

Diocesan Listening Sessions – Overview and Findings (March 2023)

Reflection from The Rt. Rev. Bishop Robert Fitzpatrick:

Aloha, My Siblings in Christ Jesus,

As you review the findings of the Listening Team (Kim Arakawa, Tim Bostock, and Phyllis Miller), I am certain you will join me in offering the Team our profound thanks. As three lay members of Diocesan Council, they have talked with the lay and clergy leaders of this Diocese over the course of many months. They have spent hours on Zoom talking with us and collating and analyzing data about our hopes and concerns as a Diocese. Some interviews took place during the height of the Pandemic lockdown and others as we return to our “new” normal. Their work offers us an invaluable snapshot into the life of our Diocese today.

Personally, after reviewing this finding report (and the aggregated/anonymous data from which it is drawn), I felt positive about the responses – especially about the Pandemic – despite primarily being collected during the “shutdown,” folk seemed resilient and engaged. Likewise, I feel positive about our response to the COVID crisis (I was recently told that the Honolulu Roman Catholic Diocese followed what we shared and set policy based on what we issued/directed). Overall, relationships seem hopeful, and folk want more. I learned long ago that sometimes the downside of our Church’s polity is that having a “bishop” and having a “diocese” makes an individual, or a seemingly disembodied system, the focus of anxiety. That generally does not seem to be the case in our Diocese. For that, I am grateful. Thank you.

So, as we review this report, for Council, the issues of budget reorganization are keen in the short term. For the Diocese – for all of us – it is about taking stock of where we are in this new “normal” and what is God’s mission for us today. As you reflect on the findings in this Listening Team report and then have conversations together, I hope you’ll challenge one another and me. I hope you will pray and discern together. I pray we, together, can set a course to fulfill God’s mission for us as the Diocese of Hawai‘i.

Kim, Tim, and Phyllis: MAHALO!

Bishop Bob

SUMMARY OF PROCESS:

From April 2021 through June 2022, three members of Diocesan Council (Phyllis Miller, Tim Bostock, and Kim Arakawa) conducted 63 listening sessions across the diocese with the intent of providing a grace-filled space to discover emerging concerns and innovative ideas, as well as celebrate joyful successes. Over 80 listening hours, and through the review of 245 pages of transcripts, 36 clergy and 177 lay participants (63 male/114 female) shared thoughts on seven (7) open-ended questions centered on *loss, call, support, spiritual food, identity, community, and joy*. In addition, the sessions offered participants the opportunity to wonder together – *What is God Calling us to do? Who is God Calling us to be?*

Since concluding the sessions, the Listening Team has analyzed all responses – organizing the information into a two-step process: **DATA and FINDINGS**.

- The extensive data reports (broken down into clergy/lay, parish/mission, O’ahu & Neighbor Island subgroups) total 70 pages of aggregated/anonymous data. This information has been made available to diocesan leadership for further discernment around next faithful steps.
- **The Findings report is what you have here – two pages of finding summaries per question (14 pages total) – providing the reader a general numeric overview of the data and areas of consensus from respondents.** To organize the replies in a meaningful and useful format, we have used a *grounded theory* approach – allowing the data to suggest patterns that align with categories/thematic groupings – “Emergent themes.” Note – some groupings have natural overlaps.

WHAT YOU WILL NOTICE:

1. Each report section begins with the **Theme/Question:**
 - **LOSS:** What may no longer be possible – have you been able to name and grieve this (these) loss(es)?
 - **CALL:** What is God calling you to now – what is arising that you did not hear or see before?
 - **SUPPORT:** What support do you need to manage any anxiety or obstacles that come with these uncertain times – freeing you to attend to the Holy in your own lives?
 - **FOOD:** What feeds you spiritually – bringing you closest to God? (worship, piety, service, sacrament, word, study...others)
 - **IDENTITY:** How has your identity shifted in your individual and communal call - Why do you follow Jesus?
 - **COMMUNITY:** How are you being called to be in greater community – with other churches and organizations in your area?
 - **JOY:** Where have you found joy amidst the challenges of 2020-2022 - what are the successes you are celebrating as you reflect on this most unusual pandemic time?
2. Next – you will see “**Numeric Data**” accompanied by data across a spectrum of responses generally organized by O’ahu (O); Neighbor Island (NI); Parish/Mission.
3. The middle section of the report gives a breakdown of the “**Emergent Themes**” that arose. This data shows how many Faith Communities (FC’s) responded with this theme and how many were from the neighbor islands (NI). Areas of bold indicate places of large consensus.
4. Finally – **Overarching Questions** were posed – and then, where consensus was identified around what works, where there are systemic stresses, what may be missing or not affirmed, and helpful “a-has” – the data appears on the chart for your review.

