

**Report of the All Agency Review Committee  
to the 223<sup>rd</sup> General Assembly (2018)**

**Recommendations**

**That the 223rd General Assembly (2018):**

**1. Direct the six Agencies of the General Assembly in implementing the General Assembly's mission to focus on the call to a new openness in Book of Order F-1.0404, and to consider the following questions in establishing work plans and budgets:**

- **What are the agencies' views, collectively and individually, as to what radical obedience to Christ looks like both in times of possibility as well as in times of peril?**
- **What commitment to transparency in process and resources exists in each agency and in their collaborative work?**
- **What does it mean to say yes to some opportunities and say no to others? What do we need to celebrate and release? What do we need to celebrate and support?**
- **How does the agency grieve what once was beautiful, but now is no longer possible?**
- **What does it mean to be faithful and useful?**
- **What will the PC(USA) do to open wide the doors of the church to God's amazing diversity, welcoming all ages and all expressions of race, class, gender, and sexual orientation in striving to increase the membership of our denomination and achieve the great ends of the church?**

**2. In order to strengthen the review process:**

**a. Recommend that the next All Agency Review Committee focus its review of the effectiveness of the agencies in implementing the General Assembly's mission directives on their response to the call to a new openness in Book of Order F-1.0404, and address the questions set forth in Recommendation 1 in that review.**

**b. Adopt the revisions to the Standards for Review of General Assembly Agencies attached as Appendix B and direct the Committee on the Office of the General Assembly to prepare revisions to Section IV.D.1. of the Organization for Mission consistent with the revision to the Standards for Review of General Assembly Agencies.**

**c. Direct that the review schedule required by the Standards for Review of General Assembly Agencies be delayed, to recommence with the schedule contained in the proposed revisions to the Standards for Review of General Assembly Agencies, with the**

35 election of a review committee for the Board of Pensions, the Presbyterian Foundation  
 36 and the Presbyterian Investment and Loan Program by the 224th General Assembly  
 37 (2020), reporting to the 225th General Assembly (2022).

38 **3. Approve Recommendation 5 of the Way Forward Commission in creation of a “Moving  
 39 Forward Implementation Commission,” to be appointed by the Moderator or Co-  
 40 Moderators of the 223rd General Assembly**

41 **4. Amend the Organization for Mission by including the following statement regarding the  
 42 value of Shared Services as a new bulleted subpart to Section I.G:**

43 **The value of shared services in the PCUSA exists when all agencies, carrying out  
 44 their respective missions as directed by the General Assembly, collectively best serve  
 45 the church with excellence, transparency and efficiency. Simultaneously, sharing  
 46 any service must be accomplished without harming the safety, soundness, well-being  
 47 or missional goals of any individual agency.**

48 **5. Instruct the six agencies of the Presbyterian Church (USA) to engage in a collaborative  
 49 self-study of the per capita model and its ability to adequately fund the Office of The  
 50 General Assembly and the Presbyterian Mission Agency in the immediate and longer term  
 51 future and to explore alternative and creative funding resources for both.**

52 **6. Approve Recommendations 1.a through 1.i. of the Way Forward Commission to free the  
 53 Presbyterian Mission Agency Board to focus on setting and executing the mission direction  
 54 of the Presbyterian Church (U.S.A.) by changing the bylaws of the Presbyterian Church  
 55 (U.S.A.), A Corporation, and taking the other steps recommended by the Way Forward  
 56 Commission in its Recommendation:**

57 **7. That the 223rd General Assembly (2018) amend the Standing Rules of the General  
 58 Assembly as follows:**

59 **a. Add new sections to the Standing Rules as Section E.2.i. and E.2.j. as follows:**

60 **i. A representative of any agency affected by an overture or commissioner  
 61 resolution, either with respect to the use of its financial resources or its mission  
 62 priorities, shall be entitled to speak to the item of business immediately after the  
 63 presenter of the overture or the commissioner resolution, and shall be allocated  
 64 reasonable time to speak.**

65 **j. The financial effect of each recommendation on any agency or entity of the  
 66 denomination that would be affected by the action shall be clearly presented at the  
 67 time that an overture or commissioner resolution is considered by the committee.**

68 **b. Amend Standing Rule E.5.a. as follows:**

69 **a. Each committee, with the exception of the Assembly Committee on Bills and  
 70 Overtures, shall schedule at its convenience one or more public hearings on matters  
 71 before it, including on any commissioner resolutions submitted to it.**

72 c. Amend Standing Rule E.5.c. as follows:

73 c. Any person who wishes to be heard in a public hearing shall sign up on a hearing  
 74 form, posted in a public place in the building in which the assembly is being held, no  
 75 later than the close of business on the second day of the General Assembly or one  
 76 hour noon of the day after the subsequent referral of business to the committee by  
 77 the General Assembly. The location of hearing forms shall be announced during the  
 78 first session of the assembly. In the event that an issue is expected to be  
 79 controversial, those wishing to speak shall be asked to indicate whether they wish to  
 80 speak for or against the recommendation.

81 8. That the 223<sup>rd</sup> General Assembly continue providing support for the vision process in the  
 82 following ways:

- 83 a. Receive the mid-term report of the Vision 2020 Committee and encourage them as  
 84 they continue to discern over the next two years.  
 85  
 86 b. Establish a representative Vision Team as part of the denominational structure that  
 87 is tasked with shepherding ongoing vision discernment work, including engaging in  
 88 discernment practices in collaboration the six agencies and mid-councils; bringing  
 89 recommendations about that discernment to the agencies and/or General Assembly;  
 90 and communicating the unified, dynamic vision to the broader church.

91

92 ***RATIONALE***

93 *I. Introduction*

94 Ten years ago the General Assembly created a committee to “review the service of the whole  
 95 Presbyterian Church (U.S.A.) and its six agencies in implementing the General Assembly’s  
 96 mission directives” (Minutes, 2008, Part I, p. 727.) This was a response to concerns about  
 97 “overall effectiveness” beyond the individual agency reviews, and directed a focus on  
 98 cooperation of work and duplication of services. The first “All Agency Review” prepared for the  
 99 2010 General Assembly noted that a limitation of their mandate was that “there is no formal or  
 100 consolidated specification of mission directives of the GA” and that no standards were provided  
 101 for the review, “such as those that exist for the individual agency reviews.” In the context of that  
 102 time, the All Agency Review Committee lifted up the need for collaboration between the  
 103 agencies.

