

## SECTION 2



### JOHANNA'S DILEMMA: A CASE STUDY

This case is a composite of several actual experiences. The names and genders are altered so that any resemblance to actual situations is coincidental. Our intent in using this case is to examine responsibility and accountability in the practice of supervision from different religious perspectives and from different practices of formation and supervision. The respondents were invited to reflect on the case from their particular perspectives.

Herbert Anderson  
Editor

### Johanna's Dilemma

Johanna, a twenty-eight-year-old married seminarian from a Midwest Protestant seminary, is serving a twelve-month long church internship in a medium-sized church in a suburb of San Francisco, California. She has completed about four months of her internship when the annual youth snow trip occurs. The participants are ninth through twelfth graders who are in the youth program at the church. One of Johanna's responsibilities in her internship is to staff the youth program. Sixteen young people and five adults trained in youth ministry, including Johanna, go on the snow trip. They depart from the church Friday afternoon and return from the trip Sunday evening. All twenty-one stay in an elegant hotel in the mountains close to the ski slopes. The entire trip occurs without any ski/snow board accidents, no bad weather, and general good cooperation from all participants.

About a week after the ski weekend, one of the twelfth grade boys on the trip asks to speak privately with Johanna. During the ski weekend, Kevin tells Johanna, several kids mixed drugs and alcohol one night. It seemed harmless at the time, but Kevin does not remember what happened. He has discovered two monogrammed towels and a glass from the hotel in his possession and now wonders what else might have occurred. He has only talked with one friend who was there. She does not remember the episode either, although Kevin is certain she was present. He is unwilling to give Johanna the names of the other kids involved. He wants to know what to do with the towels and glass from the hotel. Most of all, Kevin is concerned that he might lose a college scholarship he has applied for that depends heavily on character recommendations.

Johanna expresses her appreciation to Kevin for coming forward, but she does not promise to keep quiet about this episode. Johanna is uncertain what to do next. She remembers her own experimenting with drugs and alcohol on several occasions when she was that age. As one of the adults responsible for this activity, however, Johanna is concerned that if nothing is reported, she will be implicated if eventually the episode is revealed. Talking with the other adults on the weekend would be difficult because two of them are parents of kids who might have been involved in the episode. Her supervising pastor had not been very helpful to her in the past, and he has not been very interested in helping her figure out complicated situations. As a result, Johan-

na contacts her supervisor from clinical pastoral education (CPE) the previous summer for advice. Johanna indicates that she needs some supervision around an incident that has just occurred on her internship and that she does not trust her supervising pastor to help her deal with the situation. Johanna also sends an e-mail to the director of Field Education at her seminary briefly describing the episode and indicating that she is seeking help.



**Venerable Thom Kilts** is an Association for Clinical Pastoral Education (ACPE) supervisor, an endorsed and commissioned member of the Dzogchen Community of North America, and an ordained lineage holder of the Celtic Buddhist tradition. He writes from a Buddhist perspective as an ACPE supervisor.

A term from the Vajrayana Buddhist perspective that comes to mind after reading the case above is *samaya*. In the general sense, samaya is like a vow or commitment made between student and teacher. Developing samaya takes work both on the part of the student and the teacher and should always be attended to mindfully and very seriously. In Vajrayana Buddhism, there is a commitment to work with some very difficult aspects of mind, under the guidance (or for our terminology here, supervision) of a qualified teacher. In CPE, the samaya is created and developed in the first weeks, but, during that time, the samaya also has an end date. This is made clear during orientation. For a unit of summer CPE, the end date of the samaya is eleven weeks or when the program officially ends. Does this mean that I no longer speak with students when they leave CPE? Of course not, but I do recognize that the relationship has changed. There is no longer the same level or intensity of samaya between us that constitutes the supervisor/student relationship while working in the constructs of a CPE program. In my view, the relationship becomes one of consultation and not one of supervision. When I am supervising, I am much more involved and more apt to challenge, clarify, and support in a deeper and more impactful way (again, there has been samaya in a shared context established there). In consulting, there is a more hands off approach, less riskiness on my part and a clearer boundary around what we will and will not explore together.

