Back to Contents

A PASTORAL RELATIONSHIP RESOURCE

When Things Get Stuck

After the Apology: A Facilitator's Guide to Grace, Accountability, and Reconciliation

BY LORNE BOSTWICK



Contents

Quick reference during a conversation. Select a topic below; page numbers match the PDF. For individual roadblocks and other sections, use the PDF bookmark panel. Every page has a return link in the header.

Beginning here 3

Readiness, impasse, and safety 6

Choosing participants and support people 7

Keeping the account specific and truthful 9

Receiving an apology 11

Common roadblocks and possible responses 12

When emotion fills the room 15

Connecting repair to the failure 15

Making a workable agreement 16

Clarifying leadership responsibility 17

Continuing hurt or obstruction 17

Moving forward without unanimity 18

When more conversation is not more help 19

Preparation questions 21

Beginning Here

Sometimes an apology opens the way forward.

Sometimes it does not.

A pastor acknowledges a mistake, offers repair, and hopes the relationship can begin to recover. Yet the concern keeps circulating. Some people feel heard; others do not. Leaders hesitate. Conversations repeat themselves. The pastor grows weary, and the congregation begins organizing its life around a failure rather than the ministry they share.

Sometimes the direction is reversed. A congregational leader takes responsibility, but the pastor cannot receive the acknowledgment or stop returning to the injury.

You may have been asked to help.

Perhaps you are a liaison for a Committee on Ministry (COM), an executive presbyter, a trusted colleague, or another person outside the congregation whom those involved respect. You may have little formal preparation for this work. You want to be fair, and you hope a conversation can help.

It can. But a fair conversation does not guarantee reconciliation.

People bring more than the present disagreement into the room. They bring the ways responsibility, anger, shame, forgiveness, and authority were handled in their families and earlier communities. Some learned that admitting a mistake invites humiliation. Others learned that forgiving means giving up their protection. Some have rarely seen disagreement handled without someone winning and someone losing.

Public life offers plenty of examples of accusation, exaggeration, contempt, and refusal to take responsibility. A congregation does not automatically develop healthier habits because its members know the language of confession and grace.

Even people who sincerely care about the church may struggle to repair a relationship. Their struggle can leave a facilitator searching for the words that will finally change everything.

You are not responsible for producing another person's repentance, forgiveness, or willingness. Your work is to help people tell the truth, understand what remains unresolved, own their responsibilities, and consider a faithful next step.

Sometimes that leads to a restored relationship. Sometimes it leads to more limited cooperation, clearer expectations, outside help, or a responsible transition.

The hope is reconciliation. The immediate task is to discover what faithful movement is possible—without allowing the process itself to become another source of harm or exhaustion.

This guide concerns ordinary failures in leadership and communication. It does not replace safeguarding, investigation, professional mediation, or an appropriate response to abuse, threats, serious misconduct, or retaliation. You do not have to become an expert mediator to offer useful help. You do need to recognize when a situation exceeds the help you can responsibly provide.

The four movements are not a timetable:

- Prepare people—not just a meeting.
- Hear the concern and make room for responsibility.
- Turn acknowledgment into workable repair.
- Help leaders carry the relationship forward.

As the situation becomes clearer, you may need to return to an earlier movement.

Keep three questions close:

What still needs attention? What belongs to each of us? What can we responsibly do next?

Grace Gives Repair Somewhere to Begin

Christian reconciliation begins with a truth that shame makes difficult to believe: a failure is real, but it is not the whole truth about a person.

In the Reformed tradition, our worth rests in God's grace, not in our ability to maintain an unblemished life. Confession becomes possible because acknowledging a failure does not place us beyond God's mercy. We can tell the truth about what we have done without making it the measure of everything we are.

That grace does not make responsibility optional.

Jesus calls people to take initiative when a relationship needs attention (Matthew 5:23–24). Paul joins gentle restoration with bearing one another's burdens (Galatians 6:1–2). Ephesians connects truthful speech, responsible anger, kindness, and forgiveness with the life of the community (Ephesians 4:25–32).