MAHALO

The listening team feels blessed to have been given the opportunity to be in relationship in such meaningful ways. We felt that each session had value in itself as they were always enlightening and sometimes even cathartic – we were certainly enlivened and inspired by the process. We hope this report not only offers a review of what has been illuminating and fruitful but expands into deeper opportunities for reflection, dialogue, discernment, and collaboration within our faith communities and across the diocese in the months and years to come. ***How do we continue to listen? How are we willing to be transformed?***

In gratitude: Phyllis Miller, Tim Bostock, and Kim Arakawa

LOSS – FINDINGS

Question: What may no longer be possible – have you been able to name and grieve this (these) loss(es)?

Numeric Data: Before anonymization/aggregation, each faith community's responses to question one (1) were reviewed to gauge the depth of perceived loss for their groups. **Three main areas arose: Grieving; Anxious; Adaptive.** Note: grief and anxiety were understandably higher for those interviewed earlier in the pandemic.

- Grieving (2021) = 10 / (2022) = 5; total 15
- Anxious (2021) = 4 / (2022) 4; total 8
- Adaptive (2021) = 8 / (2022) 3; total 11

Grieving (15) | Anxious (8) | Adaptive (11)

Note: Adaptive respondents, regardless of year, seemed to have a clearer sense of community identity and/or increased willingness to live into uncertainty.

Emergent Themes

Absence – 12 comments total: 9 FC's (4NI)

Anxiety – 17 comments total: 12 FC's (5NI)

Grief – 65 comments total: 26 FC's (9NI)

[47FC's (18NI) – 94 comments]

Change – 19 comments total: 12 FC's (3NI)

Opportunity – 16 comments total: 11 FC's (1NI)

[23FC's (4NI) – 35 comments]

Relationship – 55 comments: 22 FC's (9NI)

Note: Themes around Absence, Anxiety, and Grief made up a large portion of responses. Of the 55 comments within relationship – many leaned toward lament, as welcomed by the question, naming the importance of and desire for connection. Change/Opportunity comments were grounded in adaptive/resilient thinking.

Overarching Questions:

- Is there clear consensus on what **works**?
- What are the systemic **stresses**?
- Is there anything among clergy leadership that we are **missing/not affirming**?
- Is there anything among lay leadership that we are **missing/not affirming**?
- Are there any deep **a-ha's**?

WORKS	1. Communities who could flex more with the uncertainty – leaned more toward adaptation. They saw the opportunities while still naming what was challenging.
STRESSES	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. [Absence/Grief] Lack of connection, whether through physical absence or spiritual disconnection, deeply affects faith communities. Trauma around deaths, esp. of long-time parishioners, during Covid that were not properly mourned may need to be explicitly named/addressed. 2. [Anxiety/Grief] A lack of “returning to normal” has created low-grade anxiety. On-going Covid issues coupled with continued reported church decline weighs heavy on many. Covid laid bare the systemic issues of disconnection from one another – disunity of values and needs. Over-reliance on individuals to do the work of the many creates undue stress. Stress is also incurred by holding on to ministries that no longer have enough volunteers to be healthfully sustained. 3. [Relationship] Holding tight to an insular model of being church creates stagnation and decline.
MISSING/Not Affirming (Clergy)	1. [Change] Opportunity to celebrate – clergy who embraced strengths of online technology, creating contextual worship experiences that increased connection.

	2. [Change] Opportunity to celebrate – clergy/lay leaders who find ways to dialogue around tensions – building bridges of community.
MISSING/Not Affirming (Lay)	1. [Change] Opportunity to celebrate – kūpuna who stretched themselves, engaging in new ways of being through technology. 2. [Change] Opportunity to celebrate – clergy/lay leaders who find ways to dialogue around tensions – building bridges of community. 3. [Relationship] Opportunity to celebrate – Connection really matters to laity. (38 responses to clergy 17)
A-Ha's	1. [Anxiety/Grief] Naming and learning how to live with uncertainty – learning how to hold an ongoing mixture of chaos alongside order is key. Building back the ability to connect across difference is vital. 2. [Change] Some clergy reported finding a spaciousness and rhythm they didn't realize they lacked in the busy before-pandemic times – how to ensure clergy have the space necessary for their own spiritual health and growth? 3. [Change] Online formats resonate with many people – the flexible design can be a powerful source for connection and growth. 4. [Opportunity] Liturgical variety can breathe vitality into a community. 5. [Opportunity] Hybrid identity – in-person/online – increased ministry opportunities. 6. [Relationship] Embodied experiences matter. Standing, kneeling, passing the peace, engaging the senses, hugging, casually chatting, cooking, serving...

