

June 14, 2011
The Community Church of Chapel Hill
Board Meeting Minutes

Present: Kari Andrade, Vice-Chair; Bob Weston; Josh Socolar; Marianna Fiorentino; Maggie Scarborough; Eleanor Armstrong; Maj-Britt Johnson, Minister; Steve Marshall

Minutes: Hillary Waugh

Guest(s): Susan Spalt

Welcome: Kari Andrade, Vice-Chair, called the meeting to order at 7:15pm.

Lighting/Reading: Maggie read a reading for Steve Marshall, board member of the month at large.

Board Sharing: Kari led the board in board sharing.

Announcements

- Visioning weekends 9/23-9/25 and 10/21-10/23
- Board Retreat and congregational meeting 1 weekend: 2/3-2/5/12
- The second congregational meeting will be 6/3/12
- Executive committee proposed moving the August board meeting to the 16th and exec to the 9th
This was agreed upon by the members present.

Board Learning

Susan Spalt joined us to talk about funding outreach and how the church responds to disasters. This issue has come up for years and hadn't really been resolved.

The question proposed to the board was how do we as a congregation want to respond to a disaster and how are disasters defined (i.e. something that effects the church community, UUs, people more broadly) and who makes this decision.

- Discussed providing financial support in these instances, as well as space, food, people power, etc. depending on the event and location.
- Concern was expressed about where the congregation draws the line in terms of who we help and how, as many members of the congregation could have personal ties to local, national, and international disasters. It was also noted that church efforts could get lost or be a drop in the bucket in international events, so perhaps focus should be on local events and UU congregations domestically.

- Maj-Britt mentioned that if we give to other UU congregations, she prefers that we do so through the UUSC
- Perhaps we can use benevolence fund to send \$ to UUs impacted by disasters

Susan noted that the benevolence fund began as a way to give money quickly to local individuals in need; disasters weren't included in its scope, probably because they weren't thought of at the time.

It was decided that, for disaster relief, the board will give to the UUSC or to benefit UU churches directly. These donations could go through the Minister's Discretionary Fund, so one check could be written and all donations would be tax-deductible.

- In the past we have done a share the plate for the UUSC, which are for anticipatory donations
- Concern was raised about the donation to UUSC with regard to the notion that congregation members might want to know where their money is going more specifically (i.e. how they are helping); Maj-Britt said that staff and then the denominational affairs committee could be responsible for letting congregation members know where this is going

For local issues, the board chair would direct an immediate response that would be appropriate, which could include money from the benevolence fund.

Susan realized that she is involved with every financial/giving decision the board makes; looking for someone to help with the Benevolence Fund instead.

- Eleanor stepped forward to join the committee.

Susan also noted that the share the plate process has changed a bit. It had originally been that if someone wrote nothing on their check, it went to share the plate. Now they must denote what it goes to in the memo line and if it says nothing and they are a pledging member it will go toward their pledge. All of the cash given will go toward share the plate. This is now listed on the website correctly and is being disseminated to share the plate coordinators.

Consent Agenda

Maggie Scarborough moved to approve the May consent agenda; Marianna seconded. It passed unanimously with one abstention.

Annual Report

Steve Marshall presented on the annual report. People he had spoken with enjoy the report and feel it should continue, as do board members. The question raised regarded who will produce this report. In a fiscal year beginning in July, he believes we should release the report in the fall so

that people will have the report in hand before pledging, which means we should begin collecting information now.

-Maj-Britt suggested that in future years the committee chairs could come to the May church council meeting with their reports in hand to share how the year went and can then send this to whomever is coordinating the report.

-She mentioned that they also come together in January of 2012 to talk about their goals for the past year, how they went, and will then go to their committees to set new goals; since the pledge drive will happen in March, this information could be used as a mid-year report addendum to the annual report.

Kari mentioned that this task could fall under the communications committee, who could then delegate out the creation of the annual report to individuals or a sub-committee.

-Steve mentioned that we should find a more cost-effective means for creating/producing these than by having solely hard copies; consensus was that there should be electronic copies available via email and on the website

The report was delegated to the communications committee to discuss and report back to the board with the help of Steve. This report will reflect the period of January 2010 through June 2011.

Stewardship Update

Maj-Britt is now making a recommendation on what should be done with the extra funds that have been raised above the originally proposed budget (listed below in attachments).

-For the \$15,000 second chance pledges, the only stipulation made was that it does not go to the reserves

It was noted that Maj-Britt doesn't believe that we will find a volunteer coordinator to begin before 10/1/11.

Finance Committee Report

Proposed motion by finance committee: "The Board authorizes Staff to pay to the UUA and Southeast District a total amount equal to the amount by which the actual pledge receipts for the fiscal period January-June 2011 exceed \$204,000, not to exceed our fair share of dues. Pledge receipts for fiscal period January-June 2011 are defined as pledge amounts promised for this fiscal period and received no later than August 31, 2011, including amounts promised for this fiscal period and received in 2010, but excluding amounts received during this fiscal period but promised for other fiscal periods."

This motion was seconded by Steve Marshall; it passed unanimously.

2011 Board Agenda

Below is the tentative plan, pending approval from Paige:

August

Fiscal year close
Consent on visioning consultant
Email hygiene

September

Budget process debrief
plan for policy revisions
Annual report- communications cmtee
Vison w/e

October

Vision w/e
List of by law changes
MBJ board learning / evaluation

November

Vision Statement
Strategic plan

December

Vision Approval
Board self evaluation

January

strategic plan- team
Governance trail year end plan
Retreat and Cong mtg
Vison approval and new board member vote

February

Strategic plan process
Budget
By Law cahnges

March

Trail year end- policy changes
Budget

April

Budget

May

Congr mtg budget / by law changes

Retreat

Ministerial Evaluation Committee

Josh and Maj-Britt presented recommendations expressed at the congregational meeting.

Josh, Maj-Britt, and Jim will develop the survey and its specifics.

-This survey will be in addition to the 30 people that have already been asked to share their thoughts in a longer form as part of the formal evaluation.

-UUA does not recommend that you survey the entire congregation as part of ministerial evaluation, so we do not have guidelines from them on this matter.

-The board informally agreed that this is a good thing to do.

-Josh mentioned that the committee is currently a month behind in this process.

Process Observations

None (not present).

Kari mentioned that people listened well and that we ended the meeting early.

Action Items

TOPIC	ACTION	WHO	DUE DATE
Budget	Approval of finance committee resolution – tell Andrea and finance committee	Maggi	June 15
Scheduling	Note these Important dates: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Visioning weekends 9/23-9/25 and 10/21-10/23• Board Retreat and congregational meeting 1 weekend: 2/3-2/5/12• Congregational meeting 2: 6/3/12• Aug board meeting moved to 16th and exec to the 9th	All	ASAP
Ministerial Eval	Board supports the proposed survey	Jim and Josh	--
Benevolence Cmte	Eleanor is hereby appointed to Benevolence Committee	Eleanor	Done

Closing

Steve Marshall

UPDATE ON SHARE THE PLATE AND BENEVOLENCE;

Susan Spalt will lead us in a discussion of “funding outreach”. She will update us on Share the Plate and lead us in a discussion of how we as a congregation could (or should) provide funding for disasters and emergencies around the US and world. We have a benevolence committee that is a process that allows us to fund individuals in crisis. It is not designed, at this time, to also allow us to provide funding to organizations that are responding to emergencies. Later in the agenda we will focus specifically on the Benevolence Committee; at this time we want to discuss more broadly the question of whether and how the church should be funding organizations that are responding to crises and emergencies around the globe and if so, is the Benevolence Fund the way for us to do this.

Share the Plate**26 SUNDAYS
SHARE THE PLATE****A Field Guide**

In January of 2009 the Community Church of Chapel Hill UU began *Share the Plate* to support the outreach ministry of our congregation. The Share the Plate Steering Committee (STPSC) is charged with developing and coordinating Share the Plate collections. Between thirty and forty thousand dollars a year are given by our generous congregation to organizations nominated by ministries or members. That is something for all of us to be proud of.

How are Share the Plate Recipients Selected?

A maximum of twenty-six Sundays a year were designated by the Board of Directors as Share the Plate Sundays. There are two deadlines for applications each year—one in the spring and one in the fall. Applications are made electronically to the STPSC through the website or to one of the STPSC members.