104 The state of the PCUSA in the time period 2016-18 is different, and rapidly changing. We claim  
 105 the conviction and cling to the hope that God is doing a new thing, and we’re trying to perceive  
 106 it. Who are we now and what is our calling as a Church of Jesus Christ? As Presbyterian  
 107 Christians? What is our mission and what are the “mission directives” that should be directing  
 108 and inspiring our faithful work? These questions loomed so large at the 2016 General Assembly  
 109 that it created three separate entities to pursue them: A Way Forward Commission (“WFC”), A  
 110 20-20 Vision Committee, and the All Agency Review Committee (“AARC”).

111 One of the challenges in our work was to parse the mandates and try to identify where we might  
 112 work together and share resources, and where we might risk redundancy. Before the groups  
 113 convened their leaders met to discuss the whole and the parts and to commit to collaboration and  
 114 communication.

115 We early on felt the pain of our predecessor review committee. The absence of criteria for  
 116 review brought our attention to the process itself, and our hope that developing a framework  
 117 would be helpful to both present and future reviews. Our process took us to the heart of our  
 118 affirmations about the mission of the Church. Each agency has a particular mission within the  
 119 larger mission of the Church, and we are called to align that work to a larger calling. There are  
 120 “Great Ends of the Church” and we felt drawn to lift up great beginnings. Our Reformed and  
 121 Presbyterian ethos affirms an “openness to the guidance of the Holy Spirit” -- continuity and  
 122 change, ecumenicity, unity in diversity, and openness. The last chapter on “The Mission of the  
 123 Church” Chapter One) ends with “a new openness.” It is our hope that our work helps us to  
 124 move into the next chapter of the life of the PCUSA.

125 “As it participates in God’s mission, the Presbyterian Church (U.S.A.) seeks ... a new openness  
 126 to see both the possibilities and the perils of its institutional forms in order to ensure the  
 127 faithfulness and usefulness of these forms to God’s activities in the world.” F-1.0404. We  
 128 believe that the agencies of the Presbyterian Church (U.S.A.) need to be supported and  
 129 encouraged in living into these words of promise and challenge.

130 These views represented the unanimous conclusions of the AARC, which was elected by the  
 131 222<sup>nd</sup> General Assembly, and has been made up of the following individuals: Deborah A. Block  
 132 (moderator), Debra Avery, Eric Beene, David A. Davis, Marco A. Grimaldo, Christopher M.  
 133 Mason, Claire J. Rhodes, Kelly Boubel Shriver, James N. Tse, Madison VanVeelen, and James  
 134 A. Wilson. (Two other members elected to the AARC resigned before they were able to  
 135 complete their service, Rachel Mihee Kim-Kort and James Rea.) In reaching these views, we  
 136 held five in person meetings and met by conference call nine times. As indicated by several joint  
 137 recommendations contained in this report and in the report of the WFC, we engaged in extensive  
 138 efforts to coordinate its work. We have also been in regular communication with the Vision  
 139 2020 Committee.

## 140 *II. Overview of the Agencies*

141 At the beginning of its review process, we received verbal and written summaries from the  
 142 executives of each of the agencies about their specific missions and unique function in the  
 143 Presbyterian Church (USA). A few months later, to encourage reflection within the agencies  
 144 about God’s call to “a new openness,” we prepared a set of questions based on F-1.0404 and  
 145 asked each agency to respond in writing to those questions. Following are our summaries of the  
 146 functions and the responses from the agencies to our questions about “a new openness.”

147 **The Board of Pensions (“BoP”)** traces its roots back to the year 1717. According to the  
 148 Organization for Mission of the Presbyterian Church (USA), the BoP is the legally responsible  
 149 corporate body established under a civil charter for the purpose of administering the pension and  
 150 benefits program of the PC(USA). The functions assigned by the General Assembly for the BoP  
 151 include: to design and administer pension and benefits; to design and administer a program of

152 financial assistance to help meet needs beyond the scope of pension and benefits; to receive,  
 153 invest, and disburse the funds required to support the plans; and to sponsor programs for the sole  
 154 benefit of the members and beneficiaries of the BoP.

- 155 • In recent years, the BoP has heard and acted on a call in the church for flexibility and  
 156 affordability for benefits in multiple contexts of ministry along with a continued commitment  
 157 to ministers. As a result of their new programs, there is a 19% increase in active members  
 158 using the BoP's plans and services.
- 159 • The BoP is committed to cooperative work with the other agencies as well as participation in  
 160 ecumenical efforts to share best practices, form buying coalitions, advocacy and lobbying  
 161 around faith-based benefit plans, and similar common interests.
- 162 • The BoP is exploring the possibilities of providing additional new products and programs to  
 163 meet the needs of ministers and other church workers in new ministry contexts and other  
 164 settings who currently are not being served. They also seek to find partners in the other  
 165 agencies to engage together in bold and comprehensive strategic thinking.

166

167 The tasks of the **The Office of the General Assembly (“OGA”)** fall under three primary  
 168 ministry areas: Ecclesial and Ecumenical Ministries, Mid Council Ministries, and Church Wide  
 169 Ministries. The Committee on the Office of the General Assembly (COGA) oversees and  
 170 supports the ministry of the Stated Clerk and staff and partners with OGA in carrying out work  
 171 assigned by the General Assembly. The OGA is directed by the Stated Clerk of the General  
 172 Assembly, who is the highest ecclesial officer of the denomination, elected by the assembly to a  
 173 four-year term.

- 174 • OGA has gone through significant changes, with a major reorganization and loss of several  
 175 staff positions in 2013 and the election of a new Stated Clerk in 2016. They remain  
 176 committed to being faithful, accountable, transparent, present, and loving as they engage with  
 177 the church.
- 178 • Listening to and learning about the hopes and struggles of mid-councils has been a major  
 179 focus of OGA's work since the last General Assembly. OGA plans to continue that work  
 180 with recently hired staff charged with supporting and strengthening mid-councils. They are  
 181 also developing new proposals to support mid-councils more fully.
- 182 • Based on its listening throughout the church, OGA is seeking to be flexible in meeting unmet  
 183 needs. Examples include the initiative to address context of the St. Louis community as we  
 184 prepare to hold our General Assembly there; laying out a vision to make the Presbyterian  
 185 Center a place where we engage in ministry, service, and fun for the Louisville community;  
 186 and challenging the church to grapple with its own racism and fear of sharing power which  
 187 impedes revival and future growth of our denomination.