The issue for Johanna is not that she is seeking supervision or needs help and guidance in this situation, but it is in how she is approaching it. If she would come to me, I would listen to the story, affirm her search for con-

sultation and also let her know that my role in this will only be to help her explore options for how she can attend to her process within her new context. As with most situations, many aspects of the case study point to larger problems in Johanna's new ministry setting. The lack of guidance and trust are just some of the huge issues this little ski trip seems to be unveiling. I would empathize with Johanna's difficult situation, but I would not become involved and would refuse to "supervise" or become her supervisor again around this issue. In the spirit of "the path is goal," a Vajrayana phrase I use in my CPE work, I would consult with Johanna and recommend that she take more responsibility for getting her needs met within her current situation. I would make it clear that turning to me is not the solution, but again I would consult with her about ways in which she can get her needs met closer to her context. I would encourage a more proactive attention to the larger systemic issues and the lack of accountability and responsibility of her new situation that has led her to call me.

Johanna does not feel that her supervising pastor is trustworthy, so there is no samaya there. Those feelings could be very well-founded, but she still needs to be accountable to her new supervising relationship and responsible for doing her part to create new samayas. What if she struggled (as I am sure she would have in the beginning) with establishing samaya with me during her unit? If she went to another more trusted supervisor in the past, then there may have been no movement or developed trust in our relationship. Johanna doesn't need to trust her supervising pastor to start addressing the issues in the context she is in currently. She is not being very trustworthy herself by avoiding approaching her responsibilities and accountability to her new ministry setting. I would consult her to address this issue with the parties involved and at the same time encourage her to bring attention to the larger issues in the community. In our time together, when there was samaya in the context of an ACPE program, I was teaching her how to be a leader; now would be the time for her to put it in practice.



**Eldon L. Olson** is a retired pastoral counselor and is still an occasional consultant to denominational and parish systems. He writes from Seattle, Washington, as someone who has counseled troubled clergy later in ministry.

I regret that Johanna does not have a good relationship with her supervising pastor. I cannot discern why he has not been helpful in "complicated cir-

cumstances." His counsel and participation in any continuing conversations Johanna will have is essential. His role as Johanna's field supervisor and as pastor of the congregation cannot be circumvented, no matter how uncomfortable or complicated Johanna may feel. The situation that is outlined must become a matter for his pastoral care for members of his congregation. He probably knows the families of the youth who were involved, as well as the adults who are designated as youth ministry volunteers for the event.

Since Johanna is short-term, inexperienced, and largely unsanctioned as a pastoral caregiver, her responsibility is to refer any such matters to the pastor. That supervising pastor also will have organizational oversight of adult volunteers who are entrusted with the care of children and youth on church-sponsored programs. If she withholds information that might be germane to his pastoral relationships within the congregation or his responsibilities for oversight of volunteers in ministry on behalf of the congregation, that pastor would be advised to seek a termination of her internship. I doubt that she could repair the damages that have occurred and serious questions should be raised about her competence for public ministry.

While the case study seems focused on issues raised by Kevin's disclosures—purloined towels and glass, character references for college scholarship, the confidentiality of the conversation with Johanna, possible counsel of CPE supervisor and seminary Field Education contact—all of this obscures the central concern: a very dangerous event has occurred during a church-sponsored activity of children. The issue is not the morality of the children, violation of acceptable codes of teenaged behaviors while on church-related activities, or what to do when candid disclosures of unacceptable behaviors are reported. The primary issue is the safety of vulnerable minors who participate in the ministries of the church. Certainly, unknown alcohol/drug activities are in violation of behavioral codes, but they are also potentially dangerous. Children can be seriously damaged, even killed, by such activities. The very discovery that such an activity has taken place requires immediate and decisive action.

Not only would the supervising pastor be justifiably angry with Johanna's response to the disclosure, those adults who had been designated as youth ministry advisors/chaperones would also be angry. They would have been trained to accompany youth ministry events with the primary purpose of ensuring the safety of children in their care. They may well have other functions in the youth group—discussion leaders, arrangement makers, adult counselors, and so forth. Parents would have entrusted their children to their

care with a primary confidence that their children would be kept safe. The fact that some of them are also parents of participating children heightens the urgency that they be fully informed of the incident and that this incident underscore the importance of their role as adult attendants to youth activities.

