**Pre-Board Meeting on Salary, September 10, 2013, 6:15 pm**

**Guests:** Bo Boghani, UUA Southeast District Compensation Consultant; Ivy Brezina (Ministerial Search Committee); Polly Johnson, Bob Weston, Dave Klibanow (Negotiating Committee); Board

Bo went through the Power Point presentation sent in advance of the meeting.

Clarification/Discussion points:

* Minister’s time is measured in units; 12 units per week is fulltime; Gary noted minister usually spends 20 hours on the sermon
* Salary and housing are combined; can be reset once a year; cannot be changed retroactively; housing and salary are taxed at 15%
* Observation was made that the minister is given 80% of employee and 50% of family premium; our staff is only paid at 65% of employee, not fair; Gary noted that his former church gave him an amount for copays since he was covered under his wife’s plan; Bo pointed out that it is tricky in terms of non-premium coverage because of additional taxable income
* Retirement—guideline is 10% recommended; If you stay with TIAA-CREF next year you will be required to do 5% for all staff; need to enroll at least 70 percent of 21+ year old employees employed over 1 year and working 1000+ hours
* Long-term insurance—recommendation is to provide funds and require minister to enroll; if employee enrolls it is not tax deductible
* If our congregation is at 343 plus 94 friends, we should think about being in the next size up 350-499; will likely end up between minimum to mid-point of higher size
* Gary noted that ministers look for the letter rating of churches and may use that as their initial screening tool; it is a mix of size and salary range for size

**Board Minutes, September 10, 2013**

Attending: Gary Kowalski, Andrew Strahs-Hennessy, Becky Waibel, Dave Klibanow, Eleanor Armstrong, Elsbeth van Tongeren, Ginger Long, Kari Andrade, Mary Hulett, Peter Bird, Laurence Kirsch, Sally Freeman

**Welcome**

Becky lit the chalice at 7:00.

Opening: Pete is board member of the month and did a reading by Tim Haley related to giving thanks for the now amidst our busy lives.

**Board Sharing & Announcements**

1. September Birthdays: none

2. Beyond Categorical Thinking workshop on Sep 29, 2013; Ministerial search committee is sponsoring it – open to all in the congregation

**Consent Agenda**

Receipt:

Executive Committee Minutes Church council Minutes for June

Approval:

Board Minutes from August

Acceptance of August minutes and receipt of items were approved unanimously in a motion by Kari and second by Elsbeth.

Minutes will be posted on this webpage:

<http://www.c3huu.org/our-board-of-trustees.html>

**Old Business**

**1. Strategic Plan Update**

Kari presented an update:

* Finding someone to design the survey
* Gary Giles and Andrea Sordean-Mintzer are working on costs for a sexton to see if it would be more cost efficient[[1]](#footnote-1)
* Communications team and fellowship team are up and running. Fellowship ministry will be under Membership.
* Team will be working on sacred grounds and an annual vision statement to the board
* Space assessment team will meeting with the architect

**2. Search Committee for Settled Minister**

Cottage meetings were completed; good participation. The church survey needs to be completed.

**New Business**

**1. Budget**

Pledges exceeded budget by $23,690, leading to a $21,944 surplus in operating expenses. Revenues were up and expenses were down. We have received 96% of pledges. Idea is to transfer last year’s excess to next year’s proposed deficit.

A discussion followed on whether or not it is against board policy to use excess operating expenses for recurring expenses. If it is, it is currently not in our policy documentation. If it should be, we need to address this. One person expressed the thought that our goal was to meet operating expenses and then use excess. This aspect of the finance discussion was tabled until end of meeting or until next month.

Further discussion points related additional funds:

* If we have surpluses in this and next year, may we can move forward with strategic plan.
* We could apply the surplus to pay 80% of staff’s premium. Finance committee can look into it.

**2. Policy Issues**

Mary and Dave have been working on reviewing policies and procedures. Mary sent two documents in advance of the meeting to all board members that showed easy changes identified last month.

A few clarification questions were discussed. Items were deleted if they were verbatim to the bylaws (recommendation to not duplicate) or if they were a policy that could not be met.

Andrew moved to approve changes and Kari seconded. Passed unanimously.

**3. Evaluating the Minister**

Guest: Josh Socolar

The board invited Josh Socolar to share his experience and viewpoints related to the previous process for evaluating the minister. The purpose of tonight’s discussion is to start the conversation in order to develop a good process going forward.