188

189 Established in 1799, **The Presbyterian Foundation** is charged by the General Assembly with  
 190 responsibility and accountability of raising, stewarding, and distributing funds to support the  
 191 mission and ministry of the PC(USA). The Foundation is understood to be the national entity  
 192 specifically called to offer charitable expertise that unites and empowers Presbyterians in the  
 193 work of the church. The Foundation's umbrella includes a number of historic corporations like  
 194 *The Presbyterian Board of Home Mission (1862)* and *The Board of National Missions (1923)*. In

195 addition, the Foundation operates a fully owned subsidiary called The New Covenant Trust  
196 Company established in 1998 and chartered to operate in all fifty states.

- 197 • In engaging congregations, pastors, lay leaders, mid-councils, and donors in conversations  
198 about what the church needs in order to fund the mission and ministry to which God calls  
199 them, the Foundation has found it critical to emphasize God’s abundance as a counterpoint to  
200 voices in the church fearing scarcity – focusing on what we don’t have rather than what God  
201 has given us.
- 202 • The Foundation has created new areas of service and greater flexibility to meet the needs of  
203 the church and donors, such as developing their online giving system, expanding their Donor  
204 Advised Funds products, outsourcing their investment functions, and preparing church  
205 financial literacy resources. As a result of these initiatives, the Foundation is growing in its  
206 total assets and serving more people, including smaller, more diverse congregations.
- 207 • The Foundation is engaged in common projects with each of the other agencies. The  
208 Foundation still sometimes encounters challenges related to donor intent, beneficiary interest,  
209 and agency processes and policies.

210

211 **The Presbyterian Investment and Loan Program (“PILP”)** was established by the General  
212 Assembly in 1995. It is a nonprofit member corporation empowered to sell notes or other  
213 financial instruments in order to raise capital for PC(USA) mission and to establish standards of  
214 underwriting and loan criteria that enable PC(USA) institutions to acquire or improve real  
215 property. PILP offers investments that provide a competitive return while participating in the  
216 growth, development, and support of congregations within the PC(USA).

- 217 • In addition to continuing its traditional products and services to provide loans for  
218 construction and capital improvements for church buildings, PILP has introduced new loan  
219 products to respond to changing needs and creative initiatives by congregations for energy  
220 efficiency, accessibility, and leasehold improvements for congregations leasing space rather  
221 than owning it.
- 222 • In the course of their work, PILP spends considerable time working with congregations to  
223 determine readiness to assume a loan and the appropriateness of proposed construction or  
224 improvements. PILP would like to deepen these consultative functions to include mentoring  
225 and guidance for all matters related to church finances.
- 226 • In the future, PILP looks to further share the stories of churches whose ministries are  
227 transformed by the investment PILP makes in them with investors. They also would like to  
228 build greater awareness of their products to enable them to serve more congregations.

229

230 **The Presbyterian Mission Agency (“PMA”)** serves as the mission and ministry arm of the  
231 Presbyterian Church (USA). This agency coordinates and leads the mission program of the  
232 PC(USA), working in partnership with synods, presbyteries, and sessions. It also advises and  
233 responds to the General Assembly on priorities, programs, and strategies for addressing matters  
234 of concern of the PC(USA).

- 235 • PMA is committed to listening and responding to the whole church as it receives directives  
236 from the General Assembly, engaging in consultation with mid-councils and church leaders,  
237 and partnering and consultation with mission partners. PMA seeks to become even more

238 inclusive, expanding translation ministries, examining practices and policies for their impact  
 239 on people of color and racial diversity, and possibly bringing a single focal point for their  
 240 work for the next four years on structural racism and white supremacy.

- 241 • New initiatives in the past two years to build trust and improve morale among PMA staff  
 242 include the creation of a Community Life Team, all-staff events, regular all-staff meetings to  
 243 share information and solicit questions, weekly worship services, mission projects, and  
 244 mutual support for staff members facing hardship. The PMA Board has also engaged in a  
 245 significant restructuring, resulting in a much smaller board.
- 246 • PMA sees mission as a means to unite the whole church. They seek to bring even greater  
 247 focus to their work as they balance corporate accountability with their identity as a church  
 248 agency. Overcoming a scarcity mindset and creating new ways to be faithful in the ways the  
 249 church is alive will reduce a feeling of competition among agency departments and staff.

250

251 The current corporate identity of the **Presbyterian Publishing Corporation (“PPC”)** was  
 252 established by the 205<sup>th</sup> General Assembly in 1993. PPC’s purpose is Christian nurture through  
 253 the development and publishing of resources. PPC receives no mission funding and is a legally  
 254 independent, self-supporting corporation dedicated to the mission of the PC(USA).

- 255 • In recent years, PPC has faced radical changes in mainline churches, decline in the number of  
 256 students of religion in colleges and seminaries, and fundamental changes in the bookselling  
 257 industry. It has maintained itself as a self-sustaining agency through increased operational  
 258 efficiency, new technology to reduce costs, new initiatives such as children’s book  
 259 publishing, new partnerships with seminaries, and ongoing assessment of the needs of their  
 260 core market. Over half of the resources they publish are used by people outside the  
 261 PC(USA).
- 262 • As a denominational publisher, PPC frequently publishes materials which they know will not  
 263 provide them a return on their investment but provide value for the church.
- 264 • Recently, PPC has developed the PC(USA) Store as a single source website for PC(USA)  
 265 resources. They have also assumed responsibility for congregational ministry publishing  
 266 from PMA, which they see as an opportunity to better serve congregations looking for  
 267 Christian Education curricula and other resources.

268

269 In addition to these responses directly from the leadership of the agencies about their openness to  
 270 God’s call, we gathered reflections from mid-council leaders about the work of the agencies and  
 271 their interactions with mid-councils and congregations. Some leaders gave specific examples  
 272 about very positive interactions with the agencies. For instance, a Presbytery executive from  
 273 Florida reported that all six of the agencies took the initiative to contact the presbytery within  
 274 days of Hurricane Irma. All of the agencies offered specific forms of help to the presbytery and  
 275 its congregations related to their unique mission and work.

276

277 Other mid-council leaders shared different perceptions of the agencies. Some still shared their  
 278 perception of siloing among the agencies, with little coordination of communications, projects,  
 279 and programs. Similarly, some spoke of branding confusion and the difficulty for mid council  
 280 and congregation leaders to understand the distinctiveness of the agencies. Some mid council

281 leaders spoke of not enough direct communication with agencies; for instance, they had  
 282 examples of times when agencies hosted events in their geographic bounds without notifying the  
 283 mid council, or of fundraising activities which circumvent the mid council leadership to go  
 284 directly to congregations and individual members of those congregations. Some mid council  
 285 leaders also spoke of inefficient communication, with a constant need for reporting and data  
 286 sharing with multiple agencies.

