perspective.

The other thing I’d like to single out is Tom Tierney’s excellent comment about courage being the “secret sauce.” All of us have to continue to summon up that courage when it comes to speaking our minds and our hearts and putting our best forward in terms of developing approaches to solving some fairly serious problems that have gone unattended for a long time. Courage is something we should all think about and pray over and, when appropriate, summon up, because speaking the truth to people in power is a tough thing. The reason most of us are in this room today is because we’ve made that commitment part of our way of doing business. We do it in a thoughtful, appropriate, respectful way.
Another accomplishment we can be proud of is the fact we’ve recruited 178 of us to our mission. What’s more, we’re constantly growing. We’re trying to be very judicious about the diversity of our group, though I believe we suffer from not having enough women leaders. Nor do we have enough people of Hispanic background in the Leadership Roundtable.

Any suggestions you have in either of those categories would be extremely helpful to us. Indeed, we heard an eloquent presentation from Arturo Chavez on the importance of our Hispanic brothers and sisters, and how they represent the future growth of the Catholic Church. We simply have to do a better job of listening to them.

In addition to that, I was particularly taken by the comments yesterday from both Susan King and Bill McGarvey. We can’t afford as an organization to have a tin ear. We must be more thoughtful about integrating our younger brothers, sisters, and children into our organization, and taking advantage of the talents and experience of the wide range of people who would like to join our efforts.

With that in mind, the Board has decided to expand our organization by creating an associate membership category. While we continue to look for and bring in to the Roundtable at the council level a dynamic group of individuals who are essentially executive-level CEOs, COOs, and chair-level people in their organizations, both inside and outside the Church, we’re also aware of the tremendous talent that exists at other levels of organizations—people who can contribute to the committee work and the programmatic work we’re doing.

The associate member category addresses that reality. I urge you to take advantage of the nomination process we’ve put in place, then give us suggestions about people in your own sphere of influence you think could be helpful to us in that role.

Programmatically, I think you have a good sense of the two major goals we’re trying to accomplish at the Leadership Roundtable. The first is to create an atmosphere for embracing the notion of excellence and developing an attitude of trust and credibility, not only for the organization but for a lot of the messages we’re developing. That’s where our DVDs come into play. They’re now being distributed around the country and being used in more and more places. Even better, we’re getting a tremendous number of compliments and encouragement from people who have seen them.

The second thing we’re trying to accomplish is to create a roadmap for success and post benchmarks along the way through the Standards for Excellence we talked about yesterday. The Standards are meant to serve as guideposts for how we should be operating from both a governance and an accountability standpoint. We believe they provide us with a safe harbor from any legal exposure, as well as help us in terms of finding the capital to fund the activities we’ve been talking about.

We’ve heard over the last several days about what the funding community is demanding of the nonprofit world, whether it’s in a religious or a secular environment. Namely, that accountability and professional standards must be adhered to if funders are going to provide the largesse that the nonprofit world needs. That message is becoming louder and louder across the country. And because the Catholic
Church represents 25 percent of the country, it’s going to have to listen to—and effectively deal with—that message.

As all of us know, accountability is a good, professional way of doing business, a way of ensuring checks and balances. All the things we’ve heard over the last two days, and at meetings over the last several years, reinforce that notion. There’s no better example of this than the comments and suggestions that have been made about implementing the Standards for Excellence.

We’re essentially hearing two things. One is that as a group, we feel we need to do pilot programs in this area. I can assure you that we intend to do that. We’re very thankful that the bishops who are involved with us here have all committed to carrying out pilot programs in their dioceses.

We’ve asked all of you take the Standards for Excellence to your own organizations and boards of directors, to hopefully utilize these Standards, and to provide testimonials so that others looking to you for leadership will utilize them. And as you and a number of bishops have pointed out to us, there is a certain sense of urgency to this work because we don’t want to find ourselves in a situation like we did with the sex scandals—when we know there are elements within the system that aren’t working correctly.