These passages do not provide a meeting agenda. They give the work its direction.

A pastor is responsible for acknowledging a mistake and undertaking appropriate repair. The congregation is responsible for receiving truthful acknowledgment, participating in repair, addressing destructive responses, and resisting the temptation to turn a failure into the pastor's permanent identity.

Extending grace is not simply a desirable outcome. It belongs to the church's calling. A community that receives God's mercy cannot faithfully make permanent accusation its way of relating to someone who has taken responsibility.

The congregation is not required to ignore harm, forget what happened, or restore trust before there is reason to do so. Neither is it faithful to rehearse a repaired failure as though it has given the pastor a new name.

This responsibility belongs to the whole church, not only to its most gracious members. Lay leaders, other staff, and presbytery leaders have work to do when congregational habits undermine reconciliation. The same responsibility applies when a pastor preserves a congregant's failure as a permanent identity.

Shared responsibility does not mean equal blame. It means that each person, and each part of the system, must carry what belongs to them.

Paul's words, "if it is possible, so far as it depends on you," recognize that peace cannot be accomplished by one person alone (Romans 12:18). They also invite an honest question: have we carried the part that depends on us?

The companion resources *Making an Apology* and *After the Apology* can help pastors and congregational leaders prepare for their respective work. This guide supports an outside person helping them undertake that work together.

Movement One: Prepare People—Not Just a Meeting

Clarify What You Have Been Asked to Do

Before you hear the whole history, discover why you have been invited.

Are people hoping for help understanding one another? Do they need an agreement about unfinished repair? Does someone expect you to persuade the pastor to leave or a member to forgive?

An invitation to facilitate is not authority to decide the outcome.

You might begin:

> "My role is to help clarify what remains unresolved, identify responsibility, and consider workable next steps. I am not here to secure a particular outcome."

Ask who invited you, whether others accept your involvement, and which decisions belong to congregational or presbytery leadership. If expectations differ, clarify them before arranging the conversation.

Disclose relationships that may affect confidence in your fairness.

> "I have worked with the pastor before. I want you to know that as you consider whether you are comfortable with my helping."

Being outside the congregation does not automatically make you impartial. Being trusted by one person does not mean everyone else feels safe with you.

Fairness is not indifference to harmful conduct, nor does it require dividing blame equally. It means giving people a meaningful opportunity to be heard, maintaining consistent expectations, and locating responsibility accurately.

Discover Whether This Conversation Can Help

Meet briefly with those directly involved before bringing them together. Ask similar questions of each person:

- What most needs to be understood?
- What acknowledgment or repair has already occurred?
- What remains unfinished?
- What would make a conversation worthwhile?
- What might you be willing to reconsider or undertake?
- What would make participation difficult or unsafe?

These conversations help you prepare. They are not opportunities to build competing cases or promise private loyalty.

Listen for more than willingness to attend.

Someone may say, "Of course I will come," while expecting the meeting to prove that everyone else is wrong. Another person may sound reluctant but be willing to consider a small, reasonable step.

Readiness does not require calm feelings, polished language, or agreement about everything. It requires enough willingness to listen, speak without intimidation, and consider responsibilities beyond the other person's.

You might ask:

> "You do not have to arrive ready to forgive. Would you be willing to hear what has been acknowledged and consider what remains?"

Or:

> "If the conversation does not produce everything you want, can you still participate without attacking or pressuring others?"

People must be free to decline. Declining does not settle the concern or remove responsibilities that exist outside the meeting. It does clarify what this particular process can accomplish.

Notice What Is Making Participation Difficult

An impasse can have different roots.

Someone may want repair but lack the words. Someone may be overwhelmed. An important concern may remain unanswered. The basic facts may be disputed. Someone may reject any outcome that does not vindicate them completely.

Hold your understanding provisionally. One difficult exchange rarely tells the whole story.

A person who says, "Nothing will help," may mean, "I cannot imagine what would help." They may also mean exactly what they said.