The Share the Plate Steering Committee (STPSC) which consists of 6 to 8 congregation members, carefully reviews applications. Applications are prioritized based on the following categories

- Category 1 The church body has made an official commitment to the organization (Only the IFC, Habitat and Orange Justice are in Category 1 at the present time)
- Category 2 The organization has been supported over time by a church committee or ministry.
- Category 3 New recipients supported by a committee or ministry
- Category 4 Organization has been nominated by a church member

What happens on Share the Plate Sunday?

Ministries or members who submitted the application are responsible for educating the congregation with newsletter articles, tabling and an STP announcement during the church service. One of the many benefits of STP is the opportunity to involve the congregation in the work of the organizations we support.

To give or not to give to STP—a completely personal choice.

To give to STP: Place a check or cash in the collection plate. Nothing needs to be written in the memo line of the check.

To give to the church: Place a check in the collection plate and write on memo line where you want the check to go, for example towards your pledge.

To give to STP before or after the service: place check in collection plate and write the desired STP recipient on the memo line.

All checks and cash placed in the collection plate not designated for the church go to the STP recipient

My application was not accepted—why not?

While the STPSC tries to accommodate as many requests as possible—we only have 26 Sundays to work with. There is more good work to be done than we can support. A few reasons why organizations might not be accepted include:

- The request was for an “in-reach” cause. While we all appreciate and support issues that support our members, programs or buildings—STP was begun and has as its mission, outreach. We have had to turn down worthy projects for this reason.
- The request was made by a member and not endorsed or supported by a ministry or by a group of members. The STPSC recognizes that church ministries work with many worthy organizations and considers their support to be an important endorsement.
- The organization did not seem to be as likely to benefit from the donation our church could make as other organizations.

Where can I learn more?

The church’s website complete information, including application forms, about Share the Plate.
<http://c3h.wikispaces.com/Share+The+Plate#toc7>

Please contact any of the STP members if you have questions!

The following is from the December 2010 newsletter that discusses the Benevolence Fund

BENEVOLENCE AND THE MINISTER’S DISCRETIONARY FUND: SHARE THE PLATE ,
12/19 2010

1) Maj-Britt is working in her office on her Christmas Eve sermon when the phone rings. Someone in a personal and confidential crisis needs immediate help and is calling churches in the area asking for assistance.

2) A number of church members are really concerned about a family in the congregation. The family is struggling because their 20-year-old son has been diagnosed with schizophrenia and needs long term care. Due to the dad's loss of a job they have no health insurance. The family has no money for food and they are facing the loss of their home.

These are difficult times for many people. And the holiday season can make life even more difficult. Fortunately both our minister and our congregation have resources they can tap when the need arises.

In the first scenario, Maj-Britt can dip into the Minister's Discretionary Fund—a fund which can be accessed immediately by her for any reason she deems appropriate. Only Maj-Britt knows how MDF funds are spent. Funds can be used to help a church member in crisis or a member of the community in need. The church treasurer reviews this account once a year to ensure its correct use---but it is otherwise confidential. Anyone who thinks they or someone they know may benefit from this type of assistance should contact Maj-Britt directly.

Sometimes there are critical needs that go beyond the scope of the Minister's Discretionary Fund. Needs arise in the church or in the community—which if met can really help address a critical problem (often caused by an injustice). As a non-profit the church cannot collect funds for individuals. Enter the Benevolence Fund. The non-confidential Benevolence Fund exists for use in situations where a need is identified which cannot be met in other ways. Church members who serve on the Benevolence Task Force receive requests for these funds and approve the allocation once they have confirmed that there is a need. These funds are not confidential. Current members of the Benevolence Task Force are Nancy Reichle, Susan Spalt and Katie Donovan. Church members who are aware of needs in the community can contact one of the Benevolence Committee members for more information.

On Sunday, December 19th our Share the Plate collection will be divided between these two funds. Let us reflect the spirit of this holiday season by giving to these funds so the church can help those in crisis or in critical need.

This is an article previously written by Susan Spalt for the Board of Directors

THE SAGA OF BENEVOLENCE:

A TALE OF TAX-DEDUCTABLE, AND ONLY TAX-DEDUCTABLE GIVING, GENEROSITY AND GENERAL CONFUSION

This story began when several church members were concerned about a community member who had a young daughter and who was threatened with deportation for not being a properly registered alien. Many people refused to contribute unless the contributions were tax-deductible. Because these donations were for a specific individual and not for an organization or for the church to later designate for a needy individual—they were not tax-deductible. The question was brought to the board—as virtually all questions were back then—why can't we make these tax-deductible? The attorneys on the board had a near apoplectic reaction to this—perhaps influenced by a recent tax-related snarl only recently resolved.

After consulting with Frankie and others we arrived at a solution—we would create a fund which could be used for this purpose. It differs from the Ministers Discretionary Fund in that it is not necessarily confidential—and decisions are made by church members, not church staff. Nominations can be made by anyone.

The original policy had a stated purpose of serving “needy individuals.” The following policy was included in the Governance Task Force policy work:

D. Care for Resources

7. Benevolence Fund (as of 10 05 10)

Date of First Reading: April 13, 2010

Date Affirmed: May 11, 2010

Date Adopted:

Suggested Date of Review:

A Benevolence Fund shall be maintained by the congregation for the purpose of aiding needy individuals. The Benevolence Fund shall be administered by a three-person Benevolence Committee appointed by the Board of Directors. The Benevolence Committee shall develop and follow written procedures for the administration of, acceptance of contributions to, and

disbursements from the Benevolence Fund. These procedures will be approved by the Board of Directors, and any changes thereof must be approved by the Board of Directors.

A combination of factors now results in a new challenge. In the past a few committees made most of the decisions about church giving. The committees were given an allocation of funds by the board and they dispersed those funds. Share the Plate has increased church giving and had worked to better involve and inform the congregation about recipients. The downside of recent positive changes is this: We don't have an effective way to respond to local, national or global emergencies. This absence is glaring because we now have a way to respond to other needs.

I think these are board questions. Some of the questions that come to my mind are:

1. Is the Benevolence Fund (which is not used all that much) the best way to respond to crises or unanticipated needs?

One Pro—there is funding readily available which can be used

One Con—the congregation would not be involved in an immediate way

2. If the role of the Benevolence Fund is expanded—who should be responsible for making decisions—probably more than 3 church members

3. Currently we use an intentionally broad description of need so we can respond quickly. If we expand this to emergent situations some criteria would probably need to be developed.

4. What kind of board and or staff involvement would be best?

Finally, it is a joy to be discussing Benevolence in this way—as a broad policy issue and not as a reaction to a specific problem.

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MINUTES

Community Church of Chapel Hill – Executive Committee Meeting

Date: June 7, 2011, 3 pm

Present: Paige Hall Smith, Maj-Britt Johnson, Kari Andrade

Absent: Steve Marshall, George Thompson, Scott Provan

Recorder: Kari Andrade

Calendar- Important Dates

- Visioning weekends 9/23-9/25 and 10/21-10/23
- Board Retreat and congregational meeting 1 weekend 2/3-2/5/12
- Congregational meeting 2- 6/3/12
- Kari will lead discussion on board calendaring and topics to cover the rest of the calendar year and the 11/12 church year if time during the board meeting.

Summer Calendar

- Exec proposes moving Aug board mtg to 16th and exec to the 9th- Please check your calendars.
- Staffing plans for summer- update from MBJ. Office hours will be covered by staff and temp hire.

Finance Update

- MBJ summary of latest pledges, revised budget 11/12 will be moved to Aug board meeting due waiting for final numbers to come in for first six months of 2011.
- Finance ctmee - Maggie will present whether and how we pay UUA dues. Dues for UUA and SED - cant fund until we have the funds. Will be discussed at finance mtg on Thurs.

Annual Report

- Steve to present at board meeting

Benevolence Fund

- Benevolence fund for natural disaster Yes or No? STP person not on Benevolence cmtee?
- Identify new members and clarify if Katie Donovan and Nancy Reichle stay on cmtee or not?