CALL – FINDINGS

Question: What is God calling you to now – what is arising that you did not hear or see before?

Numeric Data: Before anonymization/aggregation, each faith community's responses to question two (2) were reviewed to gauge areas of primary focus. **Three main areas arose: Inward, Outward, and Mixed.** Note: *Inward* communities reported calls to support the needs of their congregation; *Outward* groups spoke to calls for engagement outside their immediate faith community, and those who reported *Mixed* calls reported a balance between the two.

Inward: O=11 (6 parishes/ 5 missions); NI=8 (5 parishes/ 3 missions)

Outward: O=2 (1 parish /1 mission); NI=1 (1 mission)

Mixed: O=7 (4 parishes/ 3 missions); NI=5 (1 parish/4 missions)

Inward (19) | Outward (3) | Mixed (12)

Emergent Themes

Justice – 2 comments total: 2 FC's – both O'ahu

Change – 4 comments total: 4 FC's (1NI)

Flexibility – 5 comments total: 4 FC's (3NI)

Formation – 9 comments total: 8 FC's (3NI)

Stewardship – 24 comments total: 15 FC's (6NI)

Service – 28 comments total: 12 FC's (6NI)

Online – 34 comments total: 16 FC's (9NI)

Engagement – 41 comments total: 19 FC's (6NI)

Relationship – 54 comments total: 22 FC's (8NI)

Insights – 63 comments total: 24 FC's (11NI)

Note: Faith Communities (FC's) who heard and responded to calls for inward nurturance alongside outward community engagement reported less overall anxiety and grief. These "mixed" groups tended to see and live into opportunities within the uncertain times.

Note: Emergent Themes for this question are organized by greatest response energy – from least to most comments received.

Justice was the least reported call.

Engagement and relationship were major response areas across the diocese – primarily around growing the church community.

Overarching Questions:

- Is there clear consensus on what **works**?
- What are the systemic **stresses**?
- Is there anything among clergy leadership that we are **missing/not affirming**?
- Is there anything among lay leadership that we are **missing/not affirming**?
- Are there any deep **a-ha's**?

WORKS

1. **[Engagement]** Broadening the ability to connect either online, by collaborative efforts and community partnerships, or through the reduction of silos.
2. **[Insight]** Honoring the importance of, and making time for, contemplation, discernment, listening, re-examination, and rest.
3. **[Insight]** Pre-recorded offerings often work better for an online format.
4. **[Online]** – increases accessibility, especially reported by rural and other geographically disbursed parishioners, or those with mobility challenges. (Much consensus that online is a mostly positive addition – esp. by neighbor island communities).
5. **[Online]** Hybrid church can be impactful, and online giving can be powerful.
6. **[Service]** Faith communities who felt called to expand or start feeding ministries during the pandemic found increased meaning and purpose as they lived into the gospel.

STRESSES	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. [Engagement] Clergy reported a larger need for lay engagement across the church, however, laity struggle with lack of capacity to do so. 2. [Engagement] There is a broad lay consensus that low youth presence/participation is concerning – however, no reported clarity on what youth need or want. 3. [Insight] Systemic weaknesses were laid bare during the pandemic – creating much to hold for clergy. 4. [Online] Lack of tech support, concerns over how to transform use of online platforms to a post-Covid environment while still retaining gained engagement – esp. reported by neighbor island laity. 5. [Relationship] A lack of relational connection to people within church community, or others in the greater community creates stress. 6. [Stewardship] Deferred maintenance and lack of admin support is very challenging – stewardship is an increased concern for laity at missions.
MISSING/ Not Affirming (Clergy)	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. [Online] Services and other online formation opportunities increase ministry reach – also can dramatically increase management logistics and workload for clergy. 2. [Relationship] Many clergy would like to build closer fellowships /partnerships /collaborative opportunities with one another.
MISSING/ Not Affirming (Lay)	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. [Formation] Clergy noted that many parishioners connected on a level they had not reached before. Laity noted how important different modes of connection became for them: meditation, prayer, Bible study, time in creation. 2. [Insight] Laity are wanting to bring what is done on Sunday out into the world – they are reporting a disconnect.
A-Ha's	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. [Change] Clergy reported a “deepening” of call due to pandemic challenges. 2. [Flexibility] Lay prayer leaders/officiants allowed for greater engagement and reduced burn-out. 3. [Formation] Focusing on beingness before doing-ness grows a healthier church. 4. [Insight] There is a disconnect between older/younger generations on what church means, how church connects one to Spirit and Community. 5. [Insight] Cultivating a ministering congregation is vital to living into the call for relationship. 6. [Insight] We are often risk adverse and afraid of disruption – this can create stagnation. 7. [Insight] Some people focus better online, are able to hear better, and feel they can participate more fully. 8. [Justice] This was the least mentioned call for respondents, at two comments. 9. [Relationship] This was the second highest response area – but little cohesion on how to go about forming deeper relationships – much consensus on the desire to do so. 10. [Service] As Covid recedes, many groups are looking to restart or engage community partners for manpower, donations, certified kitchens etc... – recognizing that being open to what the greater community is asking for is loving thy neighbor while also expanding relationships. Lay respondent: “We need to understand the needs of the larger community and listen to how we can help. How can the church help the whole community get better?” Interfaith initiatives are also part of upcoming ministry plans. 11. [Engagement & Relationship] Engagement =13 Clergy Comments vs. 28 Lay; Relationship =21 Clergy comments vs. 33 lay. All felt each was important. Clergy comments focused on parish-centered work; laity comments leaned more toward outward efforts/desires.