Try:

> "It may be difficult to picture a way forward. Would it help to consider one small possibility?"

If every possibility is rejected, ask:

> "Is there any next step you would be willing to consider, or are you not willing to work toward repair at this point?"

Seek clarity, not agreement at any cost.

When intimidation, threats, retaliation, or serious allegations make ordinary facilitation inappropriate, pause.

> "This needs a different kind of help before I can responsibly bring people together."

Seek consultation through the appropriate denominational, safeguarding, or professional channel. Limited finances do not make an unsuitable process safe.

Make Room for the Person Beneath the Position

Sometimes what looks like stubbornness is an effort to protect dignity.

A pastor may hear criticism as, "You are not fit for ministry." A member may hear an invitation to receive an apology as, "Your pain no longer matters." A leader may fear that acting will cost friendships or divide the church.

You do not need to uncover someone's childhood or interpret their inner life. Ask what the proposed next step means to them.

> "What concerns you about acknowledging the apology?"

> "What worries you about taking this step? Is there something important you fear losing?"

> "What are you afraid might happen if you take responsibility?"

Then distinguish the feared meaning from the actual invitation.

"Receiving the acknowledgment does not mean saying the mistake was acceptable."

"Owning this action does not mean agreeing with every criticism of your ministry."

"Taking responsibility for the process does not require choosing a camp."

These distinctions may open room that another argument would close.

Help People Imagine a Different Conversation

People accustomed to accusation or avoidance may not know what productive participation sounds like.

Offer possibilities, not scripts they must perform.

For a pastor:

"I can explain the pressure I was under without using it to excuse how I responded."

For a congregant:

"I can acknowledge the apology and still name the part of repair that remains."

For a leader:

"I can care about both people and still interrupt conduct that harms the congregation."

Ask:

"Which of those feels possible? What would you say in your own words?"

The aim is not to make people sound professionally coached. It is to help them find a response they can honestly inhabit.

Choose Participants and Support Carefully

Invite the people directly involved and those responsible for undertaking the next steps. Do not assemble competing camps.

Consider whether a support person would help someone participate. Invite the participant to suggest someone they trust, and clarify the role with both of them before the meeting. Make comparable support available to others where appropriate.

Choose someone who can remain steady, respect privacy, and encourage honest participation—even when the conversation becomes uncomfortable. Their commitment to the process needs to be as strong as their commitment to the person they accompany.

The support person is a caregiver, not an advocate arguing a case or an ally recruited to strengthen a side. They might help the participant gather their thoughts, ask for a pause, or remain present while hearing something difficult. They are there to support faithful participation, not shield the person from responsibility or speak in their place.

You might explain:

"You are here to support this person as they take part in the conversation. That includes helping them speak honestly, listen, and consider their own responsibilities—not securing a particular outcome for them."

If the proposed person is deeply involved in the dispute or cannot accept that role, explore another choice together.

A support person cannot make an unsafe process appropriate. If someone needs advocacy, protection, or specialized assistance, reconsider the kind of process being offered.

Agree on the Shape of the Meeting

Choose a setting, time, and length that make participation possible without unnecessary barriers. Account for hearing, mobility, language, fatigue, and access needs.

Agree on a few expectations:

- Speak from your own experience.
- Describe actions rather than label people.
- Let others finish.
- Do not use threats to secure agreement.
- Ask for a pause when needed.

Clarify privacy, what will be communicated afterward, and any limits arising from your role. Do not promise secrecy you cannot keep or prohibit appropriate support and legitimate reporting.

Explain how you will respond when expectations are disregarded.

> "I will ask us to restate a personal attack as a specific concern. If that cannot happen, we will pause rather than continue in a harmful way."

Expectations matter when people know how they will be maintained.

Prepare Yourself, Too

Something in the story may touch your own experience.

Perhaps you have watched a pastor driven out by repeated accusations. Perhaps you have seen leaders protect a pastor while dismissing genuine harm. Perhaps this conversation reminds you of a relationship you could not repair.