Ministerial Evaluation Process

At MBJ's request, the Executive Committee recommends the following

1. That we maintain the ministerial evaluation committee process as outlined by Josh and Jim and recommended by the UUA
2. That we supplement that process with a survey of members and pledging friends, the purpose of which is to solicit input from the entire congregation that will help MBJ serve the congregation. In keeping with our covenant we recommend that the responses be confidential but not anonymous; that means that MBJ and the members of the ministerial evaluation committee only will be able to identify the names of the respondents. The committee will not share with anyone else the comments in anyway that could identify the respondent. These comments will be summarized and included as part of the committee's evaluation report.
3. We further recommend that this survey be electronic (using survey monkey or some other system) and include the following questions

1. In what ways do you have the most contact with MBJ (check all that apply)
 - a. worship
 - b. adult religious education
 - c. pastoral care
 - d. coffee hour
 - e. committee/ministerial meetings
 - f. church council
 - g. Other (please specify _____)
2. Are you a member or friend
3. In a typical month, about how many Sunday's do you attend services?
4. What are her strengths? (open ended)
5. What are her challenges? (open ended)
6. What specific changes could she make that could make this church a better place for you? (open ended)
7. What specific changes could the church make more generally to make this a better place for you? (open ended)

Ministry and Management Report

This report updates us about the staffing plans for the summer

Ministry and Management Report
Rev. Maj-Britt Johnson
June 14, 2011

Stewardship update:

Current 2011-2012 Pledged \$426,866 (not counting "OP 2nd Round Pledge" which is \$15,000).

Current Budget situation

2011 Six Month Income numbers:
Pledged \$222,454
Received 5/31 \$192,391 or 86%

My recommendation, after meetings with Board chair and Finance Committee is that we decide in August, after the 6 month fiscal period ends:

-How much we can pay of our UUA/TJ Dues. I have asked Andrea to let the UUA/TJ know they will be late. They are due June 10th. I am going to readjust the amount due downward to reflect our current membership numbers. After doing a very thorough inventory and "canvass" we were took approximately 40 people off the membership rolls who did not fulfill the by-laws criteria for membership.

-If our expenses came under (an expectation due to staff changes and the lowering of membership numbers) how the "extra" will be allocated.

In August I will also be better able to ascertain how to allocate what looks like "extra" in pledges for 2011-2012, as well as how to allocate the 2nd Round Pledge money.

Staffing:

New office assistant: Andrea and I have a plan in place for hiring. We will be begin advertising in late July and hope to have a new hire by late August.

Volunteer Coordinator position: I will not yet be advertising, for two reasons: I need to wait until we have the full financial picture in August, before I could promise anyone a job. And, I need to work on a new job description.

Note: Our office assistant, Susie Warden is leaving for TX, as you all know. There will be a goodbye reception for her on the 19th of June at coffee hour. I'll provide the cake.

Temporary office assistant: Grant McLendon begins work on the 24th, under Andrea's supervision. I'll be at GA. He will be working from 9-12 Monday through Friday. He has a reduced

job description for these reduced hours. Either Marion or Andrea will be available to him throughout the month of July for help.

Summer staffing: I will be away July 1- August 9th. The August week I am on call for pastoral issues.

-Rev. Blaine Hartford has agreed to be my pastoral care back up minister in July. He has provided his cell phone number and I have written a item for the newsletter that includes that.

-When I am away Andrea is Acting Chief of Staff. When she is away, July 21-26 Marion is Acting.

Addendum to Ministry and Management Report

Though we have decided to wait until August to finalize some decisions about the budget here are some preliminary numbers

Pledges for the 2011-2012 fiscal year are at \$426,866
95% = \$405,523

This is an increase of \$8,400 in pledges after the budget was formulated and approved.

Additionally we received \$15,000 in a “second chance” gift campaign

From this I would like to do the following:

\$4100 returned to R.E. childcare
\$965 returned to Lawn care
\$9446 Membership coordinator position October 1 through June 30th

Balance \$481 from the \$15,000 gift.

With the increase of \$8,400 in pledges, plus the balance of \$481 from the gifts, we have \$8,881 to allocate.

I would recommend the following:

\$100 to ECO which was zeroed out and has no restricted funds to draw down.

\$200 more to covenant groups. This returns them to their former level, but is \$50 less than requested.

\$1,900 to the pianist position. This keeps her at her current rate and hours.

\$1,000 to a miscellaneous operating fund (there are always things that crop up every year and I have nowhere to pay for them from, e.g. this year it was a gift for a leaving staff member, or new signs for the parking lot)

\$681 to Leadership development/Associational Affairs e.g. GA etc.

\$5,000 to reserves

Total: \$8,881

I looked carefully at the various committees and ministries thinking I would add to others. However most of the remaining groups are using down some funds that have been sitting for years which is not a bad idea, for now. Others, e.g. Caring is already at the amount requested and can cover the basic expenses (cards) at the currently budgeted amount. COM determined they have no real expenses this year. Please let me know if I have overlooked anyone!

Faithfully,
Maj-Britt

MINUTES OF THE ANNUAL CONGREGATIONAL MEETING
COMMUNITY CHURCH OF CHAPEL HILL – UNITARIAN UNIVERSALIST
MAY 22, 2011 – 11:15 A.M. – THE SANCTUARY

The meeting was called to order at 11:23 a.m. by President-Elect Kari Andrade.

Maj-Britt Johnson, Minister, presented a reading followed by silent mediation.

Paige Smith, President of the congregation, welcomed all members, noted those present exceeded the number required for a quorum, gave an overview of the agenda, reviewed our Congregational Covenant, and expressed thanks on behalf of the entire congregation to everyone who helped to make the previous night's Service Auction a huge success.

AGENDA

- **2011-2012 Budget**
 1. Our budget in numbers and story
 2. Open discussion
 3. Congregational affirmation of budget

- **Committee Reports, Approvals and Updates**
 4. Endowment Committee
 - a. Congregational approval of new members to the committee: Mary Hulett and Gayle Ruedi
 - b. Update on status of investments
 - c. Report on tentative process for disbursement of Endowment funds

- d. Congregational review and approval of proposed amendments to the Endowment Resolution.
- 5. Nominating Committee – congregational review and approval of proposed amendments to our by-laws proposed by the Nominating Committee and approved by the Board of Directors
- 6. Board Committee Reports
 - a. Ministerial Evaluation Committee
 - b. Board Vision and Strategic Planning Committee
- 7. Community Services Ministry: Listening Sessions Update

CONGREGATIONAL COVENANT

- We will communicate with and about each other openly, kindly and respectfully.
- We will seek peaceful and constructive resolutions when conflicts arise.
- We will value diversity of thought, belief and culture within our community.
- We will work together to build the common good.

1. Our budget in numbers and story – Paige Smith – see Attachment A

- The budget presented is in-line with comparable sister churches.
- Without a vision and strategic plan, it is hard to say whether the budget is appropriate to meeting the mission of our church.
- The new governance structure allowed for efficient, effective construction of the budget.
 - It is based on actual, not anticipated income.
 - The Chief of Staff can reconsider and make appropriate revisions if income is over or under projections.
- Based on church budget history, the budget is attainable and realistic.
- The budget is mission driven.
- More volunteers will be needed in all areas.
- The budget reflects that as a congregation
 - We value inclusion
 - We are a generous congregation
 - We rise to the occasion
 - We have high standards and expectations
 - We are ambitious
 - We desire to be good stewards of all our resources

2. Open discussion of budget

- Why do we pay taxes? To comply with IRS regulations, we pay taxes on parking and rental income.
- Are the reserves adequate? Is \$15,000 an adequate allocation for this budget year? In order to boost the amount in reserves, should consideration be given to the way in which pledge income is allotted?
 - Without a sufficient amount in reserves, it would not have been possible for the church to conduct the search that found our current minister.
 - Putting all of the income from pledges into programs is not recommended. If there is an emergency that requires funds not available from the reserves, then the burden of coming up with those funds will fall on a few members of the church.
 - Our current reserves are not in keeping with UUA standards; to be so, the reserve fund would need to be in the six figures.
 - Some feel that monies in reserve are sitting idle and not serving a purpose; this is not so. Reserves do serve a moral purpose, that is, to meet our promises to employees.
- Paige suggested a Town Hall meeting of the congregation to discuss the congregation's perspectives on reserves.
- Share the Plate (STP) and outreach should be taken into consideration; it is not a part of the budget, but it should be revealed and taken into account when we do the budget. It affects people's sense of giving.
 - Scott Provan, Treasurer, said in the past year approximately \$35,000 to \$40,000 has been raised through STP.
 - Jim Siplon said this was gone through in detail by the Board of Directors.
 - Susan Spalt concurred with Scott's figures, and noted that the amounts raised through STP have been posted in church bulletins and newsletters. She also noted that the STP Committee has been sensitive to how STP might affect pledges.
- Reserves for Ministerial and Director of Life Span Religious Education sabbaticals have not been in previous budgets.
 - The Chief of Staff has the responsibility of budgeting for these funds.
- Where is Sunday hospitality reflected in the budget?
 - Two new chairs have been found for Sunday hospitality; they will work with volunteers.
- Olga should be given some kind of recognition for her work with Sunday hospitality.
- How is the contracted janitorial service working out, and how do we deal with problems?
 - Under our new governance structure, a member having a concern should convey that to a member of the staff. Ultimately, this is the responsibility of the Chief of Staff (or her designee).
- Maj-Britt indicated there is approximately \$70,000 to \$80,000 in restricted funds that are not in use. This money will be reallocated to meet current budgetary needs. The groups involved with these funds are aware of this.