SUPPORT – FINDINGS

Question: What support do you need to manage any anxiety or obstacles that come with these uncertain times – freeing you to attend to the Holy in your own lives?

Numeric Data: Before anonymization/aggregation, each faith community's responses to question three (3) were reviewed to gauge satisfaction with the diocese, specifically, respondents' feelings around perceived support offered from/desired of the Diocesan Support Center. **Six levels emerged from the data:** *dissatisfied; disconnected; neutral; generally favorable; overall favorable; and very favorable.*

- [3] Dissatisfied: O=3 (2 parishes / 1 Mission)
 [4] Disconnected: O= 2 (1 parish / 1 mission); NI= 2 (1 parish / 1 mission)
 [7] Neutral: O= 5 (2 parishes / 1 mission); NI= 2 (1 parish / 1 mission)
 [6] Gen. Favorable Neutral: O= 3 (2 parishes / 1 mission); NI= 2 (2 parishes)
 [11] Overall Favorable: O= 3 (3 parishes / 5 missions); NI= 3 (3 missions)
 [5] Very Favorable: O= 1 (1 mission); NI= 4 (1 parish / 3 missions)

Note: The meaning of “satisfaction” varied. For some faith communities, it meant financial and administrative support, for others it centered on engagement and relationship. One parish had a split between clergy and laity, with clergy feeling overall favorably supported, but laity feeling dissatisfied. Those placed in the neutral category either had very few comments to offer, with a balance of need and appreciation, or they were a parish with expansive internal support systems and a low need for diocesan resources.

Dissatisfied (3) | Disconnected (4) | Neutral (7) | Generally Fav. (6) | Overall Fav. (11) | Very Favorable (5)

Emergent Themes

Formation – 6 comments total: 5 FC's – O'ahu only
Ministry – 6 comments total: 3 FC's (1NI)
Infrastructure – 7 comments total: 5 FC's (1NI)
Pastoral – 8 comments total: 8 FC's (1NI)
Communication – 9 comments total: 7 FC's (1NI)

Technology – 15 comments total: 9 FC's (5NI)
Administration – 16 comments total: 12 FC's (8NI)
Financial – 22 comments total: 12 FC's (5NI)
Relationship – 45 comments total: 22 FC's (11NI)

Note:

The data shows a disconnect between desiring a low assessment rate alongside increased DSC support. There is also a reported lack of clarity around what the DSC should be assisting with and what is the responsibility of the faith community.

Overarching Questions:

- Is there clear consensus on what **works**?
- What are the systemic **stresses**?
- Is there anything among clergy leadership that we are **missing/not affirming**?
- Is there anything among lay leadership that we are **missing/not affirming**?
- Are there any deep **a-ha's**?

WORKS

1. **[Admin]** Diocesan training for lay ministry.
2. **[Financial]** Stated preference for ongoing 15% assessment. Many respondents felt more connected to the diocese and more able to invest in deferred maintenance and mission due to the financial relief.
3. **[Ministry]** Outreach programs are successful if adequately supported, administratively/financially – may need diocesan assistance to do so.
4. **[Relationship]** When Clergy and Lay feel responsiveness, guidance, and pastoral support from DSC.