Your experience may help you notice what others miss. It may also lead you toward a conclusion before this situation has revealed itself.

Before the meeting, ask yourself:

- Whose account am I finding easiest to believe?
- What am I afraid will happen?
- Am I trying to repair an earlier experience through this one?
- Can I remain curious without becoming passive?

Arrange a confidential way to consult about the process within appropriate privacy limits. A second facilitator may help if their role is clear and acceptable to those involved.

You do not have to carry this work without support.

Movement Two: Hear the Concern and Make Room for Responsibility

Begin with a Purpose People Can Reach

Do not begin by promising that everyone will be reconciled before they leave.

Try:

> "We are here to understand what still needs attention and what each of us can do next. We do not have to agree about everything or leave with all our feelings settled."

If prayer is appropriate, keep it brief and open. Ask for truthfulness, courage, gentleness, and wisdom. Do not use prayer to identify who needs to repent.

Begin with the concern the group has agreed to address.

Stay Close to What Happened

Broad judgments make responsibility difficult to locate.

> "The pastor does not respect anyone."
>
> "This congregation is impossible."
>
> "That member wants to destroy my ministry."

Invite a particular account:

> "What happened that led you to that conclusion?"
>
> "Which interaction most needs our attention?"
>
> "What did you experience as a result?"

Distinguish the action, its effect, and the meaning someone has given it.

A member may say, "When you cut me off, I understood that my contribution did not matter."

That experience can be heard without assuming the pastor intended that message.

> "We can hear how the action affected you. Let us be careful about claiming to know the motive."

Uncertainty about motive should not be used to dismiss a clear effect.

When accounts differ, identify what is agreed, what is disputed, and whether the disputed fact must be clarified before repair can proceed. You are not required to settle a consequential factual dispute by asking everyone to compromise.

Let Each Person Be Understood Before Asking for a Response

Protect enough space for an account to be heard.

> "I will make room for your response. First, I want them to finish."

Summarize briefly and check your understanding.

> "You understood the decision to be settled before your concern was considered, and you felt your leadership role had been bypassed. Have I understood that?"

Then invite a response that separates acknowledgment from disagreement.

> "What can you acknowledge in that account? What do you understand differently?"

Someone does not have to accept every interpretation to own a particular action. The person receiving an apology does not have to endorse every explanation to recognize truthful responsibility-taking.

Help People Hold More Than One Truth

Conflict can narrow a story until only one statement is allowed to remain true.

The pastor acted disrespectfully.

The pastor has taken responsibility.

The member remains hurt.

Some of the account circulating afterward is inaccurate.

Leaders have avoided their responsibilities.

Several of these may be true at the same time.

You might say:

> "Acknowledging the repair does not erase the original failure. Naming the original failure does not erase the repair."

Or:

> "We can take your concern seriously without making it the whole truth about the pastor."

This is not an effort to balance blame. It is an effort to keep the story truthful.

Distinguish the Original Failure from What Followed

One failure can give rise to others.

A pastor dismisses a concern. A member exaggerates the incident afterward. Leaders avoid addressing either issue. Staff defend the pastor by belittling the member.

Each action deserves attention.

> "We have the original interaction, what was said afterward, and how leaders responded. Let us consider each without using one to excuse another."

The pastor's mistake does not justify every congregational response. Harmful congregational responses do not excuse the pastor's mistake.

Do not require a harmed person to admit a fault simply to make the meeting feel balanced. Invite each participant to consider the conduct and responsibilities that actually belong to them.

Notice What Has Already Been Acknowledged and Done

Ask:

> "What responsibility has already been taken?"
>
> "What repair was offered?"
>
> "What has actually happened?"

Do not restart the process because feelings remain difficult. Do not assume an apology completed repair if an important action remains unaddressed.

A pastor may have apologized for speaking sharply while leaving a decision made through an unfair process untouched. The remaining question may be whether that decision needs reconsideration—not whether another apology is required.

Keep a brief shared account of completed and unfinished steps. It can help later conversations remain connected to what has happened rather than returning to the claim that nothing has been done.