287  
 288 While we decided not to do a survey, it received the moderator's report as well as the OGA  
 289 report, both of which were before the Way Forward Committee at the 2016 General Assembly.  
 290 Throughout our process, we have valued and sought input from people connected with the  
 291 church and the agencies who are not a part of the agencies. Not all of the groups to which we  
 292 reached out responded. We sought the advice of the various racial ethnic caucus leaders related  
 293 to their engagement with the PMA, the OGA and the other four agencies of the Presbyterian  
 294 Church (U.S.A.). We heard from Rev. Tony Aja of the National Hispanic/Latino Caucus and  
 295 Rev. Takako Terino of the National Asian Presbyterian Council. While these two responses are  
 296 far from representative of all of the racial ethnic caucuses, they nonetheless inform our thinking.

- 297 1) Both interviews highlighted concerns about language, communications and translations.  
 298 They expressed the challenge faced by clergy and lay leaders in communicating with  
 299 agency staff in their own language. The Hispanic caucus highlights the need for more  
 300 Spanish speakers in church agencies and the Asian Council expressed a need for helping  
 301 clergy gain or strengthen their English skills.  
 302 2) Both interviews commented on what they perceived as a lack of connection with some or  
 303 several of the Presbyterian agencies.

304 We heard similar responses in conversations with some staff of the Racial Ethnic and Women's  
 305 Ministry division. We take these responses as reminders that there is still much work to be done  
 306 within the Presbyterian Church (USA) and commend to the whole church, a commitment to  
 307 apply a racial equity lens as we each do our part in service to Christ.

308  
 309 In our interactions with the agencies during the process of review, it has found the agency staff to  
 310 be helpful and responsive. We want to give special attention and affirmation of the work and  
 311 hope of agencies to lead the church in addressing white privilege and racism.

312  
 313 *III. Merging the Office of the General Assembly and the Presbyterian Mission Agency*  
 314 *Would Not Serve the Denomination*

315  
 316 Our initial reviews of all six agencies revealed that the relationship between the PMA and the  
 317 OGA surfaced as a dominant theme to be addressed. Particularly, there were recurring questions  
 318 about the possibilities feasibility and/or desirability of a merger between the two agencies.

319 We looked in depth into the issues concerning the PMA and OGA, their mission and mandates.  
 320 Both agencies are staffed by dedicated people who have demonstrated faithfulness in their work  
 321 over the years, but also acknowledged their frustrations, tensions and uncertainties in carrying  
 322 out their duties because of the recurring conversations about a possible merger.

323 We, however, has seen convincing evidence that the PMA and OGA have distinctly different  
 324 mandates and as such, do their work differently, reflecting the message in I Corinthians 12,  
 325 “There are different kinds of gifts, but the same Spirit...There are different kinds of service, but  
 326 the same Lord.”

327 We concluded that any merger of the PMA and OGA would not be in the best interest of the  
 328 Presbyterian Church (USA) at this time. With this in mind, we supported a “no merger”  
 329 recommendation in conjunction with the WFC. It was felt that this decision would:

- 330 (i) help clear up the uncertainties and tensions of staff in the two agencies
- 331 (ii) give the two agencies the freedom to concentrate on working on important tasks  
 332 within their mandate without having to put out efforts to constantly address issues  
 333 concerning a possible merger between the OGA and PMA
- 334 (iii) provide the members of the General Assembly with essential information to better  
 335 guide future decisions for the Church as a whole.

#### 336 337 *IV. Continuing Conversations*

338  
339 This review process identified concerns and issues beyond the scope of its work that need to be  
 340 addressed in ongoing processes:

341 Communications. We and the WFC continue to engage with communication staff and  
 342 agency executives to refine a process to guide changes to denominational communication plans  
 343 and vehicles. Related projects include (i) an agency-wide communication plan, (ii) a unified  
 344 style/brand guide, (iii) a unified and updated web-presence and use of social media, (iv)  
 345 clarification and definition of roles, responsibility, and authority within the communication  
 346 departments.

347 Property and facilities usage. All six agencies are engaged in discussions about the use of  
 348 the building at 100 Witherspoon Street and other PCUSA properties. How can our buildings be  
 349 used as instruments of our mission? How do the locations of our agencies contribute to or  
 350 detract from collaborative work, cooperative culture, and common service to the PCUSA?  
 351

#### 352 *V. Rationale for Specific Recommendations*

353 A. Recommendation 1:

354 Recommendation 1 of this report urges that the agencies consider six questions arising from F-  
 355 1.0404 in setting their budgets and work plans in the coming years. As all of the  
 356 recommendations in this report reflect, we believe deeply that the call to a new openness set  
 357 forth in F-1.0404 speaks to the particular needs and calling of the Presbyterian Church (U.S.A.)  
 358 in this time and place. In our discernment, it became clear that we should center our assessments  
 359 and focus our recommendations around:

- 361 • A new openness to the sovereign activity of God in the Church and in the world...
- 362 • A new openness in its own membership...

- 363 • A new openness to see both the possibilities and perils of institutional forms...
- 364 • A new openness to God's continuing reformation of the church"
- 365 • We believe that this provides significant focus while at the same time offering enough
- 366 flexibility and adaptability as the Spirit continues to shape our shared future.

367 We recognize, however, that the focus on F-1.0404 may not always be the appropriate focus of  
 368 the denomination and its agencies. Accordingly, it has communicated to the 2020 Task Force its  
 369 recommendation that their final report suggests a process for regular and on-going discernment  
 370 for the denomination and its agencies.

## 371 B. Recommendation 2:

372 *2.a.: Focus of Next All Agency Review:* In the course of its work, we concluded that the call to a  
 373 new openness in Book of Order F-1.0404 provided a useful framework for review of the  
 374 agencies in light of the challenges that they currently face. We have used this lens as it has  
 375 sought to discern the meaning of its charge to review the agencies with respect to their  
 376 effectiveness in implementing the General Assembly's mission directives. We believe that  
 377 continuity in the application of this focus of the all agency review will lead to continuity in the  
 378 review process and a useful framework for assessing the agencies in light of the current  
 379 recommendation of ourselves and the WFC.