STRESSES	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. [Admin] Clergy reported great concern around how much pastoral/ministerial time is taken up by administrative needs (paperwork), not to mention infrastructure challenges like clogged toilets, and leaky roofs. Laity also remarked on the stress incurred by managing admin. Both desire more efficiencies and support from DSC, esp. around required paperwork. 2. [Communication] Inconsistent policy changes and lengthy messaging from DSC increases overwhelm and confusion. 3. [Financial] Many lay respondents noted concern over who has the knowledge and capacity within their communities to be administratively responsible – few volunteers or succession possibilities. 4. [Infrastructure] Physical plant concerns – without guidance, anxiety increases. 5. [Pastoral] Concern that too much is asked of too few – volunteer burnout. 6. [Relationship] “Parochialism” seen as challenge. 7. [Relationship] Disconnection between faith communities and the diocese. 8. [Relationship] O’ahu-centric – concern reported that the Neighbor Islands give much but feel they receive little, lack of mutuality. 9. [Relationship] Laity feel they need more clarity on what support the diocese can provide, as well as more consistency in walking alongside them to resolve their concerns.
MISSING/ Not Affirming (Clergy)	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. [Pastoral] Clergy need/deserve pastoral support. 2. [Pastoral] Regular sabbath for clergy is vitally needed. 3. [Relationship] Desire for increased collegiality/consistent interaction with fellow clergy.
MISSING/ Not Affirming (Lay)	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. [Pastoral] For faith communities dependent on supply priests – there is a clear desire for a regular presence. 2. [Pastoral] Congregations really named feeling traumatized by Covid/PTSD – needing to address the ramifications of those feelings. 3. [Relationship] Laity report a desire to know Bishop Bob on a deeper level – more relationality.
A-Ha’s	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. [Communication] A lay respondent felt the DSC provided good support but noted that “the hours they are offered tend to be during the regular workday.” [Formation] Suggestion for the DSC to be “more unconventional” – offering trainings, and perhaps diocesan-wide online formation offerings for spiritual growth, at varied times, pulling from multiple parishes. 2. [Infrastructure] Pooling resources can reduce anxiety and expenses – bulk buying, vetted contractors, established partnerships – general sharing of contacts/best practices organized by DSC.

FOOD – FINDINGS

Question: What feeds you spiritually – bringing you closest to God? (worship, piety, service, sacrament, word, study...others)

Numeric Data: Before anonymization/aggregation, each faith community's responses to question four (4) were reviewed to gauge areas of primary spiritual nourishment. **Three main areas arose: Internal, External, and Mixed.** Note: *Internal* communities reported feeling nourished and closest to God through contemplative and prayerful practices; *External* groups spoke to feeling nourished and connected through engagement with the greater community, and those *Mixed* groups reported a balance between the two.

[22] Internal: O=18 (9 parishes/ 9 missions); NI=4 (2 parishes/ 2 missions)

[1] External: O=1 (1 parish); NI=0

[11] Mixed: O=2 (1 parish/ 1 mission); NI=9 (4 parishes/5 missions)

Internal (22) | External (1) | Mixed (11)

Emergent Themes

Building – 5 comments total: 4 FC's (2NI)
Reflection – 7 comments total: 6FC's (2NI)
Sacrament – 12 comments total: 11FC's (3NI)
Prayer – 20 comments total: 14 FC's (7NI)
Creation – 22 comments total: 14 FC's (6NI)
Singing/Music – 22 comments total: 13FC's (6NI)
Worship – 24 comments total: 15FC's (6NI)
Service – 32 comments total: 13 FC's (7NI)
Study – 39 comments total: 23FC's (9NI)
Relationship – 54 comments total: 26 FC's (10NI)
Insights – 18 comments total: 13FC's (4NI)

Note: Faith Communities (FC's) who described a mixture of internal practices to cultivate being-ness alongside the external work of doing-ness, communicated adaptive and resilient community practices. For many groups, an internal focus was necessary during Covid as they sought to strengthen practices of presence and reflection.

Note: Service, Study, and Relationship received the most comments. **Service** had an equal distribution of responses from lay O'ahu and lay NI. 30 of 39 comments about **Study** came from O'ahu respondents. There was great energy around cultivating **Relationships** – and a multitude of varied thoughts on how to go about doing so = relationship is contextual.

Overarching Questions:

- Is there clear consensus on what **works**?
- What are the systemic **stresses**?
- Is there anything among clergy leadership that we are **missing/not affirming**?
- Is there anything among lay leadership that we are **missing/not affirming**?
- Are there any deep **a-ha's**?