Support the Receiving of an Apology

Some people do not know how to receive an apology without feeling that they have surrendered their concern.

Offer language that allows acknowledgment without pretending resolution.

> "Thank you for naming what happened. I am not ready to say everything is resolved, but your taking responsibility matters."
>
> "I can receive the apology. The part that still needs attention is…"
>
> "I am willing to participate in repair, even though rebuilding trust will take longer."

Ask:

> "Is there something in that acknowledgment you can receive?"

Receiving an apology does not mean declaring the conduct harmless, forgetting what happened, or restoring unrestricted trust. It means recognizing truthful responsibility-taking and considering what follows.

Pastors may need the same help when a congregational leader apologizes.

Keep Forgiveness, Trust, and Cooperation Distinct

These words often become tangled.

A person may be working toward forgiveness while remaining cautious about trust. Two people may cooperate responsibly before warmth returns. Someone may need personal support beyond the meeting.

Ask what is being requested.

> "Are we asking for a statement of forgiveness, a particular repair, or agreement about how we will work together?"

Do not require a declaration of forgiveness to make the meeting look successful. Do not let uncertainty about someone's feelings make every practical step impossible.

If personal forgiveness work needs more space, offer appropriate pastoral care or other support. Do not make accepting that help a condition for having a concern heard.

Movement Three: Turn Acknowledgment into Workable Repair

Respond to the Pattern Without Judging the Person

Recognizable remarks can help you prepare. They cannot tell you everything about the person saying them.

Fear, habit, confusion, and deliberate pressure may sound similar. Name what the language is doing to the conversation before assigning a motive.

The responses below are possibilities, not words you must recite. Let them help you prepare a steady response in your own voice.

"I already apologized, but you have no idea what I was dealing with."

A possible response:

> "We can consider the pressure. First, what responsibility are you taking for your response?"

A way forward:

Let the acknowledgment stand without qualification. Address workload or support separately rather than using it to excuse the action.

"This shows who the pastor really is."

A possible response:

> "Let us name the conduct we are concerned about without making it the whole truth about the person."

A way forward:

Ask whether there is a specific recurring pattern or one acknowledged failure. A relevant pattern deserves attention; a permanent character verdict does not identify repair.

"Everybody is upset. I am just the one willing to say it."

A possible response:

> "Please tell us your concern. We cannot treat unnamed people as though they have all made the same statement."

A way forward:

Offer an appropriate route for others to bring concerns. If people fear retaliation, take that seriously rather than demanding public disclosure.

“I know there was an apology, but it does not count.”

A possible response:

> “What was missing from it?”

A way forward:

Look for something particular: qualified responsibility, the wrong action named, absent repair, or acknowledgment that did not reach those affected.

If no acknowledgment seems possible to receive, ask:

> “Is there an acknowledgment you could receive, or is receiving one not possible for you right now?”

The answer helps clarify the limits of the present conversation.

“If I let this go, they get away with it.”

A possible response:

> “What accountability do you believe remains unfinished?”

A way forward:

Distinguish unfinished accountability from preserving an accusation after proportionate repair. Explore what receiving repair seems to threaten.

“They did what we asked, but now I need something else.”

A possible response:

> “Is this new information, an unfinished part of the repair, or a different concern?”

A way forward:

Review the agreement. Make room for relevant information without moving the finish line simply because the earlier step did not change every feeling.

“This is just like everything else that has happened here.”

A possible response:

> “What earlier experience helps us understand this concern? Let us name the connection.”

A way forward:

Relevant history may reveal a pattern. Other disappointments may need their own attention. Record them rather than allowing every grievance to become a condition for repairing this one.

“Christians are supposed to forgive. We should be done.”

A possible response:

> “Forgiveness does not remove the need to address unfinished repair.”

A way forward:

Identify what remains. Do not use theology to close a concern that has not been responsibly heard.

“Until I am satisfied, this church cannot move forward.”

A possible response:

> “Your concern deserves attention. Let us name what remains unresolved and what decisions belong to the church’s leaders.”