3. Congregational affirmation of budget

Paige Smith moved that the congregation affirm the budget for 2011-2012 as presented. (No second was required as the proposal came from the Board of Directors.) The affirmation of the budget was unanimous; there were no nays and no abstentions.

Further comments:

- Maj-Britt informed the congregation that \$8000 in pledges has come in since the budget presented today was prepared. Also, through second-round generosity, Frankie Price-Stern and Bill Poteet have raised an addition \$15,000 to keep programs in place. As a result she proposes increased allocations to
 - Religious Education (\$4000 so child care will not be cut)
 - Membership Coordinator position (more focused on well-being of the membership)
 - Buildings and Grounds (\$900 for lawn maintenance)
- A proposal was made that 3% of all additional funds be put into the reserves.
 - Maj-Britt responded that she thought she knew what people wanted.

4. Endowment Committee – see Attachment B

- a. Kari Andrade presented a proposal that Mary Hulett and Gayle Ruedi be approved as members of the Endowment Committee.
 - **John Leopold moved, and Terry Baker seconded, the approval of this proposal. The vote to accept the proposal was unanimous; there were no nays and no abstentions.**
 - Kari noted that Mary Hulett will chair the Endowment Committee.
- b. Update on status of investments – Mary Beth Powell
 - The first statement for this calendar year shows approximately \$100,000 in the Endowment Fund.
 - The fund accrued \$3300 in interest for the first quarter of this year.
- c. Disbursements from Endowment Fund – Kari Andrade
 - The committee is establishing a process for disbursements.
 - At the annual meeting one year from now, the committee will be voting on distributions.
 - Applications must address one of the three areas of the church's mission statement.
 - Examples: Salaries? Probably no. A new boiler? Maybe. A new building? Probably.
 - Comments: An endowment should enhance the permanence and influence of the church; a foundation has a life of its own. Our endowment should support the mission and work of the congregation – outreach v. in-reach.

- The Endowment Committee is working on defining the process for application and disbursements.
- The first two areas of our mission statement do address in-reach.
- d. Congregational review and approval of proposed amendments to the Endowment Resolution

- **Polly Johnson moved and David Kline seconded a motion to accept all proposed amendments to the Endowment Committee Bylaws (see Attachment B). With the exception of seven (7) abstentions, all present voted to accept the proposed amendments; there were no nays.**

5. Nominating Committee – review and approval of proposed changes to bylaws – Ruth Gibson – see Attachment C

- **Article 5, Section 5.3, third paragraph:**
 - Current bylaws: *The Nominating Committee shall mail each church member a ballot*
 - Proposed change: *The Nominating Committee shall provide each church member with a ballot.* (This change allows for electronic ballots.)

It was moved, seconded, and passed unanimously that this revision to the bylaws be accepted.

Comments: (1) A major effort must be made to get email addresses for every person entitled to vote, not just every household. (2) Those that do not have email access will be provided paper ballots.

- **Article 5, Section 5.3, second paragraph:**
 - Current bylaws: *The Nominating Committee shall prepare and announce a slate of candidates from the church membership that shall include a Vice-Chairperson, the remainder being at-large candidates, at least thirty (30) days prior to the election. The minimum number of at-large candidates shall be equal to twice the number of vacancies on the Board.*
 - Proposed change: *The minimum number of at-large candidates shall be equal to the number of vacancies on the Board.*

It was moved and seconded that this to accept this revision to the bylaws.

- **Joan Garnett moved the addition of the following language: “The nominating committee will try to have a contested election when possible.” The motion was seconded. Ten (10) voted in favor of the motion; six (6) abstained; the majority voted nay.**

Returning to the original motion to accept this revision to the bylaws, with the exception of one (1) abstention, all present voted to accept this revision.

6. Board Committee Reports

a. Ministerial Evaluation Committee – Josh Socolar

- Feedback for the purpose of helping Maj-Britt understand how best to lead us in our mission.
- **360-degree format:**
 - Solicit written responses to 8 questions pertaining to the various ministerial roles
 - Questionnaire will go to 30 selected people
 - Responses will *not* be anonymous
 - Committee will synthesize and report to Board after seeking any necessary clarifications
- Questions & Comments
 - What criteria will be used in selection of the 30 participants? They will be people who have had extended interaction with Maj-Britt.
 - What about others who want to give feedback? Anyone is welcome to give feedback directly to Maj-Britt at anytime.

b. Vision and Strategic Planning Committee – Kari Andrade

- Vision & Strategic Planning Task Force
 - Mission completed last Year: Inspired by the wisdom of diverse religious traditions and our own history of ethical engagement, we strive to nurture spiritual growth, support and care for each other, and effect change through our love for the world.
 - Vision done 15 years ago. This year we will define where we will be in 2020.
 - Strategic Plan: Road map how we will achieve our vision. This work will be done next year -2012.
- Visioning Process 2011
 - Hire a consultant – June
 - Plan the work over the summer with the consultant
 - SAVE THE DATES: 9/23-25 and 10/ 21-23 for possible weekend workshops
 - Vote on new vision in January Congregational Meeting
 - Members
 - Kari Andrade
 - Mariana Fiorentino
 - Marion Hirsch
 - Steve Marshall

7. Community Services Ministry Listening Sessions Update – Nato Hollister

- Listening Campaign

- 108 participants from congregation
- Many, many concerns were raised: well-being of women, youth and children; health care, GLBT rights...
- Top 3 general topics:
 - Immigration (37 votes)
 - Poverty (39 votes)
 - Environment (36 votes)
- Next Steps
 - Faith in Action Forum: September
 - Report to Juice
 - Standing on the Side of Love – action list
 - Sacred Fire Course – applications

Respectfully submitted,

Barbara Holland Chapman, Acting Recoding Secretary

ATTACHMENT A – BUDGET

2011-2012 BUDGET APPROVED BY BOARD OF DIRECTORS

INCOME	
Pledge assumption	397,10
Total income	519,134
RESERVES	15,000
OPERATIONAL BUDGET	
Ministerial ops (Salary/benefits)	119,832
Lifespan RE (inc MH. Salary + programs)	94,424
Worship & Arts (Inc. GM salary +programs)	43,834
Denominational affairs	28,350
Within these walls (inc. Membership position + other programs (e.g., caring, committees, stewardship etc)	3,250

Beyond these walls	0
Admin/operations (inc. office staff, taxes)	94,753
Buildings & Grounds (inc mortgage, Sunday hospitality)	119,674

ANOTHER SET OF NUMBERS – BUDGET ALLOCATIONS

	2011-2012
INCOME	
Pledge assumption	397,10
Total income	519,134
RESERVES	15,000
OPERATIONAL BUDGET	
Ministerial ops (Salary/benefits)	119,832
Lifespan RE (inc MH. Salary + programs)	94,424
Worship & Arts (Inc. GM salary +programs)	43,834
Denominational affairs	28,350
Within these walls (inc. Membership position + other programs (e.g., caring, committees, stewardship etc)	3,250
Beyond these walls	0
Admin/operations (inc. office staff, taxes)	94,753
Buildings & Grounds (inc mortgage, Sunday hospitality)	119,674

OUR STORY THROUGH BUDGET PRINCIPLES*

Principle	Meaning
Inclusion	Thorough process, getting input and information from a variety of stakeholders; reviews ministerial operation
Equity	Fair or right; does not hurt one ministry in favor of another one; gives good balance
Flexibility	Tool to reach a goal; not carved in stone; can accommodate emergencies and opportunities;
Attainable	Realistic and attainable goals; has included a review of giving patterns and natural cycles
Mission driven	Will this budget help us achieve our mission

****Modified from Kevin Batman, General Treasurer of The Wesleyan Church (ND)***

PRINCIPLE OF INCLUSION – INPUT USING NEW GOVERNANCE STRUCTURE

- Board and minister discuss 2011 vision for ministry (January board retreat)
- Board charges minister as COS to create budgets with varying expense and reserves allocations
- COS charges ministries to create goals and budget
- Ministries present budgets at Church Council (March)
- Minister presents budgets to board (April)
- Congregational Town Hall (April)
- Board reviews stewardship progress and updated budgets; votes on pledge assumption, reserve amounts; approves budget
- Board presents budget to congregation for affirmation.

