

SYNTHESIS OF RESPONSES

All thirteen congregations:

- ✓ Are supportive of the futuring conversation and want to continue the process
- ✓ Desire to make strengthening inter-congregational relationships the focus for future conversations
- ✓ Used words such as “resonated”, “excited”, “cautiously optimistic”, “good beginning”, “hope-filled”, “Refounding”, “organic”, evolutionary”, “spirit-filled” and “potential” to describe their Sisters’ responses
- ✓ Believe that the Marys should be involved in the process with input and support from the Elizabeths

Ten congregations noted:

- ✓ Using chronological age as the only factor in determining Marys/Elizabeths; desire for fluidity between/among the groups; possibility of self-selection as a Mary, Elizabeth or Phoebe; can a Sister “age out” of the Marys; need to build bridges between the Marys and Elizabeths (AD, AM, GR, HP, MSJ, P, RA, SK, SP, SR)

Eight congregations noted:

- ✓ Separating Marys and Elizabeths as we move into the future because of the desire for intergenerational living and the possibility of fracturing relationships; separation could become polarizing or divisive in a global community that is striving for unity; need to engage the Elizabeths’ creativity and wisdom; need to maintain good communication between the groups (AM, BL, MSJ, P, RA, SK, SP, SR)

Five congregations noted:

- ✓ Ability of the Marys to belong to two Congregations, including leadership and canonical issues, while maintaining energy for mission (AD, BL, MSJ, P, RA)
- ✓ Desire to maintain focus on mission/ministry (MSJ, P, SN, SP, SR)

Three congregations noted:

- ✓ Impact on vocations, including which congregation a candidate might choose, and on initial formation. (HOU, SK, SR)

Two congregations noted:

- ✓ Effect this might have on the pool for leadership for both Elizabeths and Marys (GR, RA)
- ✓ Move soon to birth this entity so that there will be time for it to evolve while all congregations have the fervor and energy to provide support for the birthing process; make this a priority. (SN, SK)

One congregation noted:

- ✓ Incorporating the movements of the Elizabeths and Marys into DSC and LCWR as future leaders (HOU)

Other suggestions for moving forward:

1. Provide opportunities to ensure that Marys engage with each other, including ZOOM and DSC, both within the founding Congregation and among the participating Congregations. (AD, MSJ, P, SP)
2. Continue to study dual membership including accountability and process. (AD, MSM, P)
3. Consider the possibility of intercommunity/inter-congregational intentional living/shared ministry. (MSJ, P, RA)
4. Remain open to collaboration with other religious and to global sisterhood; include members of US Dominican Congregations ministering in other countries; invite the non-DSC/LCWR communities as well; allow for intercultural togetherness; nurture a growing awareness of and appreciation for the larger context of the DSC and LCWR. (BL, GR, MSJ, RA, SK, SP)
5. Consider requiring that one council member be under the age of 70. (MSJ)
6. Consider including Associates, Dominican Young Adults and Dominican Volunteers in the discussion; have Marys engage with younger Associates as they move forward. (AM, BL, HP, P, SN, SP)
7. Consider hiring a facilitator to create a process for moving forward. (BL, SP)

8. The possibility must have shape and structure; a timeline needs to be created and adhered to; create specific processes/resources for member engagement, including the Elizabeths. (AM, SK)
9. Have a representative from the Marys share and report regularly to the Elizabeths; share Marys ideas/input with Elizabeths; communication is critical; incorporate Phoebees. (AM, BL, GR; SK, SN)
10. There could be different kinds of membership and forms of commitment. (GR)
11. Consider recording Task Force members so that all the congregations will view/hear the same information. (GR)
12. Model holds potential to attract millennials. (GR)
13. Each of the Marys must personally choose an Elizabeth who will companion her. (AM)
14. Accountability to all congregations is needed; seek a commitment from all DSC leadership teams to follow-up on next steps with their congregations. (AM, SK)
15. Are we able to free some of our younger members to experiment in creating the new? (RA)
16. How can we build on all we share in common and build a presence as Dominican Charism Carriers that will move us forward? (RA)
17. How can we share in our Vocation, Formation and Associate programming? How do we share our financial and personnel resources for the good of the broader Dominican Family? (RA)
18. The work of reaching out to women discerning religious life needs to be ongoing if this new entity is to thrive. (SK)
19. Stay with the model of Mary and Elizabeth and encourage the Phoebees; expand the understanding of the role of the Phoebees in all of this; gain the interest/support of the Elizabeths. (SK)
20. Don't put pressure on either the Marys or the Elizabeths in terms of how soon/extensively they participate in the evolution of this model. (SK)
21. Provide for annual updating of the demographic circles. (SK)
22. Provide, sooner rather than later, for opportunities for discussion by congregations who have native communities in other countries which will be impacted by this new entity. (SK)
23. "Marys, Elizabeths, and Phoebees" were great ways to help us to see ourselves when the idea was being introduced; can we find new descriptors of the constituencies going forward? (SK)
24. We need to listen to what the Marys want. They need to take the initiative. Leadership should not design the new entity. (BL)
25. Allow Marys to choose from the most viable congregations and join one rather than form a new entity. (BL)
26. Explore temporary commitment of lay people. (BL)
27. Provide something concrete after the DSC meeting. (BL)
28. Some current OP projects e.g. the CDN might become the responsibility of the new entity. (BL)
29. We must lighten the load of historical and institutional commitments, focus our efforts and be true to the Dominican charism. (SN)
30. Birthing and risking innovation and creativity were a strong theme. (SN)
31. What might emerge: wisdom pods? action pods? talent pods? geographic pods, area hubs, common centers (houses) of hospitality? (SN)
32. How do we insure that ALL who walk the Dominican path at this point in human history are included in the unfolding of a fresh approach to the Dominican Family? The model needs to include more than vowed membership. (SN)
33. Be generous in financial commitments. Make the Futuring Project a priority. (SN)
34. Listen to those who are experimenting with Nuns and Nones. (SN)
35. The work before us is to make space for the new to emerge, most likely involving collaboration across charisms. (HP)

36. Continue the conversation, including a diversity of vibrant religious in the process (regardless of age). (HP)
37. Engage in the work of dealing with properties and other temporalities that are currently before us as religious congregations. Right-sizing is an important step for the future. (HP)
38. Encourage our Sisters under 50 to engage in Giving Voice, and those under 60 to engage in the LCWR leadership collaborative. Collaborating with others of diverse charisms will clarify the Dominican energy for God's preferred future. (HP)

1.	AD	Adrian
2.	AM	Amityville
3.	BL	Blauvelt
4.	GR	Grand Rapids
5.	HOU	Houston
6.	HP	Hope
7.	MSJ	Mission San Jose
8.	P	Peace
9.	RA	Racine
10.	SK	Sparkill
11.	SP	Springfield
12.	SR	San Rafael
13.	SN	Sinsinawa