A way forward:

A fair hearing matters. Complete satisfaction is not always a workable condition for every congregational decision.

“If you support the pastor, you are against us.”

A possible response:

> “We can support responsible repair without endorsing everything anyone has done.”

A way forward:

Ask what action is being requested. Keep the conversation from becoming a test of allegiance.

“I am only telling people because I care about the church.”

A possible response:

> “How is this conversation helping the concern reach people who can address it?”

A way forward:

Distinguish appropriate support and reporting from recruiting a camp, circulating unverified claims, or renewing a settled accusation.

“If this happens, I will leave—or stop giving.”

A possible response:

> “You can make decisions about your participation. We still need to consider this matter fairly, without making that threat the deciding argument.”

A way forward:

Do not bargain away a fair process to retain a donor or influential member. Decisions remain with those authorized to make them.

“We are not taking sides. They need to work it out.”

A possible response:

> “You do not have to take sides to take responsibility. What does your leadership role require now?”

A way forward:

Identify a concrete action: protecting a fair meeting, correcting an inaccurate account, addressing personal attacks, or maintaining the concern process.

“Nothing will help.”

A possible response:

> “Would it help to consider one small possibility, or are you not willing to work toward repair at this point?”

A way forward:

Offer time or a limited choice if the person cannot imagine a next step. If they are unwilling, name the limit without turning it into a character judgment.

“You are too sensitive.”

A possible response:

> “Please describe the concern without labeling the person.”

A way forward:

Invite a restatement. If personal attacks continue, pause rather than allowing the expectation to become meaningless.

Let Emotion Be Present Without Letting It Decide Everything

Tears are not automatically manipulation. Anger is not automatically bad faith. Silence is not automatically refusal.

People can be upset and still participate responsibly.

> “This is difficult. Would a short pause help?”

> “You can be angry here. We still need to speak in a way that allows others to participate.”

If someone cannot continue, consider a shorter meeting, a written response, another conversation, or additional support.

Do not make emotional composure the price of being heard. Do not make emotional intensity the deciding authority.

Connect Repair to the Actual Failure

Repair should bear a recognizable relationship to what happened.

If a pastor publicly silenced someone, private regret may not restore their place in the group.

A possible acknowledgment and repair is:

> “I interrupted you and closed the conversation unfairly. I am sorry. At the next meeting, I will acknowledge that publicly, and the chair will make space for your concern before we decide.”

Where action is pending:

> “I will email those involved, acknowledge my mistake, and explain that we will hold off until we meet again and your thoughts can be considered.”

If a member circulated an inaccurate account:

> “I will contact the people I told and correct the statement that no apology occurred.”

If leaders allowed the matter to fester:

> "We will explain the concern process and address renewed personal accusations rather than leaving the pastor to respond alone."

Discuss these steps with those affected. The person apologizing cannot decide alone what will repair the relationship. Someone publicly dismissed should not be required to make a public appearance they do not want.

Ask:

- What would address the failure?
- Is it proportionate and possible?
- Who needs to participate or authorize the action?
- Does it place unnecessary work on the person harmed?
- How will we recognize completion?

More apology language is not always the missing repair.

Make the Agreement Small Enough to Carry

A modest agreement people will undertake is more useful than an impressive statement no one owns.

Record the action, the person responsible, and the timing.

For example:

> "The pastor will acknowledge the interaction at Tuesday's meeting. With the member's agreement, the chair will provide space for the concern before a decision. The member will correct the inaccurate account shared with three people. We will review completion in two weeks."

Ask each person what they actually agree to.

> "What part of this can you undertake?"

Do not treat silence, fatigue, or a desire to leave as consent.

If agreement is partial, record what is agreed and what remains disputed. Do not announce reconciliation that has not occurred.

Movement Four: Help Leaders Carry the Relationship Forward

Give Leadership Its Own Work

The facilitator supports the conversation. Leaders carry the responsibilities of leadership.