Finally, if parents were to find out that their children were involved in any of the described activities, either actively or passively, they would rightly be enraged that such information had not been disclosed to them. The litigious possibilities would be daunting. As parents of minors, they have every moral and legal right to hear of any activities that might put the safety of their children in jeopardy. This is true of all parents of any children who participated in the church activity, not just those who are reported as directly involved. They should be fully informed of all information Johanna possesses as quickly as possible. It would be best if the supervising pastor were involved in these conversations, assuring the parents of the ongoing support and pastoral care of the church. The parents would have a parental responsibility to confront their child, examine the dimensions of the group's involvements, enquire about precautions that were taken, and, hopefully, use this event as an opportunity for deliberate education for their child about the dangers involved in consuming alcohol and drugs. Under parent supervision, this incident may well provoke church-sponsored education or sensitization about the misuse of any chemical substances. The parents also have a right to report the incident to the local police if there is any indication that children were abused or endangered in the course of this activity.

As the situation is stated, Johanna is circumventing the resources that have been put in place—the supervisory pastor, the adult/lay advisors/chaperones, and the parents. She demonstrates a pattern of conflict avoidance and fear. But above all, she appears unable to discern the seriousness of the critical issues involved, distracted by her self-comfort and self-protection. Regarding the towels and ashtray, I would counsel that either an anonymous package be sent to the hotel or a large hole be dug in the backyard of the church.



**Jeffery M. Silberman** is a rabbi and an ACPE supervisor at Norwalk Hospital, Norwalk, Connecticut. He writes both from his Jewish tradition and from his position as an ACPE supervisor.

My religious tradition values honesty, responsibility, and personal accountability. Obviously these are some of the issues inherent in the case study.

Yet, for me as an ACPE supervisor, the question is not to judge or impose these values upon the seminarian who has approached me for help. The key phrase in the case presentation must be "some supervision." What does Johanna want from me as a supervisor? Is she primarily focused on her own culpability? Is her worry her own professional or personal self-interest? Does she feel the need to "blow the whistle" on her young man from the congregation who has spoken to her? Is her interest in punishing or protecting the teens? My first task must be to determine exactly what it is that she is struggling with and then determine how I can help her?

The case presents issues on a number of levels for me. The first is the level of the teen's behavior in the context of a religiously sponsored event. The second is the level of the seminarian's moral choices in being the person with responsibilities to the congregation and for the teens at the event. The third level is the question of what supervisory guidance do I want to offer Johanna. There are also specific questions, if I step back for a moment, about supervisory strategy.

On the first level, some things are clear. There was theft. There was underage drinking and use of drugs. There may have been more inappropriate behavior, including possible sexual activity. But, there is also remorse and contrition on Kevin's part. Going further onto the second level, there is a clear sense of Johanna's own responsibility, evidenced by her thinking about seeking consultation. She has been forthcoming in telling the story to the Field Education director and going to the CPE supervisor. Now she is decidedly at a crossroad.

This is the context for her seeking "some supervision." It does not in any way fall to me as supervisor to decide or dictate. I see my role merely to clarify the implications of each option that Johanna can choose. My own inclination is to see these circumstances as a learning opportunity for everyone. What does the seminarian need to learn from this? What do the teens need to learn?

Therefore, my intervention as a Jewish supervisor would be to help focus the issues for each one involved. Kevin trusted Johanna with an honest confession of his wrong doing. He likely felt guilty in addition to his fears about his future in college. He did not ask Johanna to keep this confidential, so he must know on some level that she could make this public or, at the very least, tell his folks. What does Johanna think he could, or perhaps should, learn from this? By the same token, Johanna "failed" on one level to monitor the teens under her supervision. She also has succeeded in building a trusting relationship with one of the teens in her care. Honesty may be the best policy,

but then it is also necessary to live with the consequences of one's choices. How does Johanna consider this tension?

From my religious perspective, I hope for what is best for Johanna. In terms of communal responsibility, Judaism draws upon Exodus 19:16. The first part of this verse states "do not stand idly by." This is a mandate to act. But the verse ends with "while your neighbor's blood is being spilled." There is no blood being spilled here. Johanna is the only one who really can decide how to resolve this. It is for her to decide.