We now have Standards. We have a way to protect ourselves, a way to teach ourselves how to operate. We don’t want to let these problems fester and come to the foreground. We need to be out in front of these issues. But at the same time, we don’t want to beat our chests and say to the world, “Look what we’ve contributed.” We view this as a gift to the Church, and to the nonprofit world. Hopefully, it will be viewed that way. We’re not going to be out there proclaiming, “This is the answer.” In truth, this is just another tool.

Several other accomplishments of which we’re proud include the Parishioner’s Guide to Understanding Parish Finances, which will soon be distributed throughout the system. Based on the positive reaction we’re getting from the financial end of the Church, we believe this document will be warmly welcomed. We also think that ChurchEpedia will be a very powerful tool. We urge everyone to come forward and tell us about your best practices, including things related to the Standards for Excellence, so that others can benefit from your wisdom, guidance, and experience.

As most of you know, we have four people on the Roundtable staff who have done an enormous amount of work. They’re also doing the consultancy work that you’ve heard us talk about in parishes and dioceses across the country. They are a highly talented and very hard working group of people, and from an organizational perspective we would like to increase their number.

We did a little comparison between ourselves and the Council of Foreign Relations. The Leadership Roundtable has four people and an annual budget of about $1 million. The Council has between 18 and 24 staff members, and an annual budget of between $15 million and $25 million—about 15 times larger than ours. So as you can see, we’re achieving a really good return on our investment in human capital, and I think everyone here should feel good about that. Given all the things we want to accomplish over the next several years, we believe we’re going to need a budget of $5 or $6 million over the next three years.
Another area under active discussion is developing a team of Leadership Roundtable fellows. Our goal is to find 10 to 15 people out of colleges or universities and bring them into our group as a way of exposing younger people and potential leaders to the temporal side of the Church. We plan to invest in a program like that over the next several years.

I want to emphasize that our next stage of development will be focused on leadership and investment in talent—in other words, how are we going to grow our talent to be actively involved in the Church? As we heard from our presenters, motivation, evaluation, and pay are crucial issues. I believe that a lot of imaginative thought has to go into these areas—and I commit to you that the Leadership Roundtable will be doing just that. As part of that process, we will be calling on many of you to help us gain insights into how you and your organizations have handled some of these issues. Let’s see if we can come up with creative solutions together.

Also at the top of our agenda is the need to figure out ways to speak to our young people. That’s why the BustedHalo concept we heard about from Bill McGarvey is so important. We need to identify other organizations that can offer us counsel and keep us up to date on important and timely issues.

Finally, let me take this opportunity to single out an individual who has been a stalwart to us and, to my mind, hasn’t gotten enough recognition for his efforts. That person is Tom Healey. He’s been here from the time we conceived this organization and has been behind the quality and the thought processes you see reflected in outstanding meetings like the one we’ve had over the last several days. I want to thank Tom very much for the wisdom, judgment, and valuable contacts he’s brought to the Leadership Roundtable. He’s been extremely generous with his time, energy, and financial contributions, and we’re all very grateful for that.

I mentioned earlier that I consider all of you to be entrepreneurs of the Catholic Church. A friend of mine, Teddy Forstmann, just celebrated the 25th anniversary of the founding of his firm. Those of us who were involved with him over the years got this great silver plaque, which I’ve placed on the coffee table in my office. Inscribed on it is the definition of an entrepreneur that I think is particularly germane to what we’ve done here. It reads: “The entrepreneur, as a creator of the new and a destroyer of
the old, is constantly in conflict with convention. He inhabits a world where belief precedes results and where the best possibilities are usually invisible to others. His world is dominated by denial, rejection, difficulty and doubt. Although as an inventor he is increasingly imitated when successful, he always remains as an outsider to the establishment. He is usually found disturbing, irritating, and even unemployable periodically.”

And so, as entrepreneurs of the Catholic Church, I commend all of you. I want to thank you deeply for your hard work, your dedication, and the inspiration you’ve provided.
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