Before closing, clarify:

- Who will support completion of repair?
- Who will respond if personal attacks resume?
- Where can specific unresolved concerns be brought?
- Who will communicate what has been addressed?
- Which decisions can proceed through the church's normal authority?

Distinguish an invitation, an expectation, and a decision.

Participation in a facilitated conversation is an invitation. Respectful conduct is an expectation of communal life. Authorized leaders make decisions through the church's proper processes.

Leaders cannot force forgiveness by making it an institutional requirement. They can maintain expectations about conduct and make decisions that do not require unanimous approval.

Understand Why a Camp Can Be Difficult to Leave

A conflict may become a source of belonging.

People find companionship in a shared grievance. They become known as defenders of the pastor or defenders against the pastor. Changing their account may feel like betraying friends.

Do not assume that people enjoy the conflict or announce that this is their motive.

Ask:

> "Would accepting this step create difficulties in your other relationships?"
>
> "What would make it possible to change your view without feeling that you had abandoned people you care about?"

Leaders can help by refusing to make humiliation the price of movement.

Someone should be able to say, "I see this differently now," without being mocked for having been upset. Friends can remain friends without requiring one another to preserve the same accusation.

At the same time, leaders should notice whether repeated accusation receives special influence, attention, or exemption from ordinary expectations.

The congregation needs ways of belonging that do not depend on a common opponent.

Distinguish Continuing Hurt from Obstruction

Someone may remain disappointed, need distance, or decline a reconciliation conversation. Those responses do not automatically constitute obstruction.

Continued personal attacks, intimidation, knowingly inaccurate accounts, and repeated disruption are different matters.

Describe the conduct rather than naming someone "the problem."

A leader might say:

> "You do not have to say your feelings have changed. We do ask that you stop telling others that no acknowledgment occurred."

Or:

> "We remain willing to hear a specific unresolved concern. We will also continue the work the congregation has responsibly agreed to undertake."

If it is unclear whether repair is complete, do not claim that it is. Name the completed steps and provide a fair route for what remains.

When harmful conduct continues, leaders should restate the expectation, identify the appropriate response, and follow the church's polity. Formal consequences require proper authority and guidance, not improvised discipline within a repair meeting.

Moving Forward Does Not Require Unanimity

Leaders cannot declare another person's feelings resolved. They can decide how the congregation will conduct its shared life.

A fair process includes hearing relevant concerns, addressing responsibility, undertaking proportionate repair, and keeping an appropriate route open for substantive unresolved matters.

It does not require every person to approve every next step.

The congregation need not make one person's complete satisfaction the condition of its functioning. Nor may leaders use "moving forward" to avoid an unanswered concern.

Ask:

> "What remains unfinished, and who is responsible for it?"
>
> "What can proceed while that work continues?"
>
> "Are we waiting for an appropriate decision—or for someone's agreement when that agreement is not required?"

These questions help leaders act without pretending the whole relationship has been restored.

Do Not Leave the Pastor to Enforce Their Own Rehabilitation

After appropriate responsibility-taking, the pastor should not have to chase every rumor, repeat an apology indefinitely, or confront every renewed accusation alone.

A chair can say:

> "That concern has been acknowledged, and these repair steps have been completed. If something specific remains, please bring it through the agreed process."

A staff member can say:

> "I do not want to keep this circulating. Let us bring the concern to the people responsible for addressing it."

A presbytery representative can ask:

> "What is the congregation doing to carry its part of repair?"

The same principle applies when a pastor keeps rehearsing a congregational leader's repaired failure. Supporting the pastor does not require permitting that conduct.

Grace must become a practice of the system, not an expectation placed only on its most wounded or most accommodating person.

Communicate Enough to Reduce Uncertainty

Silence can leave room for speculation. Too much detail can expose people and restart the dispute.

Agree on a brief, truthful account:

- The concern was heard.
- Particular responsibilities were acknowledged.
- These actions have been completed or remain scheduled.
- Specific remaining concerns can be brought through this route.

Do not disclose personal material simply to prove someone wrong. Do not claim that everyone has forgiven, trust is fully restored, or the whole congregation agrees.