**Mary Ann Moman** is associate general secretary in the Division of Ordained Ministry of The United Methodist Church in Nashville, Tennessee. She writes from the perspective of a director of Field Education and the supervising pastor.

Support and accountability are held together by trust. What is not clear in the case study is the covenant or agreements of trust that are in place with the supervising pastor. Without that clarity, it is difficult to know how Johanna might work with her supervising pastor in this situation. Although the supervising pastor would be the direct supervisor, Johanna also has a covenant with the director of Field Education at her seminary. Both of these persons will be critical in working out the solution to the problem that has been presented to Johanna.

While Johanna contacted the director of Field Education with the information, it is clear that she is relying on her CPE supervisor for advice and support. The United Methodist Church values both support and accountability. From the perspective of the director of Field Education, it would be important to help Johanna identify the next steps in the process of working through the issue of drug and alcohol abuse and theft of property at the church-sponsored retreat. The director would help Johanna determine what to do with the information she has received from Kevin and who should be involved with the youth and their parents. Accountability without this kind of support is unfair, especially for a student pastor. The director of Field Education can provide support for Johanna to meet with her supervising pastor.

The supervising pastor should be informed about the situation immediately. The event was sponsored by the church, and there could be repercussions within the congregation and the community. Johanna also has the responsibility to inform the adults who were on the trip of the event. It is

not Johanna's job to "protect" the information that has been shared with her. She was right not to promise to keep the secret. There may be legal ramifications depending on what actually happened. She has a responsibility to the youth, their parents, and the pastor to respond to Kevin's information. Even though she perceives that the relationship with the supervising pastor has not been helpful to her, she is responsible to report this incident and be open to the counsel of the supervising pastor. Ultimately, the pastor will be held responsible.

Johanna needs support to learn from this situation. This will not be the last time Johanna will be confronted with a confounding situation. Nor will it be the last time she works with someone who doesn't seem to be responsive to her learning needs. This situation can provide an opportunity for her to learn and grow in a safe environment and to build a better working relationship with the supervising pastor. Some of the questions that Johanna needs to explore would include:

1. What are Johanna's expectations for resolving the problem that Kevin has presented?
2. What are the theological issues involved?
3. What support does she need in order to understand the situation and then act appropriately?
4. Does Johanna have appropriate boundaries with regard to this specific situation, and how will she work through her experience with drugs and alcohol as a teenager?
5. Is Johanna open to creating a new relationship with the supervising pastor?
6. What new covenants/agreements need to be made with the supervising pastor and the congregation?

As the supervising pastor, I would want to have regular conversations with Johanna that would include reflections on her work and opportunity for me to give feedback. The process of setting expectations and regular supervisory conversations will be important throughout her career in ministry. In The United Methodist Church regular supervision is part of our connectional system. That supervision comes from senior pastors, district superintendents, and staff/parish relations committees. Supervision holds us accountable for our ministry. Support allows us to test our assumptions and learn from our mistakes. Accountability makes resolution possible for all persons involved.

It is important to remember that Johanna is a student. Her assignment to this congregation is part of her seminary education. The supervisor can "walk with" Johanna through this situation and provide both a spiritual center and

practical guidance as she tests her role as pastor. United Methodists are guided by John Wesley's rules to do no harm, do good while attending to the ordinances of God. Johanna's supervising pastor can help her make decisions and guide her through the process, helping her understand the importance of these rules not only for her, but for all of the persons involved.

This event may also be a time for Johanna to exercise her teaching role with the youth and parents. As they work through a process together, issues of sin, repentance, and forgiveness will need to be discussed and rituals developed to attend to repentance and forgiveness. Steps will also need to be taken so that the incident is not repeated.



**Kamal Abu-Shamsieh** is the director of the Islamic Cultural Center of Fresno. He is a Sunni Muslim who serves in a Shiite Islamic Center and is an ardent advocate of interfaith and intra-Muslim dialogue. He responds as if the case of Johanna had occurred in a Muslim context.

The case is indeed interesting and its impacts are far reaching on multiple levels. On one hand, there are religious, familial, and inner-organizational violations that must be rectified and ultimately dealt with. On the other hand, there are legal and civic law violations that must be addressed.