PRINCIPLE OF EQUITY – UUA PERSPECTIVES ON BUDGET ALLOCATIONS

Item	Percent of total operational budget
Salaries benefits taxes professional	65% (more if church is growing, ~ 70%)
Mortgage	10 (-15%)

Facilities maintenance + utilities	(5-) 10%
Administration	5%
Program committee (not B&G)	(3-) 5%
UUA Dues	5%
Reserves	Outside operational budget; variable across churches depending on circumstances

** Perspective based on associational treasurer/UUA consultants*

PRINCIPLE OF EQUITY: OUR BUDGET ALLOCATIONS: HOW ARE WE DOING?

Based on operational budget amount of \$504,134	Our Percent	UUA approach	Notes
Operational Budget			
Staff salaries + benefits	60.8	65-70%	Meet UUA fair share guidelines
Building & Grounds maintenance (inc. utilities)	13%	5-10%	Possibly high but some B&G expenses are associated with rental income
Mortgage (church + manse)	11%	10-15%	Reasonable
Denominational affairs	5.6%	5-6%	Meet fair share
Administrative + Office expenses	5.7%	5%	Reasonable
Program expenses	4.0	3-5%	Reasonable

PRINCIPLE OF FLEXIBILITY – RESPOND TO OPPORTUNITIES AND EMERGENCIES

- **Reduces uncertainty** inherent in budget process
 - Reduces likelihood of overestimating pledge income since the board can vote on a **balanced** budget possible given:
 - Actual pledges at the time of the meeting
 - Needed reserves

- **Increases ability to respond** if a deficit [or surplus] is projected, the Chief of Staff will present the board with a revised budget with recommendations for balancing the budget.
- **Handle Emergencies:**
 - **Building reserves** \$15,000 (2.8% of the budget)

Financial Reserves at Year Ends

End of year	2008	2009	2010	6/30/2011
Financial reserves*	\$88,400	\$47,500	-\$5000	\$2,000 (forecast)

Financial Reserves are funds set aside to have available when needed for

- major anticipated expenses such as lifecycle maintenance of buildings and grounds
- emergency expenses including building repairs and loss of rental or pledge income due to unanticipated occurrences
- fluctuations in month-to-month cash-flow so bills can be paid during months when pledge income is low

** Financial reserves includes both reserves for building maintenance and operating reserves.*

PRINCIPLE OF ATTAINABILITY

- Non-pledge income based on historic levels
- Pledge income is
 - Based on pledges accounted for at the time of the board meeting
 - Assumes that we will receive 95% of pledges, consistent with our pledging history
- The Board will closely watch income and expenditures throughout the year to insure that we will not have a year-end deficit for 2011-2012.

MISSION DRIVEN

Will this budget help us achieve our mission?

Inspired by the wisdom of diverse religious traditions and our own history of ethical engagement, we strive to nurture spiritual growth, support and care for each other, and effect change through our love for the world.

WHAT DOES OUR BUDGET IN NUMBERS AND STORY TELL US ABOUT OURSELVES?

- We value inclusion and want to be heard
- We are a generous congregation – and rise to the occasion when human & financial resources are needed
- We have high standards and expectations
- We are ambitious
- We aspire to be good stewards of our people, resources and buildings

ATTACHMENT B – ENDOWMENT COMMITTEE

[Endowment Committee Bylaws](#)

[Endowment Committee Proposed Amendments](#)

ATTACHMENT C – NOMINATING COMMITTEE

Rationale for Nominating Committee's Proposed Changes to Bylaws

- Heard from church members that it is discouraging and hurtful to make a commitment of time and energy to serve on the board, and then not to be elected; hurt feelings and resentment at losing has caused some very capable individuals to be unwilling to run, or if they run and lose, to be unwilling to run again in the future.
- The process as it stands is not a true democratic election but more of a measure of popularity or name recognition. Candidates do not run on platforms but on a brief bio and picture. As the church grows in size, we no longer know everyone and tend to vote for those we do know, leaving out people who may be talented but lesser known.
- The language leaves open the possibility of a contested election in the event that the Committee turns up more interested people than there are openings, or if there are additional self-nominated candidates.

Annual Report

This item was on the May Board Agenda but we did not have time to discuss it.

We need an annual report for the period January 2010-Jun 2011. We do not have a plan for this.

Annual Report – Steve Marshall

1. What is (was?) it?
 - A summary of work of the church in a report format

2. What use was it?
 - Reflected back to the congregation the breadth and depth of the work of their church

3. Did it require a lot of effort to produce and distribute?
 - Yes, but the work was shared by many people, which made it do-able

4. When were they produced?
 - A CY2008 report was published in march 2009
 - A CY2009 report was published in April 2010

5. Areas for improvement (a partial list)
 - Less words, more content
 - More cost-effective means of printing and distributing
 - Stick to a fixed production cycle
 - Strive for evolutionary improvements rather than revolutionary changes

6. Should we do it again?
 - Yes!!! In the Fall of each year (converting from Calendar Year for Fiscal Year)
 - Requires a team approach. . WHO?
 - Consider how to minimize the footprint on staff time
 - Consider how to minimize financial cost

Open discussion of 2011 board agenda items

June is half-way though the year. This is a good time to reflect on the key issues that we want to be sure we address during 2011. At the June meeting we will have time on the agenda for the board to discuss the items that we need to include on our agendas for the rest of the year; we can also consider topics for Board Learnings. It would be very helpful if the various committees could identify when they would like to be on the agenda and for how long. So if possible, please discuss this in your committees before the June meeting. It would be helpful if each of you were to review the new policy book.

Below is a list of issues that we have previously discussed as being important or that have otherwise emerged as important issues.

- a. Debriefing the 2011-2012 Budget Process:
- b. Leadership development: how do we cultivate leaders?
- c. Year-round stewardship and congregational growth
- d. Ministerial compensation process
- e. Revision of financial policies [as needed; need to do before going into the next stewardship campaign]
- f. Review of fundraising procedures developed by COS
- g. Discussion of our reserves policy and procedures
- h. Process for board self-evaluate
- i. How do we best secure democracy in a growing congregation?
- j.** How do we best evaluate ministry?
- k.** Board size, membership, terms and names
- l. Email of controversial issues***

Financial Report Jan-June 2011

This reports updates us on the financial picture for the current fiscal year. It includes a recommendation from the Finance Committee that requires board discussion and action.

(the report below may be replaced by an updated version).

As Assistant Treasurer, I need to report upon a critical outcome of this morning's Finance Committee meeting.

Based upon Andrea's report of pledges received through May 31, it appears that we will have sufficient pledge receipts to cover the budget passed by the Board on November 16, 2010, and confirmed by the congregation on December 5. That budget did not include dues payments to the UUA and the District. The good news is that it appears that we will probably (not yet certainly) end this fiscal year with total income in excess of the total income that was in the approved budget, which is to say that we will successfully meet the budget as passed. The problematic news is that it is doubtful that we will have sufficient income to also pay our full dues.

Laurence

PROPOSED MOTION From Finance Committee:

The Board authorizes Staff to pay to the UUA and Southeast District a total amount equal to the amount by which the actual pledge receipts for the fiscal period January-June 2011 exceed \$204,000, not to exceed our fair share of dues. Pledge receipts for fiscal period January-June 2011 are defined as pledge amounts promised for this fiscal period and received no later than August 31, 2011, including amounts promised for this fiscal period and received in 2010, but excluding amounts received during this fiscal period but promised for other fiscal periods.

