

<p>4 Distinct Models—<i>with emphasis on team/participative/collaborative/synodal</i></p> <p><b>A. (Canada, England, USA)</b> 3 leaders: a. with assigned roles b. according to gifts and skills c. geographic (part-time or full time as needed)</p> <p><b>B. (Mauritius and Peru)</b> 2 Co-leaders (part-time and remaining in some ministry)</p> <p><b>C. Spain</b> Province leader with 2 part time consultants</p> <p><b>D. (Australia &amp; SEA, Eastern Africa, Ireland, South Asia)</b> Province leader with 2 full time consultants and 2 part time consultants</p>	
<p>Model A</p> <p>Responses ranged from the group working well and suits the needs of the region to a preference for clearly defined roles, return to Province/Region leader with one decision maker and some configuration of support for the named person. Others focused on having clearly defined roles for each member of the team with the membership having the definition of each leader's role and even further allowing each team leader having decision making powers when dealing with member so that membership are informed about decisions in a timely manner. Given the age profile, how long is a three-person team sustainable?</p>	<p>Model B</p> <p>Responses gave credit to the value of co-leadership with the sharing of the burden of leadership and specific attention was mentioned that civil law requires a named president and this model is substantially less adherent to the civil law requirement. Also, the model does not necessarily fit the need for cultural representation in the area. At the same time another view represented that this model works well and allows for leaders to stay in ministry while in leadership given the size of the region. There is a realization that in the future this may not be sustainable.</p>
<p>Model C</p> <p>Responses expressed a great appreciation for province status and the way leadership has been shared and delegated locally. Province leader is effective in decision-making with the support of two part time consultants who visit and support local community while adding supportive role to the province leader. Given the age profile and capacity for leadership into the future, how long is this model sustainable?</p>	<p>Model D</p> <p>Responses reflect the diversity of understanding and appreciation for the expansive workload of the province leader and therefore have appreciation for the full time and part time consultant configuration. The consensus frequently being that consultants should have clearly defined roles. One shared a diagram of inclusion and upgrading of representation of needs for growth and development of the SEA sector of the province. A diagram reflecting the breakdown of how the body of leadership might be configured for province leadership.</p>

**General insights and recommendations from evaluation feedback:**

- ⇒ Representation in some feedback that the time to evaluate because of covid restrictions hampered the living out of leadership plans for provinces and regions. Recognition that leaders did their best under difficult circumstances and without a roadmap for ways of proceeding. Leadership facilitation and cooperation and support from membership helped.
- ⇒ There seemed to be some level of consensus that whatever the configuration of leadership, there should be detailed areas of responsibility/description and formation for leadership and governance.
- ⇒ Attention should be given to the formation and communication to province and region members as to the roles of each member of the leadership teams unless they are pre-determined by the traditional decision-making role of province or region leader. There was suggestion of possible rotating timing so leaders take turns.
- ⇒ Some felt that maintaining province or region leaders in the Ignatian and Mary Wardian tradition is best suited for the ongoing development of the province or region regardless of the size.
- ⇒ Furthermore, it was recommended by some that a realistic attention to appointing lay leadership on province/region/leadership teams be considered.