In the formation of Muslim leaders, they are taught that it is the responsibility of Muslim leaders and all members to live their lives in accordance with Islamic teachings and to respect the law of the land where they live. In case of Johanna, her immediate responsibility toward the youth is to foster their religious empowerment in a safe and healthy environment. Her goals should include helping the youth practice their faith, advance their religious education, and encourage them to become contributing Muslims in a nation of diverse faith and ethnic communities. To achieve her goals, Johanna must herself be a responsible and professional adult with high work ethics and excellent communication skills.

It is inevitable that Muslim leaders will encounter passionate debates among religious leaders, parents, and youth regarding the mixing of the sexes, dating, or substance abuse just to name a few. Whenever a religious offence occurs, Muslims have the religious obligation first to seek understanding of what happened. Second, it is imperative not to promote the offense or make it material for the grapevine. While Western popular culture supports joint activities between members of the opposite sex, Muslims' approaches vary. The

majority of Muslims frown on mixing of the different sexes, while others approve of it with caution. No practicing Muslim will allow underage boys and girls to be secluded without constant adult supervision. In this case, underage teens were left without supervision long enough to mix and abuse drugs and alcohol.

Johanna failed to report to her supervisor and instead turned to unauthorized individuals and used unsecure channels of communication. Also, she established her professional relationship with her supervisor based on perception instead of facts, which led her to doubt her supervisor's intentions to help her deal with the current situation. Alternatively, she must meet with her supervisor immediately and together meet with the teen and his family for further discussion.

Johanna and her supervisor are encouraged to seek additional information. They need to keep in mind their responsibility to protect the privacy of their members and not to contribute to a situation where the information collected will lead to isolation of community members or damage to their reputation. Assuming that not all teens who participated in the field trip abused drugs of alcohol, only the families of the involved teens must be informed about actions involving their sons or daughters.

The religious institution is educational and not punitive; even so, one must respect the law of the land at all times. Faith leaders, in this case, do not have the authority to report to law enforcement agencies; it is the responsibility of the parents or the legal guardians to do so if they wished. In case of an investigation, faith leaders must cooperate fully with the law. The liability of the religious institution is limited. Prior to the activity, it is customary that the legal guardians sign a release of liability that protects the institution from damages, intentional and unintended. However, inter-organizational discipline must be carried out in regards to Johanna when her levels of breach of contracts are determined.

The drug and alcohol abuse in this case is not the only problem we are dealing with. According to the teen's testimony, he has found a set of monogrammed towels in his possession. The religious institution may contact the hotel to arrange for the return of the towels. I encourage sending a letter of apology along with an offer to compensate the hotel. As for the teens involved, I recommend counseling sessions. The youth program should feature educational programs about peer pressure, risks of drug and alcohol abuse, and personal responsibility.

Finally, the process of repentance in Islam is unique. The highlight is on God, the one whom the individual is seeking help from, rather than the offense itself. The outcome is a deeper acknowledgment and stronger relationship with the Divine. While repentance flames remorse and the feeling of guilt, individuals need to be empowered with tools to correct the current sin and with the resolve not to indulge it in the future.



**Elizabeth Soto** is the coordinator of Field Education at Lancaster Theological Seminary in Lancaster, Pennsylvania. She writes from the perspective of someone responsible for approving sites for ministerial practice, training pastors in becoming supervisors, and supporting seminarians in field placement.

I understand that my primary role is to empower Johanna to address this complex crisis locally. In the phone conversation initiated by Johanna, I would aim at offering emotional support as she looks at the available resources around her. There will be two pedagogical goals to address: what does she need from my role as director of Field Education that will assist her in building self-trust to deal with the layers of this situation. Later on, when we debrief the situation, I will want to know what she learned about herself and her calling for ministry.

There are two issues that need to be addressed in a different manner. The first task is to provide support and directives for the seminarian. The second issue is the lack of support from the supervisor as understood by the student. In cultures that have suffered oppression, "trust is established as we walk in a relationship" whereas in predominantly Anglo cultures, I have observed that relationships "start with certain degree of trust." As a woman, I am aware that issues of trust are related to the use of power. The student pastor is not equal to her supervisor. How does one address this dynamic within field placement? Some of the power dynamics involve gender/race/age in the relationship between the seminarian and her supervisor. Although the seminarian has found in past experience that "the supervisor has not been helpful," we need to validate her feelings and at the same time explore the other side of the story. The pastoral supervisor is mandated to create a trusting environment with Johanna as part of the teaching responsibilities.