A truthful, limited account is better than a reassuring fiction.

Follow Through and Allow the Process to Close

A hopeful meeting is a beginning, not evidence that the work has been carried out.

At the agreed review, ask:

"Were the commitments kept?"

"Did the repair address what it was intended to address?"

"What specifically remains?"

"Are we conducting our relationships differently?"

Review actions, not whether everyone now feels warmly toward one another.

When the agreed work is completed, allow the formal process to close. Trust may continue growing through ordinary experience. New concerns should have an appropriate route without automatically reopening everything.

If commitments were not kept, return to the particular unfinished action rather than restarting the whole history.

Recognize When More Conversation Is Not More Help

Repeated meetings can become another way of avoiding a decision.

Ask:

- Are we discovering anything new?
- Is anyone undertaking a different action?
- Are people becoming more able to participate?
- Are leaders carrying their responsibilities?
- Is this process reducing harm—or extending it?

If there is no meaningful movement, name the limit.

> "I do not think another meeting in this form will help. We need to decide what kind of assistance or leadership action is needed next."

The next step may be consultation, individual support, a more experienced facilitator, an appropriate formal process, or consideration of the pastoral relationship's future.

Seek help before exhaustion becomes the only reason to change course. You do not have to repeat an unsuccessful process indefinitely to demonstrate patience or faithfulness.

Do not recommend a pastor's departure simply because some people refuse repair. Do not assume that remaining indefinitely is faithful because leaving would feel like failure.

Sometimes a responsible transition is needed. The work then includes protecting dignity, telling the truth, and refusing to make either party's whole identity the explanation for the ending.

Recognize Faithful Outcomes Without Pretending They Are the Same

The fullest hope is a restored relationship.

Other outcomes may represent meaningful movement:

A workable relationship: Trust remains limited, but people cooperate within clear expectations.

Reduced harm: Some refuse to participate, but leaders interrupt destructive conduct and protect congregational life.

Appropriate outside help: The facilitator recognizes the limit and helps the system seek what it needs.

A responsible transition: The relationship ends without an unnecessary campaign of accusation or humiliation.

Do not call reduced harm reconciliation. Do not call a departure healthy simply because it ends the immediate conflict.

But do not conclude that every faithful effort was worthless because the fullest hope was not achieved.

A Place to Prepare

Before facilitating, take a few minutes to reflect.

What is the particular concern we are addressing?

Keep it close enough to recognize.

What responsibility or repair has already occurred?

Do not begin as though nothing has been done.

What seems to be making movement difficult?

A skill gap? Emotional overload? Unfinished repair? Disputed facts? Refusal? A leadership problem?

Hold your answer provisionally.

What might help people participate?

Imagine a shorter conversation, a sentence they could honestly use, a carefully chosen support person, a smaller commitment, or help outside the meeting.

What belongs to leaders rather than to me?

Name it before the process depends on your carrying it.

What would count as a useful next step?

Do not make complete reconciliation the only recognizable movement.

What would tell me this process should pause or change?

Consider both safety and the absence of meaningful movement. Decide before exhaustion makes the decision for you.

A Word to the Facilitator

You may leave a conversation wishing you had found better words.

Sometimes better words would help. Sometimes the words were sufficient, and the willingness was absent. Sometimes the meeting revealed that the real work belonged elsewhere.

Stay open to learning without making yourself responsible for everything you could not change.

You are not there to diagnose the participants, secure forgiveness, protect a pastor at any cost, or make a congregation appear harmonious.

You are there to help truth become speakable, responsibility become particular, and repair become possible.

Remain curious about what people are protecting. Offer language when skills are missing. Make space when feelings are overwhelming. Address unfinished work. Name refusal without contempt. Help leaders recognize that they can act fairly without everyone's approval.

Then let the people and leaders involved carry the responsibilities that belong to them.

Grace is not the absence of difficult truth.

It is the ground on which we can tell that truth without abandoning one another—and the calling that asks us to do something faithful with it.