WORKS	
	1. [Creation] Both Clergy and Lay, O'ahu and NI, reported feeling close to God by being present to God's creation(s) / taking part in outside activities which connect to God through nature.
	2. [Prayer] Many reported feeling centered through a daily prayer practice, often the daily offices, or prayer groups.
	3. [Relationship] Creating opportunities for deep and meaningful relationships to root and flourish.
	4. [Service] Food related ministries and thrift shops give those engaged in the service purpose, meaning, and a connection to God and neighbor through the work.
	5. [Singing/Music] Integrating singing/music into the life of the community.
	6. [Study] Small group Bible studies and the Daily Office have fed communities and grown relationships through reflection and story sharing.
	7. [Study] Expended exposure to the Daily Office increases desire to study the Bible.

	8. [Worship] Being able to worship in-person through liturgical practices is meaningful and important to many.
STRESSES	1. [Insight] A lay respondent summed up many comments over the course of the listening sessions with this insight: “To be honest, the business of [my church] interferes with my spirituality. Going into the sanctuary makes me think of repairs.” – Another lay comment noted: “Many feel they are spinning wheels so much we can’t focus on our spirituality.”
MISSING/ Not Affirming (Clergy)	1. [Prayer] When administration and governance take up too much time in a clergyperson’s day, they get less “real ministry moments.”
MISSING/ Not Affirming (Lay)	No data for this section.
A-Ha’s	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. [Building] Five people commented that being in the church building brought them closer to God. Most respondents, however, did not mention this as a major connection point. 2. [Relationship] Covid highlighted the opportunity to redefine what it means to be in community and to worship. 3. [Sacrament] Seven (7) laity commented on the importance of the sacrament as a means to feel connected to God. However, most respondents did not mention this as a major connection point. 4. [Service] Of the 13 faith communities that spoke of service, most centered on serving the greater community, with 25 of the 32 comments rising from laity, equally distributed between O’ahu/Neighbor Island, and Parish/Mission. 5. [Worship] Beach Mass was highly-commended by those who have experienced it. 6. [Insight] Online giving platform – Tithe.ly is a useful addition for stewardship.

IDENTITY – FINDINGS

Question: How has your identity shifted in your individual and communal call - Why do you follow Jesus?

Numeric Data: Before anonymization/aggregation, each faith community's responses to question five (5) were reviewed to gauge areas of identity shifts/call. **Three main areas arose: Same; Transitioning; and Deepening.** Those communities reporting "*Same*" reported no shifts in identity or call; *Transitioning* groups spoke to feeling nourished in the process of change to meet new and emerging calls, and *Deepening* groups reported a noticeable shift – expanding on previous calls in deeper ways.

[3] Same: O=3 (2 parishes/ 1 mission); NI=0

[18] Transitioning: O=10 (2 parishes / 8 missions); NI=8 (3 parishes / 5 missions)

[13] Deepening: O=8 (7 parishes/ 1 mission); NI=5 (2 parishes/3 missions)

Same (3) | Transitioning (18) | Deepening (13)

Emergent Themes

Relationship – 56 comments total: 27 FC's (13NI)

Awareness – 41 comments total: 21 FC's (8NI)

Faith – 35 comments total: 21 FC's (8NI)

Grounded – 34 comments total: 21 FC's (10NI)

Reevaluation – 24 comments total: 13 FC's (8NI)

Social Justice/Action – 3 comments total: 2 FC's (1NI)

Note: Shifts in identity and call are very contextual, and often, individual. A place of great consensus centered around slowing down, allowing for deeper reflection and reevaluation. Most groups reported feeling movement in their lives and communities.

Once again, social justice ranked lowest in responses. There seems to be a clear disconnect between valuing social justice work and taking action.

Overarching Questions:

7. Is there clear consensus on what **works**?
8. What are the systemic **stresses**?
9. Is there anything among clergy leadership that we are **missing/not affirming**?
10. Is there anything among lay leadership that we are **missing/not affirming**?
11. Are there any deep **a-ha's**?

WORKS	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. [Awareness] Patience and Listening. 2. [Awareness] Making space for prayer, contemplation, and reflection. 3. [Faith] Putting Jesus at the center of everything a worshipping community does. 4. [Faith] Increasing lay Bible knowledge and the practice of theological reflection. 5. [Grounded] Being rooted in a Hawaiian identity is very meaningful for some faith communities – creating possibilities for growth. 6. [Relationship] Hybrid approaches to formation.
STRESSES	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. [Awareness] Old wounds that need healing. 2. [Relationship] Lack of embodied presence during height of the pandemic – missing in-person experiences. 3. [Relationship] The same few people taking on the activities and responsibilities of church life. 4. [Re-evaluation] Worries over people not returning to church – opportunity to ask the question, "Why not," and to get clear on who a faith community is/why they do what they do.
MISSING/	No data for this section.