Benevolence Fund and Committee Discussion

Our policy book includes the following

7. Benevolence Fund (as of 10 05 10)

Date of First Reading: April 13, 2010

Date Affirmed: May 11, 2010

Date Adopted:

Suggested Date of Review:

A Benevolence Fund shall be maintained by the congregation for the purpose of aiding needy individuals. The Benevolence Fund shall be administered by a three-person Benevolence Committee appointed by the Board of Directors. The Benevolence Committee shall develop and follow written procedures for the administration of, acceptance of contributions to, and disbursements from the Benevolence Fund. These procedures will be approved by the Board of Directors, and any changes thereof must be approved by the Board of Directors.

The money in the Benevolence fund is from the December 2010 Share the plate. It is not a budgeted item. There is currently \$6136 in this fund. The committee is currently: Katie Donovan, Nancy Reichle and Susan Spalt. Susan does not believe that any one person should be on both STP and Benevolence (Susan Spalt is on both).

The board needs to take the following action

- 1. Per our by-laws appoint three people to serve as the Benevolence Committee to administer the fund.*
- 2. Determine whether the Benevolence Fund can be used to support organizations as well as individuals so we can provide funding to disasters/emergencies.*

Ministerial Evaluation Committee

The following 4 emails reflect some of the recommendations expressed at the Congregational Meeting about the process used for the ministerial evaluation process.

* To the Ministerial Evaluation Committee:

I want to let you know that I believe it is imperative for you to welcome comments on the Minister's performance from any member of the congregation who might have such comments.

I agree that it makes sense for you to solicit comments from those members of the congregation whom you believe most likely to have pertinent information. I understand that your time is limited. And I understand that you would prefer not to have to deal with petty gripes that a few people are bound to express.

But you need to have the best available information, and it is inevitable that some people will have information and perspectives that you simply don't suspect that they have. Some of that information can be important. You could be very wrong in supposing that people outside of the solicitation circle will merely repeat things said by people inside that circle.

It has been suggested that people with comments on our Minister's performance can go directly to the Minister with those comments. I believe that that suggestion is naïve. As a generic matter, a Minister can be very busy and find it difficult to make time to meet with a member of the congregation about a matter that is not urgent business. As a generic matter, a Minister might be a poor listener, or might be defensive, or might simply be unable to understand certain issues. As a generic matter, a member of the congregation might find it easier (e.g., less confrontational) to express concerns to a committee than to the Minister directly. Indeed, a committee can serve a critical role in finding the patterns of concerns of many people and presenting them in a coherent form that the Minister might find easier to accept and more useful than the disparate and sometimes emotional comments of many individuals.

I believe that members of the congregation will appreciate having the opportunity to provide input even though few are likely to do so. Lack of voice gives a feeling of powerlessness. An opportunity to provide input feels good, even to people who don't take advantage of that opportunity.

I appreciate that you've taken on a challenging and perhaps controversial job, and I feel reluctant to tell you how to go about your business. Nonetheless, I feel it my duty to warn you against a policy that can compromise your success.

Laurence Kirsch

*I was disappointed to learn at last week's congregational meeting, that there will not be an opportunity for all congregation members to have input into the evaluation of our minister.

I understand the rationale for selecting 30 people who work closely with Maj-Britt, as this group may have a better perspective of what Maj-Britt's role is and her performance. However, I believe it's a serious mistake not to give any member of the congregation an opportunity to participate in evaluating our minister, and the collective voice may be more instructive as opposed to individual evaluations.

It was suggested at the meeting that any member of the congregation can meet with Maj-Britt to give feedback. However, it is unrealistic and naïve to think that Maj-Britt will have the time to meet individually with members who are not selected. This suggested process of individually giving open and honest feedback directly to the minister lacks oversight from a collective body, eg. the ministerial evaluation committee, and may be easier for the minister to accept if it is part of a trend or collective voice.

My suggestion is to open the process to the whole congregation, such as an online survey, which would also allow for individual comments. The committee's charge would be to find collective trends of satisfaction and collective areas for improvement.

I appreciate the work this committee has done, however, giving the congregation the opportunity to provide feedback and to participate in the evaluation of our minister, will create goodwill, empower members, and should be part of the democratic process.

Sincerely,

Ivy Brezina

I am disappointed that all congregation members will not be given the opportunity for input into Maj-Britt's evaluation. I fully understand the 360° process, but I have to say that I don't agree with the UUMA as to its appropriateness for evaluating a minister. The minister, unlike most other employees, works for everyone in the congregation. Just because members don't interact with her regularly does not mean that they don't have worthwhile observations and feedback. By limiting your survey to only 30 people, you will be missing the "collective voice" of the congregation.

I know that you approached this task with the best intentions. However, I left the congregational meeting with many questions: Was this process presented to and voted on by the full board? How did you select the evaluation committee? Why wasn't this opened up to the congregation? What are your specific criteria for identifying who will be asked to participate? I'm not sure if you are aware of how this process appears, at least to me. In very blunt terms, it appears that only people who interact regularly with Maj-Britt, i.e., have access to her, are qualified to evaluate her. What about all the members who regularly attend Sunday services, serve on committees, or need pastoral care? Are their opinions not valid?

When asked how members who are not among the selected participants can give feedback, you stated that they should meet with Maj-Britt one-on-one to work out their “problems” in order to avoid triangulation. Do you really intend for everyone who would like a voice in this process to try to schedule an appointment with our already extremely busy minister? Furthermore, “problems” are very different from “comments” and “feedback.” There are probably a number of members who have valuable insights or nagging questions, yet they don’t see a “problem” that needs to be addressed directly with Maj-Britt.

I urge you to open the process to the entire congregation. As a member of the search committee that selected Maj-Britt, I feel very strongly about this because our committee worked diligently for five months to get input from everyone in the congregation who wanted a voice. Because we surveyed the congregation and conducted over 25 cottage meetings, we were able to easily identify the areas of most importance to our members. Without all this work, we wouldn’t have the minister that we’re now evaluating. As a member of the congregation, I feel that it’s wrong not to provide the means for individual voices and the collective voice to be heard. I certainly don’t expect you to have cottage meetings and spend months getting input, but it would be very easy to set up an online survey--that also allows for comments—for all members to complete. In fact, Catherine Grodensky is a professional researcher and well qualified to do this.

In the interest of transparency and fairness, I believe that you need to develop an open process for Maj-Britt’s evaluation that feels more inclusive than exclusive.

Sincerely,

Cathy Cole

=====

* To the Ministerial Evaluation Committee

We are writing to encourage the task force charged with reviewing our minister’s performance to consider very carefully the importance of truly understanding and honoring the feelings of our members. While it is important not to get bogged down in petty complaints and to avoid triangulation—it is also important to give members a chance to be heard. Church members who feel as if they have not been heard may become frustrated enough to vote “with their feet” and leave the congregation. We don’t think any of us want that to happen.

We find the suggestion that church members with complaints can go to the minister to be inadequate. In many cases, we think church members have tried to go to the minister. It is often difficult to get an appointment. The church member may feel that their views have not been heard. Committees or ministries might find themselves in a similar position. In a sense, the current process will most likely be used by members who are have no concerns.

We also believe that it is unlikely that many members of the congregation will comment, especially if they are informed about the process for soliciting input from church leaders. We do not believe that it will add significantly to the work of the committee. Petty grievances, should they come, can be dismissed or referred back to the individual with the strong suggestion that the minister be contacted directly.

It seems to us that your task is to assess the performance of our minister—based on how she interacts with and supports members of our congregation. To some extent your task is also to assess how our congregation and our minister are working together to achieve the mission of the church. The current process is skewed towards the latter. We have real concerns that if the committee does not allow feedback from individual members we will lose an opportunity to help our minister and our congregation to grow and learn together. That would be a very unfortunate mistake.

Thank you for your consideration of this email and for what you do for the church.

Susan and Allen Spalt

Following is a third email written by Jim Siplon.

Dear All

Hope you all had a nice holiday and that Josh is enjoying his trip. He asked that I help in his absence on matters of this work which I'm very happy to do. We have now received three notes (Laurence, Ivey and now Cathy). They come from three involved and fairly demonstrative members. I am not sure I subscribe to the idea that they are reflective of a larger, unspoken, view but they do carry a sense of tension or unease with the process.

