

CMCL Council Meeting Agenda September 24, 2014, 6 p.m.

Present: Andrea Lommen, Cheryl Weber, Beth Oberholtzer, Julia Schrock, Lucyann Boll-Borrero, Lois Martin, Torrie Martin, John Thomas, Susan Gascho-Cooke, Chad Martin, Lori Bergey, Kevin Kautz, Adam Miller

Phil Weaver – Budget Report Rod Houser – Budget Report

- 1) Susan led us in communion, asking us to remember what we bring to council, including our skills and talents, as well as our broken places, and remembering the many CMCL tables we represent.
- 2) Julia asked each council member to introduce themselves, and perhaps (especially new members) say why they decided to accept this nomination.
 - a) Julia – 26 years at CMCL; chair
 - b) Beth – 2nd year on council; attending 25 years; member – 10 years
 - c) Cheryl – since 2005
 - d) Andrea – 6 years at CMCL
 - e) Lori – 20 years at CMCL, 2nd year on council; member 10 years
 - f) Adam – attending 4 years; first year on council; member one year. Looking for ways to get more involved and serve.
 - g) Chad – 7.5 years; member
 - h) John – 4 years, give or take; baby due in 2 weeks; still figuring out why he joined council; not a member yet.
 - i) Torrie – chair-elect; on council 3 years; 22 years at CMCL
 - j) Lois – oldest person on council;
 - k) LucyAnn – 20 years; member 15-18 years ago; initially said “no”, but then changed her mind—will offer what she comes with
 - l) Susan – since 2010
 - m) Kevin – 5 or 6 years; 2 years on council; member slightly less than 2 years ago.
- 3) Conversation:
 - a) Andrea – would like to see more diversity; people of color; ethnic minorities; LGBTQ, reflect Lancaster County’s population; would like rainbow, something obvious; statement in worship service
 - b) Beth – need to be open to other issues, as well.
 - c) Adam – sought out CMCL because it was welcoming (knew it coming in).
 - d) Kevin – would like us to become more intentional about engaging people; be a space in the world for people to be able to engage
 - e) Lori – thriving youth group; youth programs; for kids to find a place where they feel they belong.
 - f) Lois – Grant Street process; perseverance is paying off; glad to work with City
 - g) Julia – Front part of Grant Street building = “part of the future”.
 - h) Beth – assessment – strong conviction = putting money behind it. We need a common conviction to maintain fiscal health and wise ways to use volunteers. How does the roll-over, aging of the baby boomers who started the church affect our giving and volunteerism?

- i) Andrea – Thinks about “Volunteers are weary” statement. Super smart people doing a lot of volunteerism without coaching. Her vision is that our volunteers be enlivened by the process of volunteering—having service = spiritual journey.
 - j) Susan – Are we willing to bring visitors in?
 - k) Julia – Assessment: not a lot of interest in outward service; feeling of “should,” but no energy for it.
 - l) Chad – Our growth trajectory actually looks pretty good!
 - m) Lois – Jim Hanna said most Lancaster mainline churches would like to know how we are accomplishing the growth.
 - n) John – the church that we ARE brings people in;
 - o) Adam – people sense the authenticity, and that brings people in.
 - p) Kevin – some of what we ARE is standing in opposition to other Mennonite churches.
 - q) Susan – more of our struggle is – people want to be here, but what are the ways for people to connect more deeply?
 - r) Chad – need to continue to dream about rich and diverse for people to connect. (We used to have handbook we gave to visitors; we are now working on a Visitor’s brochure, are putting in “lighter” invitations—come to a Parrot Gallery opening [rather than give money and volunteer]. What are relational, life-giving things.
 - s) Kevin – Non-Mennos coming to CMCL because of CMCLers who are engaged in causes they are interested in. Any Lancaster social justice event will have CMCLers in attendance. Would be nice to make those activities more visible.
- 4) Julia read Core Values and Vision Prayer.
- 5) Approval of the August minutes – council approved the August 2014 minutes.
- 6) Andrea – Curious about length of council meetings. Would like a conversation on how council feels about more efficiency and limiting time.
- 7) Budget report – Phil Weaver and Rod Houser.
- a) Phil brought Budget Report for 2013-14 year.
 - b) Actual v. Budget and difference.
 - c) Income \$441,000 +/-; spent approximately \$441,000
 - d) Facility – held off on upgrades; \$23,000 not spent money. Will not be carried over.
 - e) Personnel – saved \$3,000 (no intern this year).
 - i) Kevin: How long can we get away with not spending the facility upgrade (insulation in sanctuary) (payback for installation would be 5-7 years).
 - f) Non-Budget Items: Ending balance within \$1,000 of beginning balance.
 - i) Large item: building fund; funds for parking lot and demolition of Grant Street are in a separate money market account (not in general fund). We have \$56,000 in hand; may need to fund raise for balance.
 - ii) Balances of non-budget income: rolled into general fund and then re-assigned.
 - g) Budget Report is for informational purposes only. No need for council action.
 - h) YAEF Fund – brokerage fund - \$300,000 balance; not part of budget. We drew \$30,000 and gave away \$20,000 of that. This is an endowment; restricted funds purposely for YAEF distribution. It might be good to let congregation know more about the YAEF account.
 - i) Kevin: Study of endowments – churches can have 20% or more of their operating budget in endowments (estates; special grants; etc.) It would be good to establish a vehicle for CMCLers to give part of their estates to an endowment.
 - ii) Lucyann – YAEF started out as \$100,000+/-; has grown significantly.