Not Affirming (Clergy)	
MISSING/ Not Affirming (Lay)	1. [Awareness] Opportunity to celebrate – The diocese has many strong, resilient, and capable lay leaders.
A-Ha's	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. [Faith] For many, the pandemic strengthened and deepened faith. 2. [Relationship] Pre-recorded services geared toward the intentional strengths of the online format allow for greater intimacy and connection due to it being more participatory and less observational. (It does, however, take a tremendous amount of planning and production time). 3. [Relationship] Live-streaming and other forms of online engagement expanded the awareness of the church beyond the walls. 4. [Relationship] Lay Respondents from Neighbor Island missions had much to share around being in relationship with each other and the greater community. 5. [Relationship] One lay respondent shared: "We don't have to be large in numbers, but we need to be strong in faith." 6. [Relationship] "Because of COVID, people are looking for answers from people of faith, and are even willing to allow you to pray for them." – This lay person reported the importance of moving past one's comfort zone when talking to others about one's faith. 7. [Re-evaluation] Lay leaders must be allowed to discern what they want to do, not just what they feel obliged to do. 8. [Re-evaluation] Important to invite decisions through contextual lens. 9. [Re-evaluation] "Outwardly focused folk have a hard time sitting with their own thoughts." 10. [Re-evaluation] "There can be two perspectives – honoring and holding decades of experience/practice and the hope of new ways to minister to people." 11. This question showed dramatic shifts in identity and call for laity alongside a deepening of identity/call for clergy.

COMMUNITY – FINDINGS

Question: How are you being called to be in greater community – with other churches and organizations in your area?

Numeric Data: Before anonymization/aggregation, each faith community's responses to question six (6) were reviewed to gauge feelings of community connection. **Three main areas arose: High, Medium, or Low Community Connection.** Those communities reporting “*High*” indicated a great understanding of and engagement with their greater community; *Medium* groups spoke to a growing connection with those outside their immediate faith community, and *Low connection* groups reported a focus on the current needs within their church.

[16] **High:** O=7 (4 parishes/ 3 missions); NI=9 (3 parishes/ 6 missions)

[5] **Medium:** O=3 (2 parishes / 1 mission); NI=2 (1 parish / 1 mission)

[12] **Low:** O=10 (6 parishes/ 4 missions); NI=2 (0 parishes/2 missions)

High (16) | Medium (5) | Low (12)

Emergent Themes

Change – 1 comment total: 1 FC – NI
Justice – 1 comment total: 1 FC – O’ahu only

Online – 7 comments total: 4 FC’s (2NI)
Insights – 13 comments total: 7 FC’s (2NI)
Engagement/Service/Relationship
– 79 comments total: 32 FC’s (13NI)

Note: Most responses were church specific and therefore hard to anonymize. Those with low connection had outreach/inter-faith in the past, but either due to Covid, an aging community, and/or lack of leadership, are in a season of reconfiguration. Those with high connection found ways to do things differently – and often created new partnerships within their communities. Of interest: most NI communities have cultivated a deep level of integration with community members/organizations beyond themselves.

Note: Almost all surveyed faith communities mentioned *engagement, service, and relationship* themes. Responses were evenly divided amongst clergy and lay, except for laity in missions, who were majority NI.

Overarching Questions:

5. Is there clear consensus on what **works**?
6. What are the systemic **stresses**?
7. Is there anything among clergy leadership that we are **missing/not affirming**?
8. Is there anything among lay leadership that we are **missing/not affirming**?
9. Are there any deep **a-ha’s**?

WORKS	When reviewing responses from high community connection groups, what works most often are efforts to reach out to groups and individuals within one’s community – with a heart to hearing what they self-identify as need, and then doing best to walk alongside those needs in relationship – expanding networks as much as possible.
STRESSES	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. [Engagement...] Waiting for people to engage the church creates feelings of stagnation and frustration. 2. [Insights] Aging faith communities mean working within the confines of physical abilities. 3. [Insights] Communities see needs but lack manpower and resources.