380 *2.b.: Revision of the agency review policy:* In the course of its work, we observed that the  
 381 current process for individual agency review could be streamlined and improved. In particular,  
 382 we concluded that the mandating a self-study in the course of agency review often does not  
 383 create a benefit to the review process commensurate with the financial and other cost of such  
 384 self-studies. If an agency or review committee determines such a self-study justifies the cost,  
 385 they remain free to incorporate such a process in the review, but mandating such a self-study  
 386 does not seem appropriate to us. We also concluded that the review cycle should be streamlined  
 387 and made more efficient by a new pattern for review. Thus, instead of two agencies being  
 388 reviewed each General Assembly over a six year cycle, with a potential hiatus at the end of that  
 389 cycle for an all agency review (leading in effect to an eight year cycle), we propose that three  
 390 agencies be reviewed in each of the first two General Assemblies in a six year cycle, and then  
 391 that in the final Assembly of the cycle an all agency review would occur. We further propose  
 392 that a single committee (perhaps divided into subgroups) conduct the review in order to reduce  
 393 costs and increase consistency in the process. Because the Board of Pensions, the Presbyterian  
 394 Foundation and the Presbyterian Investment and Loan Program all require significant review of  
 395 financial structures and fiduciary and regulatory duties, the we believe it would also increase the  
 396 effectiveness of reviews to group these three agencies together for review. Finally, the proposed  
 397 amendments to the policy include the all agency review process in the policy, given our view  
 398 that an integrated review process would benefit the church.

399 *Further,* we concluded that the criteria for the review of individual agencies should be revised  
 400 and that clear criteria for the future all agency review be developed. The lack of clear standards  
 401 for the all agency review process was not helpful us, and caused us to struggle with its charge as  
 402 it set out to complete its work. At the same time, we believe that the standards for both  
 403 individual agency review and for the all agency review process would benefit greatly from the  
 404 input of the members of the WFC. Therefore, we recommend that the task of revising and

405 clarifying these criteria be assigned to the Moving Forward Implementation Commission that  
406 both the WFC and we recommend be created by the 223<sup>rd</sup> General Assembly.

407 *2.c.: A "Sabbatical" in the Review Process:* The engagement required of staff in  
408 simultaneously responding to and interacting with the WFC and us has been immense.  
409 Moreover, the Moving Forward Implementation Commission that both the WFC and we  
410 recommend be created by the 223<sup>rd</sup> General Assembly to assist in implementing these  
411 recommendations, as well as the internal work of the agencies required by such implementation  
412 efforts, will demand significant resources of the agencies. Accordingly we recommend that the  
413 223<sup>rd</sup> General Assembly delay the beginning of the next cycle of review of the agencies to allow  
414 the agencies to focus on implementation of these recommendations as well as the work already  
415 assigned them.

416 C. Recommendation 3:

417 Along with the Way Forward Commission, we believe that the changes we have proposed in our  
418 review are complex enough, and the need for them is serious enough, that the General Assembly  
419 would benefit from appointing a group to provide support and accountability to the agencies in  
420 implementing the recommendations.

421 D. Recommendation 4:

422 It is in the interest of good stewardship that the PCUSA and its agencies make use of shared  
423 services as appropriate. We worked with members of the WFC in exploring better ways of  
424 sharing services between agencies. That work continues. We believe that the principle set forth  
425 in its Recommendation 4 should guide that process, now and in the future.

426 We have not found that that the most effective delivery of shared services is achieved by having  
427 all shared services under the control of one agency or entity. Even when a service is shared,  
428 involvement and expertise from within each agency is required for the services to meet  
429 expectations and needs.

430 We recommend that this perspective on the nature of shared services inform the work of future  
431 agency reviews when considering the effectiveness of services that cut across departments within  
432 an agency and across agencies as well.

433 E. Recommendation 5:

434 We have significant concern regarding the long-term sustainability of the per capita funding  
435 model, especially as it impacts the work of the OGA as the only agency primarily dependent on  
436 per capita funds. With the exception of some fundraising by the Presbyterian Historical Society  
437 to support its work, the constitutional office and services of OGA are completely dependent on  
438 diminishing per capita dollars. The preservation and future of such services should be the  
439 concern of the whole church and of all the agencies. We affirm the creativity, skill and thought  
440 of staff members throughout all of the agencies and seeks to engage those collective resources on  
441 this pressing issue confronting the church. It recommends a self-study by all the agencies to  
442 address this issue.

443 F. Recommendation 6:

444 As highlighted above, F-1.0404 reminds our denomination that “[a]s it participates in God’s  
445 mission”, the church should seek “a new openness to see both the possibilities and the perils of  
446 its institutional forms in order to ensure the faithfulness and usefulness of these forms to God’s  
447 activities in the world.” This openness to the work of the Spirit has inspired this  
448 recommendation concerning “A Corp.”

449 In every generation, Presbyterians have wondered whether the church was becoming too  
450 corporate. As we addressed the concerns lifted up by previous reviews and as we did our own  
451 analysis regarding “A Corp.,” we also heard this concern. The *Book of Order*, at G-4.0101,  
452 requires each council above the congregation to incorporate if it is legally possible. Indeed, as  
453 discussed below, the denomination has had a corporation to support its work since the 18th  
454 Century. In evaluating the faithful operation of the denomination and its agencies, therefore, it is  
455 simply not possible to act as if the corporate form of the General Assembly does not exist.  
456 Rather, the focus must be on whether the form of the corporation is faithfully serving the church.  
457 We concluded that the current form of governance of the corporation, and particularly its  
458 complete control by the Presbyterian Mission Agency Board (“PMAB”), is not serving well the  
459 work of the whole church. In fact, it is one of the sources of inefficiencies and, at times,  
460 problematic functioning within the PMA.

461 The Review Committee for the PMA in 2016 summarized its findings as follows: “Though the  
462 PMA has produced good work, it is evident that there are significant weaknesses in a number of  
463 areas, including: strategic decision-making and priority-setting; organizational culture and work  
464 environment; and collaborative efforts with other General Assembly agencies.” We found that  
465 these significant weaknesses remain. We have observed that one of the sources of these  
466 significant weaknesses is a board that is not effective at handling corporate governance functions  
467 and that focuses far more of its energy on corporate matters than on implementing the mission  
468 direction of the church. Many of the distractions that have directly hindered the mission work of  
469 the denomination – the lack of transparency regarding the termination of employees involved  
470 with 1001 Worshiping Communities, the long absence of a permanent executive director, the  
471 opaque use of reserve funds, and disputes regarding shared services – have arisen because of the  
472 collision between the role members of PMAB as directors of the corporation and their more  
473 important function of implementing the mission directives of the General Assembly.