In this case study, the seminarian/intern pastor is seeking help from a former CPE supervisor and her director of Field Education—both of whom

are outside the congregation. Overwhelmed by the potential replications of the outcome of this crisis, she is in need of clear guidance. As a director I will actively listen and allow Johanna to ventilate her feelings, enabling the students to sort out the next step to take. The priority in this case is safety for the youth, not silence.

Johanna must understand that the outcome of this case will directly reflect upon her ministerial skills as well as her ministerial vocation. There are two major issues in this case that require different levels of inside and outside involvement. The support from outside the congregation should be to empower her to use her agency/authority in convening/informing all the necessary parties starting with her supervisor. At the same time, the director should respect congregational autonomy in internal issues. It is the congregation's responsibility to create a positive learning involvement for the seminarian. This situation can provide for a teachable moment for the seminarian, the local church, and the seminary.

In the midst of this crisis, we need to ask, "Where is God in all of this?" As the Chinese wisdom teaches us "crisis is an opportunity for change." What are the changes we need to implement in training supervisors in building trust, working in unequal power dynamics, and what are the clues to look for in approving long distance field education sites?

There is a parallel worth noting between responsibility of the director of Field Education toward Johanna and Johanna's responsibility toward the youth in her congregation. The field education director has an institutional and pastoral responsibility in the formation of the seminarian's ministerial life; on the same note, Johanna has a moral and pastoral responsibility in providing guidance to the youth. These two types of responsibility must be exercised carefully, but not avoided. A good balance between direct and influential support should be offered, still allowing Johanna to act. At the same time, the on-site supervisor/pastor has covenanted with the seminary allowing the field education director to approach the supervisor in order to enhance the student/supervisor relationship. As director, I will assess my involvement with Johanna according to three principles: empowering others to make their decision, respecting boundaries, and supporting the ones for whom I have responsibility. Accountability and transparency are two factors that allow the pastoral supervisor, congregation, seminary, Johanna, and the field education director to move toward a peaceful and responsible outcome.



**Martha Stortz** is currently professor of Historical Theology and Ethics at Pacific Lutheran Theological Seminary in Berkeley, California. In the fall, she will become the Bernhard M. Christensen Chair in Religion and Vocation at Augsburg College, Minneapolis, Minnesota. She was invited to respond both to the case and to the six responses above. She writes as an ethicist deeply concerned about the practice of ministry.

Johanna has *reacted* to information told to her in confidence by Kevin; she has not yet *responded*. She worries that being "implicated" will affect her future; she fears that talking with her adult team will be "difficult." Because she doesn't "trust" her supervisor, she seeks counsel from trusted others. This is all important information, but it constitutes a reaction, not a response. The human brain reacts instinctively—by guts alone—for survival, and it employs reason to sift information from other parts of the brain to choose a considered response. If Johanna were to move beyond reacting, what would a considered response look like?

1. Responsibility is more process than a single action.<sup>1</sup> Like an act in four parts, the process first acknowledges agency. Johanna must see herself as a subject of action, not the object of someone else's action. Certainly, she neither invited nor initiated the actions of the youth on the snow trip. She could easily feel a "victim" of circumstance: "Kevin told me something..." Claiming agency, however, moves Johanna from accusative to nominative case: "I heard Kevin's confession." She claims agency, albeit unwanted.

Some commentators argue that she should have shared Kevin's secret first with her supervisor, rather than going over his head. She knows she'll have to do more, even if she is at present "uncertain" what that involves. At the moment, one of the best things Johanna does is to pause—and take stock. In her essay in this volume, Karen Lebacqz describes this reflective dimension of responsibility as "a certain kind of thinking—a pondering and considering of circumstances, history, and future possibilities, all within an overarching theological framework."<sup>2</sup>

2. Taking stock focuses on the second step in responsibility: assessment. Johanna has to address the question: What is going on? Elizabeth Soto reframes the question spiritually: Where is God in all this? However assessment is framed, it considers players, roles, and power involved.

At the outset, Johanna identifies her supervisor, the other adults on the snow trip with her, parents of the other teens, her CPE supervisor, and her director of Field Education as players in the situation.