MISSING/ Not Affirming (Clergy)	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. [Engagement...] Clergy are invited to join events / programs but capacity to do so is often stretched thin. 2. [Engagement...] Opportunity to Celebrate – Clergy are taking opportunities to expand inter-faith relationships and inter-cultural awareness. 3. [Engagement...] Opportunity to Celebrate – Clergy are looking at ways to discover the needs and resources within their greater communities. 4. [Engagement...] Opportunity to Celebrate – Clergy are asking how they can partner with other Episcopal faith communities to share resources and collaborate. 5. [Insights] There is a desire by many clergy to increase collegiality.
MISSING/ Not Affirming (Lay)	<p>[Not affirming] Opportunity to celebrate – Successful lay ministry throughout the diocese.</p>
A-Ha's	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. [Change] Reflection question: Is there fear of what will happen if something new is successful – how do we manage that change? 2. [Engagement...] Often, neighbor island churches report expansive community partnerships – to thrive on the NI's it seems imperative not to be siloed. This deep embrace of greater community often means the Episcopal church in that community becomes an overall hub for the area. 3. [Engagement...] Many ideas yet to be implemented as of June 2022 due to Covid restrictions/lack of capacity – ideas include inter-faith partnerships, worshipping with other Episcopal communities, building relationships with schools and non-profits, offering use of church property for community benefit. 4. [Engagement...] Thrift shops, Feeding Ministries, Community Markets, Wifi, Showers, Student tutoring – are some of the on-going and highly utilized programs across TECH – there is a great opportunity to share knowledge around these ministries and others. 5. [Justice] The one FC that spoke to justice issues as a call to community connection indicated that they look to identify needs within the community and then try to help. How are needs identified? 6. [Online] Five of the seven comments received concerning online engagement were from NI faith communities. There is great desire for more robust online options to bridge geographic divides. 7. [Insights] "If a ministry is serving a purpose; someone will step up {to continue the ministry}; if not, then it's time for something new."

JOY – FINDINGS

Question: Where have you found joy amidst the challenges of 2020-2022 - what are the successes you are celebrating as you reflect on this most unusual pandemic time?

Numeric Data: Before anonymization/aggregation, each faith community's responses to question seven (7) were reviewed to understand the focus on joyful celebrations. **Two areas arose: Inward and Mixed.** Those communities reporting "Inward" joys shared celebrations internally focused on their faith community; "Mixed" groups spoke to rejoicing in internal and external accomplishments.

[21] Inward: O=15 (8 parishes/ 7 missions); NI= (3 parishes/ 3 missions)

[11] Mixed: O=5 (3 parish/ 2 mission); NI=6 (3 parishes/3 missions)

Inward (21) | Mixed (11)

Emergent Themes

Creativity – 6 comment total: 5 FC's – 3NI
Learning – 7 comment total: 5 FC's – 2NI
Innovation – 14 comments total: 9 FC's – 6NI
Relationship– 110 comments total: 33 FC's – 15NI
Resilience– 15 comments total: 9 FC's – 5NI
Space – 18 comments total: 10 FC's – 2NI

Note: Most of the reported joys centered around relationships and gratitude for them (see 110 comments total), secondarily, many respondents shared feeling really good about completing long overdue building repairs and/or long-planned for renovations.

Clergy respondents were mainly focused on supporting healthy parish relationships (30 comments), while the laity often spoke of collaborative experiences that brought joy. (80 comments)

Overarching Questions:

3. Is there clear consensus on what **works**?
4. What are the systemic **stresses**?
5. Is there anything among clergy leadership that we are **missing/not affirming**?
6. Is there anything among lay leadership that we are **missing/not affirming**?
7. Are there any deep **a-ha's**?

WORKS	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. [Learning] Many noted the joy of learning Zoom and other technologies that increase connection. 2. [Relationship] Connecting with family; with thy neighbor. 3. [Relationship] Making choices that increase access. 4. [Relationship] Zoom Bible studies and other online formation activities – connect those who would otherwise not be able to attend. 5. [Relationship] Coming together in collaboration. 6. [Space] Having time for rest and relationship-building. 7. [Space] Having maintained buildings reduces stress and raises joy.
STRESSES	A fear was noted – what good that occurred during the pandemic may be lost once "normal" returns.
MISSING/ Not Affirming (Clergy)	No data for this section.

MISSING/ Not Affirming (Lay)	No data for this section.
A-Ha's	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. [Creativity] "There is a lot of untapped creativity in our diocese." 2. [Creativity] Changes that at first seem negative or unwelcome can actually free up energy for positive adjustments/adaptations. 3. [Innovation] The people who wanted change pre-pandemic have embraced this time of fluidity and adaptation. 4. [Innovation] Things "born out of necessity" can be transformative.