474 We have been transparent in our work regarding “A Corp.” Discussions of “A Corp.” in open  
475 session began at our meeting on May 2nd and were publicly reported. Representatives of our  
476 Committee and the WFC reached out to representatives of the Governance Task Force of the  
477 Presbyterian Mission Agency Board in October, 2017 to discuss “A Corp.” with them. We had  
478 several subsequent discussions with PMAB representatives exclusively focused on “A Corp.”  
479 issues. The moderator and vice moderator of our Committee met with and discussed “A Corp.”  
480 issues both with the chair of PMAB and with other PMAB representatives as well. In addition,  
481 we discussed “A Corp.” issues with COGA and its leadership several times in 2017, as we did  
482 with the leadership of each of the other agencies of the church—and others, both in 2017 and at  
483 the beginning of 2018. We reviewed a large number of documents, including the history of “A  
484 Corp.” (which dates to the late 18th Century), its formation and governance documents and the  
485 changes in them from 1983 forward, the audited financials of “A Corp.” for multiple years, the  
486 budgets submitted by PMA, minutes of PMAB and “A Corp.” meetings and committee meetings  
487 for a number of years, to the extent they existed. We retained independent legal counsel to help  
488 us with Pennsylvania law issues and advise us on issues such as whether a “deliverance” was

489 needed to change the board of directors of the corporation (we have not proposed one) and  
 490 whether “A Corp.” could delegate to PMA daily control of its own functions, such as personnel  
 491 activities (we proposed such delegation).

492 From all of this, our conclusion is clear: the best way to move past a corporate mentality in the  
 493 mission agency is to free the mission agency to do mission, and reconstitute the board of “A  
 494 Corp.” with broad agency representation to insure sound oversight of the existing corporate  
 495 entity.

496 “A Corp.” itself is a direct successor (along with the Foundation of the Presbyterian Church  
 497 (U.S.A.) (the “Foundation”) to the original 18th century corporation of our denomination. Its  
 498 articles of incorporation direct “A Corp.” “[t]o be an integrated auxiliary and a part of the  
 499 Presbyterian Church (U.S.A.) and to act as the principal corporation which the General  
 500 Assembly of the Presbyterian Church (U.S.A.) has caused to be formed pursuant to . . . the Form  
 501 of Government of the Presbyterian Church (U.S.A.) to receive, hold and transfer property and to  
 502 facilitate the management of its corporate affairs, as affirmed and declared by the 198th General  
 503 Assembly (1986) of the Presbyterian Church (U.S.A.).”

504 In this role, “A Corp.” holds almost all of the property and assets of the denomination not held  
 505 by the Foundation. (Assets held by the Board of Pensions of the Presbyterian Church (U.S.A.)  
 506 (the “Board of Pensions”) are not denominational assets, but assets for the benefit of members of  
 507 the benefit plans offered by that Board.) In general, the Foundation holds long-term assets. “A  
 508 Corp.” holds beneficial interests in some Foundation assets, handles the denomination’s current  
 509 operating funds, and owns the denomination’s operating assets (such as 100 Witherspoon Street  
 510 in Louisville, Kentucky). “A Corp.” provides the secular support—such as employment,  
 511 contracting, and handling of funds—needed by the Presbyterian Mission Agency (“PMA”) and  
 512 the Office of the General Assembly (“OGA”), which are unincorporated ecclesiastical entities  
 513 (as is the General Assembly). “A Corp.” also works with the four other PCUSA agencies: the  
 514 Foundation, the Board of Pensions, the Presbyterian Church (U.S.A.) Investment and Loan  
 515 Corporation, Inc., and Presbyterian Publishing Corporation.

516 There is a great deal of history behind “A Corp.” But we believe its appropriate role is clear.  
 517 The General Assembly, directly representing all the people and councils of the church, should  
 518 discern and announce theological positions, define mission, set mission priorities, and approve  
 519 targets (both of income and expense) to accomplish those things. The six agencies of the  
 520 General Assembly should implement these high-level decisions and support the people and  
 521 councils of the church in carrying them out. “A Corp.” should help support the agencies in these  
 522 efforts, particularly the two most ecclesiastical of them, PMA and OGA.

523 We believe the governance of “A Corp.” should reflect this role. Its governance structure—its  
 524 board of directors and officers—currently does not.

- 525 • The “A Corp.” board currently has 40 voting members. Although its own governance task  
 526 force has recommended reducing that number over time, even if that occurs, the number  
 527 would remain 20 or more, perhaps reflecting the multiplicity of PMA mission roles.
- 528 • All 40 are from the PMA board of directors—in effect, the boards are the same.
- 529 • The Executive Director of PMA is automatically the President of “A Corp.”

- 530 • There is confusion between PMA’s mission role and the operation of “A Corp.” by PMA’s  
531 board members.
- 532 • There is distrust over whether services provided by “A Corp.” are provided fairly for the  
533 benefit of other agencies, particularly OGA, because of this confusion.
- 534 • The opportunity for coordination of agency activity through “A Corp.” has not been realized.
- 535 • The “A Corp.” board is far too large to carry out its duties effectively.

536 Our joint recommendation with the WFC represents a better way to govern “A Corp.” It would  
537 allow “A Corp.” to carry out its corporate functions to support the agencies of the church, not to  
538 control those agencies’ own missions, or favor only one agency’s preferences. “A Corp.” would  
539 receive no additional powers from these changes in board composition and selection of president.  
540 (“A Corp.” would, for example, still have no authority to prescribe mission for PMA.)  
541 Importantly, however, these changes would eliminate the confusion between “A Corp.” and  
542 PMA. They would allow PMA to focus on mission. They would allow “A Corp.” to manage  
543 itself efficiently. They would reduce mistrust over the fair provision of “A Corp.” services to  
544 agencies, particularly as between OGA and PMA. They would provide a better platform for  
545 inter-agency cooperation.

546 Finally, we have sought to ensure that the smaller board of “A Corp.” will still be broadly  
547 representative of the diversity of our denomination. We recommend the following three steps to  
548 achieve this goal: 1) Nominating members by existing, already diverse agencies assuring not  
549 only expertise, but diversity; 2) provide seats nominated by the Advisory Committee for Racial  
550 Ethnic Concerns and the Advisory Committee for Women’s Concerns; and 3) provide for three  
551 at-large seats selected with input from the General Assembly Committee on Representation.

552 These changes would also not be unduly disruptive. They would not require any change in the  
553 ownership of any assets or liabilities. They would not require—although they could lead to—  
554 any personnel changes other than a new determination of who should be the President of “A  
555 Corp.” They would not preclude other changes that this Committee or the Way Forward  
556 Commission might want to recommend or pursue in other areas.

557 We further urge the General Assembly to support the change in the composition of the “A Corp.”  
558 board with several additional actions to support the function of the new composition:

559 *Timing of the process (Way Forward Recommendations 1.a. and 1.b.):* These recommendations  
560 are to effect the changes of governance specified in the Way Forward Commission’s  
561 Recommendation 1.c. in good order in the time frames provided.