General discussion points:

* Interesting that the minister chooses committee. Gary’s experience: he gave 7 or so names and the board chose.
* Josh’s committee had 2 board members. Important that minister be comfortable with people running the evaluation. It was done in a fluid way. Two board members and the minister talked about other people to be on the committee.
* Questions for Josh: What worked well and what didn’t?
  + Two key points:

1. It is easier to construct a procedure that looks good than it is to have it work well with the minister and congregation. In our evaluation, the person was minister and chief of staff. We did not evaluate in terms of a grade, but rather to gather information that would help the minister going forward. It was clear that there were certain things that should be confidential rather than public. We did not think that anonymous comments were appropriate.
2. When you gather information, the minister sees it all. The report we wrote was a synthesis for public consumption. There were some comments given to the minister, but not presented in the report.
   * Caution against creating a public problem when there is only a private one.

* One person remembers the committee as being only approved as a consent agenda item, rather than the board selecting them. It may have been discussed at an executive meeting.
* Via this summer’s cottage meetings, there was a perception that the evaluation was an insider process rather than a democratic process.
* If we make it democratic and transparent, we cannot worry about the past and instead will focus on going forward.

Another goal is to possibly write procedures:

How often is minister reviewed?

* Recommendation: Annually, especially since staff is evaluated annually. Common time period.
* Important to encourage input periodically not just during the review period.
* To what extent is the review done? (I.e., complete every year;

Who is the body to do the review?

* Input: Minister should have input, but not all members should be chosen by the minister.
* Neutral parties should be doing the review.

What forms for input?

How often is staff reviewed (annual)?

Addition discussion points: eJosh noted that the roles a minister plays are very different from how someone in the corporate world can be reviewed. (E.g., Goals for pastoral care—How do you measure successful sermons?) Model you use should not have the same assessments as corporate/educational reviews.

* Gary’s committee also handled various other aspects of minister’s work, not just the evaluation.
* It should be a two-way evaluation process where minister gives input as well.
* There are specific goals that can be developed jointly as benchmarks for performance. It is done in this manner currently with RE.
* Advantage with annual reviews is that it lessens the importance of a single evaluation.

Becky recommends that Mary and Dave begin drafting procedure, looking for UUA guidelines.

**4. Nominating Committee**

Guests: Josh Socolar, Steve Marshall

Goal in by-laws is to have 9 members on board. Because of attrition, we are already at 9. We should replace 2 this year. Next year when we have 4 to replace, one of them should be for a 2-year term rather than a normal 3-year term.

There is a lot of work for board to do. If we did have an extra person, we should let them work 3 years and have 10 members for one year. This goes against by-laws. It was decided to stay at 9.

Upcoming concerns for board:

Personnel

Question from Nominating Committee: Should we strive to make it competitive?

* Some people do not want to compete.
* It would be disheartening to not be chosen.
* Earlier goal was to get two people for each position in case people step down.
* If we decide we don’t want it competitive, the Nominating Committee needs to prioritize.
* If someone steps down, do you replace them or change by-laws?
* The point was made that this year’s Ministerial Search Committee was selected with several people not chosen. It worked well.

Nominating Committee is trying to find people. There will be an announcement for people who are interested.

There should be a perception in the community that it is a democratic process, not board driven.

Past experience is that it is difficult to get a slate.

Committee should strive to make it competitive, two for VP and two for board member.

We also need a Recording Secretary for next year. Sally Freeman’s last meeting will be in December.

6. Budget change is tabled (see New Business item 1).

---------------------------------------------------

**Action items:**

1. Becky will look up UUA guidelines for evaluation.

2. Board should complete online survey and sign up for Beyond Categorical Thinking workshop.

3. Mary and Dave will continue with their policy work, including finalizing changes approved by board.

4. Finance Committee will look at options for overage.

**Process Observations:**

1. We tabled a lot.

**Closing**

Pete closed with a fall equinox reading by Thomas Rhodes.

Adjourned at 9:00 p.m.

Respectively submitted by

Sally Freeman

1. Per Wikipedia (as the Recording Secretary was only familiar with the navigational term *sextant* and not the congregational term *sexton*): A *sexton* is a church, congregation, or synagogue officer charged with the maintenance of its buildings and/or the surrounding graveyard. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)