Eldon Olson rightly zeroes in on the blind spot in her deliberation to this point: vulnerable minors. Kamal Abu-Shamsieh adds God to the list of players, seeing the incident as an opportunity to draw more deeply into relationship with the divine mystery.

These players are arrayed around the incident in concentric circles, some in tight orbit around the actual incident, others more at a distance, all under the umbrella of divine love. Interestingly, at present Johanna does not have contact with players on the innermost orbits: the other teens involved and her supervisor. Contact with her supervisor is important and urgent, for he bears legal responsibility for oversight of the volunteers and spiritual responsibility for the pastoral care of the congregation.

At the same time, as she identifies players, Johanna will be aware that almost all of them have dual roles. Some in the youth ministry team are also parents of the teens in question. Her supervisor simultaneously exercises oversight over the volunteers and serves as their pastor. Finally, Johanna herself is both youth minister as well as a temporary student intern in the congregation.

As she examines the roles each person plays, Johanna identifies vectors of power throughout. Elizabeth Soto names elements of race/class/gender/age/privilege that color this incident. Johanna is closer in age and experience to the teens, younger than their parents and her supervisor. Her supervisor holds social power as male, and he is also probably older and a long-term presence in the congregation. Finally, in confessing to her, could Kevin be testing his social power as male against her professional power as intern? Mary Ann Moman's point is crucial: Johanna is still a student.

As Johanna sorts through all of these players, their various roles, and the power that flows through them, she constructs an **assessment** or **complex mapping** of the situation. This will help her discern appropriate next steps. This spatial layout identifies "different levels of inside and outside involvement," as Soto puts it, zones of appropriate confidentiality and support. Thom Kilts proposes a kind of three-dimensional mapping with his insight that *samaya*, the covenant between a student and teacher, may be limited to a specific time and space. His distinction between consultation and supervision underscores the time-frame of a supervisory relationship. Any *supervision* Johanna receives from her former CPE supervisor may make her less reliant on seeking supervision from her *de facto* supervisor in this situation.

3. With a complex mapping in place, Johanna is ready to move to a third step in the process of responsibility: **accountability**. Moral accountability requires Johanna to anticipate the players' possible re-

actions and responses to any given course of action she might take. Johanna registers her own array of reactions and responses, but this step challenges her to imagine those of others.

Here the distinctions between gut-level reaction and considered response will be particularly tricky. How will her pastoral supervisor receive Johanna's information when he learns of it—and the fact that she has shared it with others before speaking with him? Will he react or respond? Let's hope he turns out to be someone like Jeffrey Silberman, whose wise and measured insights model good supervision. How will Kevin receive what she does with his confidence? Will he understand that she has to do something? What will his array of reactions and responses be? Finally, as Abu-Shamsieh underscores, one response is certain: whatever happens, Johanna can lean on divine mercy, deepening her relationship with the divine.

4. Acting toward a common good is the fourth and final step in responsibility. I use "toward" intentionally. There will be no "perfect" resolutions here: everyone's hands will be dirty; everyone's motives will be mixed. And yet people of faith can hope for a "good-enough" resolution, one from which everyone learns something—if they can unclench their hands to receive it.

I take very seriously the use of drugs and alcohol among minors in general: it is a staging ground for sex and coercion, violence, and even death. That this happened during a supervised church-sponsored event is more serious than Johanna—and some of the commentators—grasp at the moment. Kevin and the other teens need to know theft is the least of their problems.

Regardless of where they fall in the array of concentric circles radiating out from the initiating incident, all of this plays out against a divine horizon. What we are responsible for depends on what we are responsible to. "Reflective responsibility,"

Karen Lebacqz writes elsewhere in this volume, "is a response to the call and claim of God in our lives."<sup>3</sup> Everyone in this situation is a child of God. If Johanna can respond reflectively rather than reactively, she may be surprised by the embodied grace of other players.

#### NOTES

1. In what follows, I draw loosely on H. Richard Niebuhr's discussion of a "pattern" of responsibility in his book, *The Responsible Self* (New York: Harper & Row, 1963), 61–65.
2. Karen Lebacqz, "Reflective Responsibility," *Reflective Practice* 30 (2010): 10–23.
3. *Ibid.*, 21.