562 *Changes to the Bylaws of “A Corp.” (Way Forward Recommendation 1.c.)* This is the principal  
563 recommendation to accomplish the changes to the governance of “A Corp.” that both we and the  
564 Way Forward Commission recommend.

565 *Making the President of “A Corp.” an ex officio member of each agency’s board (Way Forward*  
566 *Recommendation 1.d.):* This recommendation would help emphasize the cooperative nature of  
567 the relationship between “A Corp.” and the church’s six current agencies while also underscoring  
568 (by the absence of vote) that “A Corp.” does not control those agencies.

569 *Implementing Resolutions by the Agencies (Way Forward Recommendation 1.e.):* The  
 570 implementing resolutions directed by this recommendation would simply require the existing  
 571 agencies of the church to recognize the new governance structure for “A Corp.” The agencies  
 572 are in the best position to define the particular language they may need to manage their own  
 573 recommendations for who should serve on the Board of “A Corp.”, for example.

574 *Further Implementing Recommendation (Way Forward Recommendation 1.f.)* This  
 575 recommendation is to assist in implementation in the short term of the changes recommended  
 576 elsewhere in the Way Forward Commission’s Recommendations 1 through 1.g. It is designed to  
 577 fit with the Way Forward Commission’s Recommendation 3 if the General Assembly so desires.

578 *Review of “A Corp.” (Way Forward Recommendation 1.g.):* This recommendation is to ensure  
 579 initial review by the General Assembly of “A Corp.” following the governance changes in “A  
 580 Corp.” recommended by the Way Forward Commission in which we concur and then for the  
 581 General Assembly to determine how often in the future separate review of “A Corp.” is needed.

#### 582 G. Recommendation 7:

583  
 584 In their reports to us, several of the six agencies shared their concern that recent General  
 585 Assemblies have discussed and approved overtures which directly impact their work without  
 586 sufficient consultation with the those agencies. For example, at the 2016 Assembly, the cost of  
 587 the proposed change back to the language of “Ministers of the Word and Sacrament” from  
 588 “Teaching Elders” in the Book of Order was reported to the commissioners before they voted.  
 589 However, that cost did not factor in the significant cost of changing documents, forms, and other  
 590 printed materials at the other agencies. The Board of Pensions alone had almost \$100,000 in  
 591 costs to make the change. As the General Assemblies considered policies about investments in  
 592 companies profiting from the conflict in Israel and Palestine, several agencies had to devote  
 593 significant resources without those impacts on their work being reported to the General  
 594 Assembly. They were very willing to undertake the work, but the costs were not factored into  
 595 the overall costs of those policy decisions.

596  
 597 We believe that the amendments to the Standing Rules of the General Assembly proposed will  
 598 allow Assembly Committees to better understand the impact of business they consider,  
 599 particularly when presented with commissioner resolutions, while still allowing Assembly  
 600 Committees full freedom in its consideration of such business.

#### 601 H. Recommendation 8:

602 We believe a vision should

- 603 • bring unity and purpose;
- 604 • provide direction and focus;
- 605 • establish a basis for trust;
- 606 • undergird strategic decision-making processes;
- 607 • offer a path for alignment of staffing and programmatic choices;
- 608 • inspire people to get involved.

609

610 Because we are in a time when contextual dynamics are continually changing, attending to vision  
611 implementation and engaging in ongoing vision discernment and strategic alignment is essential if  
612 we are to live fully into the new openness to which we are called.

613  
614 We propose adding a broadly representative team with specific expertise in vision and strategy work,  
615 which would serve as the “resident experts” related to the vision of the church and which would be  
616 given the authority to:

- 617 1. Ensure that the vision is a constant focal point of the work of the church
- 618 2. Ground in the theological themes of “A New Openness” (F-1.0404)
- 619 3. Share the vision with the larger church and gather “success stories” that connect the church’s  
620 work to the vision
- 621 4. Lead discernment processes throughout the church that not only test the current vision for  
622 clarity and relevance but also provide opportunities to listen more broadly in the different  
623 ministry contexts of the PCUSA
- 624 5. Provide advice to the agencies regarding continuity of vision and the connection between  
625 vision, mission directives and new programming proposals.
- 626

*Appendix A*

627

628

**STANDARDS FOR REVIEW OF GENERAL ASSEMBLY AGENCIES**

**PURPOSE**

630 The Presbyterian Church (U.S.A.) is committed to the understanding that ‘the unity of the  
631 Church is a gift of its Lord and finds expression in its faithfulness to the mission to which  
632 Christ calls it’ (G-4.0201). The basic principles of Presbyterian polity include the  
633 responsibility of a higher governing body to review those ministries for which it is  
634 accountable (G.-4.0301f). The purpose of the review process is to provide an equitable  
635 evaluation of the ministry of the agencies of the General Assembly. The review will focus on  
636 the quality of the relationship of the agencies’ ministry with the mission of the whole  
637 Presbyterian Church (U.S.A.), the agencies’ collaborative efforts with other agencies, and the  
638 quality of the agencies’ program based on the standards for review.

**~~THE ROLE~~ TIMING OF THE PROCESS AND FORMATION OF THE REVIEW  
COMMITTEES**

641 The review process for General Assembly Agencies occurs over the cycle of three General  
642 Assemblies. In the first Assembly of the cycle, a committee will report its review the work of  
643 the Board of Pensions, the Presbyterian Foundation, and the Presbyterian Investment and Loan  
644 Program. In the second Assembly of the cycle, a committee will report its review the work of  
645 the Presbyterian Publishing Corporation, the Office of the General Assembly, and the  
646 Presbyterian Mission Agency. In the third Assembly of the cycle, a committee will report its  
647 review of the effectiveness of the six agencies and other governing bodies in working  
648 collaboratively to implement the General Assembly's mission directives.