...remember the wise counsel of Buddhist teachings (and our minister) that we all consider waiting an uncomfortably long period before responding to questions, especially emotionally charged ones. Let's all start with the assumption of good intentions from all...but maybe not consistent understanding of the objective. And to be fair, we may not have had the time to really explain that given that the

overwhelming focus of the annual meeting was the excellent and successful review of the budget and process.

The origins of this task: Maj-Britt asked for this, not the board or congregation. The Board agreed to provide a framework, consistent with our new governance structure and based on using the UUMA as our reference. We are not (at least I don't believe we are) mandated to do this by our own by-laws nor were we given any mandate by the congregation. We were simply trying to apply this suggested best practice in a way consistent with the new governance structure and productive to our minister while balancing that with a reasonable and efficient process.

The role of this committee and the tool/processes we considered are all part of a set of best practices provided by the UUMA. The concerns that are being raised are predicted as well.

One key issue here is the use of the UUMA as our guide. The outcome we are seeking is the establishment of a non-threatening, on-going process. Ministers have legitimate concerns that these processes generate problems where there were none to start with. Also that the process becomes trivialized with "small church" concerns. Thus the objective was the establishment of a process that would allow further refinement in subsequent iterations. What people seem to be having issues with are the concept of this as a tool for Maj-Britt rather than a voice for them. The concerns are fairly classic, but I'm sure unintended, triangulation.

Our role as a group is not to make everyone happy but to provide a process that will serve Maj-Britt so she can serve the community in her myriad of roles. Our objective was to establish a process for providing useful and productive feedback to our minister. It is not designed, nor should we fall prey to a full examination of her in every facet and from every interested member or party. It was not to provide a vehicle for every person in the congregation to be contacted, surveyed or involved. It was not to solicit feedback from those who feel disconnected. It was simply to provide constructive and actionable feedback to Maj-Britt in the context of the roles she plays as one of several methods for providing feedback. We do have a responsibility to communicate that as well as execute on it. We also have a responsibility to be calm (a non-anxious presence maybe) as a few well intended objections are raised.

I suggest we answer the three who have taken time to write us directly with a response we all feel comfortable with regarding the objective of the process, their concerns and our intention to proceed on with the process for a full iteration before making any conclusion as to its effectiveness (similar to many new aspects of our governance in this trial run year). I also think we should continue to communicate the process and its status in the newsletter and bulletins, always highlighting the objectives albeit succinctly.

At this point, someone less long winded than me may be the best choice for drafting a response and the other communications. Once that is done we can greet Josh and Maj-Britt upon their returns with the ability to continue with the process that we laid out.

Thoughts?

Jim

At MBJ's request, the Executive Committee recommends the following

- 1. That we maintain the ministerial evaluation committee process as outlined by Josh and Jim and recommended by the UUA***
- 2. That we supplement that process with a survey of members and pledging friends, the purpose of which is to solicit input from the entire congregation that will help MBJ serve the congregation. In keeping with our covenant we recommend that the responses be confidential but not anonymous; that means that MBJ and the members of the ministerial evaluation committee only will be able to identify the names of the respondents. The committee will not share with anyone else the comments in anyway that could identify the respondent. These comments will be summarized and included as part of the committee's evaluation report.***
- 3. We further recommend that this survey be electronic (using survey monkey or some other system) and include the following questions:***

1. In what ways do you have the most contact with MBJ (check all that apply)
 - a. worship
 - b. adult religious education
 - c. pastoral care
 - d. coffee hour
 - e. committee/ministerial meetings
 - f. church council
 - g. Other (please specify _____)
2. Are you a member or friend
3. In a typical month, about how many Sunday's do you attend services?
4. What are her strengths? (open ended)
5. What are her challenges? (open ended)
6. What specific changes could she make that could make this church a better place for you? (open ended)
7. What specific changes could the church make more generally to make this a better place for you? (open ended)

Endowment Committee Meeting Minutes

Minutes of the Endowment Committee Quarterly meeting: March 11, 2011 at 1:00 pm

Date of Approval of Minutes: Approved June 10, 2011

Meeting attendees:

Committee Members: Kari Andrade (Chair)

Jay Miller (Financial Secretary)

Mary Beth Powell (Recording Secretary)

Mary Hulett

Gayle Ruedi

Non-voting members: Rev. Maj-Britt Johnson (Minister)

Scott Provan (Church Treasurer)

Steve Marshall (Board Representative/Member-at-Large)

Consent agenda vote

1. Minutes of the December 10, 2010 meeting were approved without changes. Mary Hulett moved the recommendation for approval, Gayle Ruedi seconded the motion. Motion carried unanimously.

Main agenda

2. Mary Beth gave the committee a brief overview of the status of the UUA Common Endowment Fund (CEF) and provided the committee with handouts (attached) which illustrated the investment performance summary for the period ending 1/31/2011 (note that a typo in the date

of the investment summary report says 2010 instead of 2011). Mary Beth participates in the

UUA's quarterly Endowment Fund conference calls and shared with the committee highlights

from the 2/17/11 Common Endowment Fund conference call. These included the following

items of interest:

- The fund, like many other investments has gone through a period of enormous turbulence with the recent economic downturn. Thankfully, the era of unpredictability seems to be behind us. Right now, having come through a great recession, everyone is looking at the "damage done." Fortunately, it appears that the UUA CEF weathered the storm pretty well. When compared to the other large endowment funds our rank was 45 out of 100, so we're in the top 50% in terms of performance.
- There was a lot of discussion about Endtrust, the company that actually manages the UUA CEF's portfolio. The UUA has been extremely pleased with them and their performance. The most recent performance has suggested about a 6% return which was remarkable given the recent market volatility. Endtrust's goal has been to *preserve assets* rather than to "hit it out of the park." They have been very transparent in all of their actions.
- The UUA CEF not only manages many congregations' investments, but prides itself in its ability to conduct "shareholder advocacy." Essentially, the CEF adopts resolutions on issues consistent with UU principles (e.g., climate change, non-discriminatory/gender identity policies, etc.) and then requires companies to meet those same standards before investing in them. As a result, several companies have changed their policies to be consistent with UU principles and in some cases, have sent investors to Boston to meet with UUA reps. to make sure they were in compliance. So, instead of simply making money, the UUA CEF has the added benefit of making companies "behave better."
- Finally, the two presenters on the call – Tim Brennan (UUA) and Jim Sherbloom (NETC – consultant) indicated that they would probably have a workshop on endowments at the General Assembly in June in Charlotte. They invited everyone on the call and anyone from our congregations to attend if we can.

3. Congregational approval process for Endowment Fund distributions. The Committee discussed the method that would be used to gain approval of the distribution of Endowment Funds. It was proposed that a majority vote of the Congregation should be required. The language describing this approval process will be incorporated in the amended Endowment Fund Resolution as part of the proposed By-Laws changes that will be voted upon by the Congregation at the May 2011 Congregational Meeting.

4. Endowment Committee Annual Calendar & Next Steps Review. Kari briefed everyone on upcoming dates that the Endowment Committee has on its calendar:

- September 18, 2011 – Within these Walls – confirmed
- October 2, 2011 – Appreciation luncheon – Kirby room reserved
- July 1, 2012 – distributions from the Endowment Fund will not be allocated until this time.

In terms of other major activities the Endowment Committee needs to accomplish here is the current list of “to do’s:”

- Define financial terms for allocation process
- Determine the yearly allocation we request from the UUA CEF (which would then determine how much we have to allocate to projects/programs of the church)
- Develop and implement the distribution process
- Determine the time frame of the annual granting process and how we plan to present/communicate that to the congregation
- Need to get a portion of the funds allocated for administration costs of the Endowment Committee.

5. Chair Replacement. Kari informed the Committee that because she is the new Vice-Chair of the Board that she needs to step down as Chair of the Endowment Committee – potential conflict of interest. Jay moved and Mary Beth seconded that Mary Hulett become the new chair. The vote was unanimous with the exception of Mary Hulett abstaining.

6. Milestones. A brief discussion ensued about annual target dates for major milestone decisions. The committee decided that by June 10th of each year we will have calculated how much to allocate for the annual distribution process. By Sept. 9th we will have an application process developed and ready to employ.