649 The General Assembly Nominating Committee will nominate to each meeting of the  
650 General Assembly for election ~~two~~ the appropriate committees and a moderators ~~for each~~  
651 ~~committee~~ to conduct the review the work of one of the agencies of the General Assembly  
652 assigned based on a the six-year schedule described above. The agency review committee’s  
653 responsibility is to provide an objective report to the General Assembly as to the agency’s  
654 compliance to the standards of review. The agency review committee may provide advice on  
655 areas of program improvement. The agency review committee’s role will be to examine the  
656 agency’s church relations, its policies and practice, history of collaboration with other agencies,  
657 and its program effectiveness. ~~The agency review committee will review the agency’s self-study~~  
658 ~~report and other documents.~~ It will visit the agency and talk personally with leadership staff and  
659 the governing board or committee. ~~The agency review committee is to conduct its work within~~  
660 ~~the context of the General Assembly’s concern for the strong vital connections within the~~  
661 ~~agencies of the General Assembly and the whole church. The governing board of the agency is~~  
662 ~~responsible for the internal management of the agency and its operational details. The agency~~  
663 ~~review committee’s role is to strengthen the bonds of the agencies to the General Assembly, the~~  
664 ~~essential mission of the church, and the basic accountability of the governing board and~~  
665 ~~executive leadership of the agency to the PC(USA). The agency review committee should~~  
666 ~~celebrate with the whole church the successful ministries of the agency it is reviewing, and to~~  
667 ~~consult with the General Assembly Committee on Representation regarding representation of~~

668 employees. The agency review committee will report to the General Assembly through the  
669 General Assembly committee to which the agency reports.

## 670 **STAFFING AND FUNDING**

671 ~~The Office of the General Assembly will provide adequate staffing for the agency review~~  
672 ~~committee to complete its task.~~ Staffing will be provided by ~~the Presbyterian Mission Agency in~~  
673 ~~the year the Office of the General Assembly~~ an agency that is not being reviewed. The funding  
674 for the review process will be paid from per capita income.

## 675 **MANUAL**

676 A manual will be maintained to provide guidance in the review process to the agency review  
677 committee and the agencies. The manual will contain information on the process for ~~review self-~~  
678 ~~study by the agency, the visit with the agency,~~ and the report format for the agency review  
679 committee. The format will outline the opportunities for dialogue between the agency review  
680 committee and the agency in preparation of the final report. The manual will provide guidance  
681 for the whole agency review committee on its organization and the role of individual members  
682 in the review process.

## 683 **STANDARDS CRITERIA FOR REVIEW OF INDIVIDUAL AGENCIES**

### 684 *A. Church Relatedness*

685 1. Each agency was created by the church, and exists to serve and support the church's  
686 mission in a particular area. The agency is expected to have the expertise necessary to  
687 accomplish the work it has been assigned, and is also expected to exhibit a constant awareness  
688 of its servant role in the life of the PC(USA).

689 2. The basic work, programs, and services of the agency demonstrate fidelity to the mission  
690 and accountability procedures set forth in its establishing deliverance, charter, or mandate from  
691 the assembly. The agency should exhibit leadership in guiding the church in its engagement  
692 with the work and resources in which the agency acts as the church's expert.

693 3. When appropriate, printed materials of the agency clearly identify the agency as a part of  
694 the PC(USA).

695 3. The agency honors the policy statements of the General Assembly of the PC(USA) and  
696 the Constitution.

697 4. The agency includes in its administrative officers, and in its governing board in  
698 consultation with the General Assembly Nominating Committee, persons who understand and  
699 respect the relationship with the PC(USA).

700 5. The agency provides responses to directives and requests from the General Assembly.

701 6. The agency is actively working to open wide the doors of the church to God's amazing  
702 diversity, welcoming all ages and all expressions of race, class, gender, and sexual orientation in  
703 striving to increase the membership of our denomination and achieve the great ends of the  
704 church

705

706 *B. Policies and Program Effectiveness*

707 1. The agency understands that its responsibility is to manage its assets for the good of the  
708 whole of the PC(USA).

709 2. The governing board is properly constituted, clearly identified, and fully conversant with  
710 (a) the mission of the agency, (b) the current overall condition of the agency, (c) its specific  
711 responsibilities as directors, (d) the legal relationship of the agency to the church, and (e) its  
712 relationship to the president or chief officer.

713 3. The agency exhibits full compliance with all appropriate external regulatory and  
714 accrediting agencies, including consultation and review with the General Assembly Committee  
715 on Representation regarding principles of participation and representation in the employment of  
716 personnel, and conformity with ‘A Churchwide Plan for Equal Employment Opportunity and  
717 Affirmative Action’ or subsequent guidelines.

718 4. An annual audit of the financial affairs of the agency is conducted by qualified and  
719 disinterested parties.

720 5. The governing board of the agency has a process for the selection and review of its chief  
721 officer or president.

722 6. The president or chief officer and the governing board have policies and procedures by  
723 which they assure that the agency staff hold the necessary and appropriate skills, licenses, and  
724 experience to make it reasonable to anticipate that they can perform their work satisfactorily and  
725 a functioning policy with expectations of staff development.

726 7. The agency has in place and operating a long-range and short-range planning process  
727 and a process for measuring its delivery of services and of monitoring the effectiveness of those  
728 services with its constituencies.

729 8. The agency exhibits an effective strategy for producing high-quality communication  
730 with its constituencies.

731 9. The agency is currently structured to face effectively the challenges of the future and  
732 demonstrates appropriate attention to current and emerging technologies to enable it to fulfill its  
733 mission.

734

735 *C. Collaboration*

736 1. The agency presses beyond communication and consultation to genuine collaboration  
737 and, where appropriate and/or directed by General Assembly, shares agendas and work with  
738 other agencies toward fulfillment of shared goals.

739 2. The agency maintains open and regular communication with, and provides timely and  
740 appropriate access to information to, other agencies and PC(USA) constituencies, including mid  
741 council bodies.

742 3. The agency has conducted an evaluation of the potential gains and risks associated with  
743 collaborative endeavors with other agencies whenever new programs are initiated.

744 4. The agency seeks pragmatic solutions to operational challenges by relying on the assets,  
745 resources, and strengths of other agencies.

746

747 **CRITERIA FOR REVIEW OF THE COLLECTIVE WORK OF THE AGENCIES**

748 The review of the whole of the Presbyterian Church (U.S.A.) and its six agencies shall focus  
749 broadly on the effectiveness of the six agencies and other councils in working collaboratively to  
750 implement the General Assembly's mission directives.

751 The focus in reviewing the effectiveness of the agencies and other councils with respect to their  
752 effectiveness in implementing the General Assembly's mission directives shall be on the  
753 following areas:

754 1. The effectiveness of and obstacles to collaboration between the agencies;

755 2. The accountability of the agencies to the General Assembly and to one another;

756 3. The agencies' response to the General Assembly's mission directives, individually and  
757 collectively, in light of the call to a new openness in Book of Order F-1.0404;

758 4. The stewardship and effective use of resources by the agencies individually and collectively.

759 5. Their work to open wide the doors of the church to God's amazing diversity, welcoming all  
760 ages and all expressions of race, class, gender, and sexual orientation in striving to increase the  
761 membership of our denomination and achieve the great ends of the church

762

763