NEXT COMMITTEE MEETINGS:

June 10, 2011; September 9, 2011; December 9, 2011 – 1 p.m. in the Commons.

Submitted by Mary Beth Powell, Endowment Committee Recording Secretary.

***** Community Church of Chapel Hill Unitarian Universalist**

May 2011 Board Meeting Minutes

Present: Paige Hall Smith, Chair, Josh Socolar, Hillary Waugh, Maj-Britt Johnson, Jim Siplon, Maggie Scarborough, George Thompson, Eleanor Armstrong, Nathan (Nato) Alan Hollister, Scott Provan, Marianna Fiorentino, Steve Marshall, Kari Andrade, Vice-Chair

Visitors: Maureen O'Rourke, (Maureen's partner), Ivy Brezina, Laurence Kirsch, Bill Poteat

Minutes: Hillary Waugh

Welcome: Paige Hall Smith, Chair, called the meeting to order at 7:15pm.

Reading and Chalice Lighting: Josh Socolar, May Board member-at-large.

Board Sharing: Board members shared joys and concerns.

Announcements: Paige Hall Smith

1. The Congregational Meeting will be May 22nd. A call for board volunteers was issued. Jim, Eleanor, Kari, and Maggie agreed to help. Paige asked that the Vision+Mission, Ministerial Review, and Finance Committees present at the meeting.
2. Several board members will be absent at the June board meeting as they are traveling with the Coming of Age group to Boston. Kari will be facilitating the meeting in Paige's absence. Paige asked that the board reflect on key issues that need to be completed during the year.

Board Learning: Denominational Affairs

1. Nato Hollister presented on the historical structure of the church, which has impacted the current structure and policies. He explained the concept of congregational polity, which based in the idea of a covenant (as opposed to a creed). He also explained the current UUA restructuring and how they are working to be most effective at serving the congregations at both at the district and national levels.

2. Kari Andrade talked about UU Connections (formerly Denominational Affairs). The historic priorities of this program were to support larger community (UUA & district fair share, chalice lighters, association Sunday); join larger community (meetings); lay leader development (workshops); leverage/expand justice work; and to provide Spiritual Exploration (SE) resources.

3. The position description for UU Connections chair was also presented. It was noted that this program has not been a priority for the church for some time. Kari mentioned that with the changes going on at UUA and in our district, it is becoming even more crucial that we revive this committee. The board is looking at how to best fill the position in a democratic manner. The priorities of the committee need to dovetail with the vision of ministry for the year. The committee would recruit, organize, and brief church on cluster, district, and general meetings and also needs to serve as a conduit between congregation and the aforementioned larger entities. It was mentioned that the ideal candidate for the position would be a long-term UU with leadership experience, a self-starter and relationship builder, with knowledge of key organizations and their functions, and has attended GA. The re-energized priorities for this committee are to find a chair, perhaps a GA attendee and for the board to thoughtfully recruit individuals, perhaps post-GA.

Consent Agenda

1. For receipt:

a. Executive Committee Minutes

b. Nominating Committee

c. Pledge Update: Jan.-June 2011

i. Update as of today: pledges at 71% of what is expected; someone has pledged stock valued at \$6,000

d. 2010 Balance Sheet

2. For approval:

- a. April Board Minutes
- b. Delegates to UUA
- c. Stewardship Update; 2nd Round Challenge
- d. Minister's report: 2011-2012
- e. Budget Discussion: 2011-2012 budget
- f. Annual Report: Jan. 2010-June 2011

3. Josh Socolar moved to pass agenda. Marianna Fiorentino seconded the motion. Unanimously approved.

Delegates to UUA

1. Nato Hollister presented the slate of delegates to UUA.
2. Kari Andrade moved to accept the GA slate. Steve Marshall seconded the motion. Unanimously accepted.

Stewardship Update

1. Bill Poteat, chair of stewardship committee, presented this update. He said that there are currently the same number of households that have pledged for 2012 as did for 2011 and 2010; 41 households still have not pledged but 24 of these pledged \$28,521 in 2010. He felt that the pledges coming in for 2011-2012 were enough to fund budget options 1 or 2. For the people that increased their level of giving, the average was \$400; for those that decreased, they did so at \$600-700. The weekend prior to the board meeting additional calls were made and an additional \$10,000 of verbal pledges were made, which were not reflected in the \$418,000 figure, since they were not formally made at that time.
2. Concerns were raised that it will likely not be any easier to collect pledges in the next few years, particularly because our congregation has an aging population. This could potentially result in a need to ask people to increase their pledges year after year.

3. Bill said that the church needs to recruit new members who will then be willing to pledge.

i. Josh said this issue was critical to the budget conversation because it included deciding whether or not to approve a membership coordinator. He felt this position was particularly important if new members will be critical to the survival of the church.

4. It was mentioned that since there wasn't a person-to-person canvas done this year that we don't know why people haven't given. Bill noted that the stewardship committee and those making calls need to reach out to the 41 households to see whether they will be making a financial contribution to the church.

5. Bill was recognized by the board for his hard work in his position and for putting this information together.

6. Bill and the board then recognized Peter Witt, Jay Miller, Becky Wilkes, Mary LeMay, Paige Hall Smith, Kari Andrade, SAM Brooks, Scott Provan, George Thompson, Bob Weston, Frankie Price Stern, Jenny Warnasch, and Bonnie Nelson for their hard work.

Minister's Report

1. Maj-Britt Johnson discussed that other congregations are dealing with similar budgetary issues at present. She said that one congregation in particular has said that they are going to assume that they will reach their fundraising goal and then make cuts as needed after the first quarter if that amount has not been reached.

2. She recommended that the board choose option 1.

3. Maj-Britt then discussed the letter to the board from the Religious Education program, in which they outlined what their priorities would be if there was additional funding and at what amount this could be achieved.

i. She expressed gratitude to Marion Hirsch and the RE team for putting together their letter, which included a reorganized budget based on potential cuts.

4. Maj-Britt suggested that this current budget process a learning experience in terms of governance and how the board can make things run more smoothly in the future. She said that she and others will be debriefing the process in the future.

Budget Discussion

1. The process for voting on the budget had been agreed upon via the consent agenda.
2. Agree on Pledge Assumption to Make
 - a. Josh Socolar motioned that the board would carry the conversation forward assuming that pledges would be 95% of what was made. Kari Andrade seconded the motion. Unanimously accepted.
3. Agree on Amount to Put Into Reserves
 - a. Steve Marshall motioned that at least \$15,000 be put into the reserves budget. Marianna Fiorentino seconded the motion.
 - i. Discussion ensued about the amount of reserve funds needed, whether tapping into an equity line would be the best course of action, that insurance on critical systems to the church could be purchased instead of saving reserve funds for this possibility, how reserve funds can be spent in the future, the impact of cutting the membership coordinator position, and the uneven nature of cash flow on a monthly basis.
 - b. Following discussion Steve's motion passed with 7 in favor and 2 opposed, with no abstentions.
4. Kari Andrade motioned that the board accept the Option 1 budget. Maggie Scarborough seconded the motion.
 - a. Discussion followed in which it was asked if there was additional \$4K for RE within the Option 1 budget; but it was agreed that there was not.
 - b. Following the discussion Kari's motion passed with 8 in favor, none opposed, with 1 abstention.
5. There was discussion of how to spend additional income over budget. The agreement was that stewardship would provide an estimate of additional income to the Stewardship Committee, and they would present a report on additional income to the board, along with a plan for expending these funds. Stewardship plans to target the outstanding 23 pledges, and consistent "upper tail" pledgers

Action Items from the May 2011 Board Meeting

TOPIC	ACTION	WHO	WHEN
Budget/Vision/ Stewardship	Congregational Mtg- show up!	Whole Board	May 22, 11:15
Budget/Vision/ Stewardship	Congregational Mtg- sign in members	Jim, Eleanor, Maggi, Kari	May 22, 11:15
UU Connections	Send UU Connections PPT to Board	Kari	By May 17, 2011

Process Observations

What we did well

- Listened well and tried to understand each other
- Followed the agenda
- Budget discussion process clearly laid out
- Paige summarize and clarify direction for future discussion. Focus on our decision for tonight.
- Kept engaged as we broke new ground.

What we can do better

- Keep learning and practicing our new roles as a board members.