- iii) Chad – Info on YAEF is clearly in policy documents; YAEF committee is appointed by council; annual report is on blog (www.cmcl.wordpress.com)
 - i) Detailed Budget – Phil pointed out highlights:
 - i) Repairs for facilities – that’s where we did NOT spend \$24,000
 - ii) Most other line items – close to proposed budget; saved \$3,000 on intern and over-stated retirement budgeting.
 - j) Balance Sheet - \$70,000 in cash; \$5,500 CD; Money Market \$70,500.
 - i) Should list mortgages under liabilities = close to \$350,000 that we still owe.
 - ii) Accounts Payable – still paying on old fiscal year HSA.
 - k) We have about \$54,000 cash for operations.
- 8) Finance Committee: made up of treasurer (Phil Weaver), assistant treasurer (Andre Chubb), members (Dave Lutz and Rod Houser), Susan Gascho-Cooke as pastoral rep. Controls in place to keep from having only one person handling money. Rod writes checks; Phil signs them. Rod can sign, if Phil is not available.
- a) The actual pledges we have are \$4,000 lower than last year.
 - b) We look at what comes in in addition to the pledges and guesstimate.
 - c) We will be entering pledges/planned giving into new software (have not in past year).
 - d) For people who do not pledge, we look at last year’s giving and assume they will give the same.
 - e) Total we get is about 20% more than the pledges we receive.
 - f) This is the first year we have reduced budget. Our actual income has risen with growth of congregation.
- 9) Rod: We like to have 2 months operating expenses in cash (approx. \$75,000). We are close to that.
- 10) Thoughts on the Congregational Meeting – Overall thoughts from people who attended.
- a) Julia - Need to have more congregational meetings. People like having a place to talk about issues. Open forum for people to voice joys and concerns.
 - b) Lois – we should have had 5 congregational meetings last year, according to Don Hess. Bylaws mentions one designated “open meeting” per year. We do need to offer opportunity for open discussion.
 - c) Beth – not good to do congregational during Christian Ed.
 - d) Kevin – positive feeling that many people came and were engaged. We should have a published set of topics for open discussion. (There was an outline in people’s mailboxes).
 - e) Andrea – dangerous to have open meeting with no agenda. Concern expressed by one member sidelined processing agenda. Good to have 10-minute period at end of agendaed meeting, with someone keeping people on task of agenda.
 - f) John – Interesting that there are fewer volunteers than are needed.
 - g) Torrie – got several comments over the year that if we don’t have volunteers that we need to re-evaluate committees.
 - h) Kevin – general trend in society – each generation is shifting in its involvement in society; we can counter the general society trend. People’s desire to engage outside of their family does not dwindle, but the shape it takes changes. (e.g., Lion’s Club). Millennial generation actually volunteers a lot, but not for organizations like Lion’s Club. (Tree planting for Mary Lou Weaver Houser’s birthday party easily drew 75 people).
 - i) Torrie - Some structure needs to end or morph into new entities.
 - j) Julia – we do need to figure out what our “core” issues are that need to be worked on and accomplished.

- k) Susan – current vehicles for communicating discussion items: are we putting out enough ways for the congregation to know what council is working on? Trying not to spam people’s e-mail boxes.
 - l) Julia – feels the need to communicate more. Could put blog address into bulletin each Sunday. Note that council snippets are on blog.
- 11) What are the important issues/goals Council needs to focus on in the coming year?
- a) Council last year edited structural documents to reflect current actual practice.
 - b) This year, Council needs to work on restructuring
 - i) Chad has drafted a timeline for restructuring/writing.
 - ii) Trying to put sequence into restructuring. Need to complete this work by end of this program year. Hope to have concrete, real changes to be enacted by this time next year.
 - iii) Broke it out into 3 strands of parallel work to be done:
 - (1) Structural revision;
 - (2) Congregational goal-setting; and
 - (3) Volunteer cultivation.
 - iv) Wrote this from a perspective of changing trends in volunteering/aging of congregation, etc.
 - (1) Do more work in listening to what congregation wants to do.
 - (2) Have a way to access information on availability, skills, energy levels. In this size congregation, we no longer can do “shoulder-tapping” like in smaller congregation.
 - c) Kevin – would like to change title from “Volunteer Engagement” to “Engagement Coaching.” Does like the 3 categories.
 - d) Council members filled in areas of interest –
 - i) Structure revision: **Beth**, Greg, Lois, Adam; Dennis [consult]; non-profit consultant? (Chad—but will be out in October)
 - ii) Goal-setting – **Andrea**, Adam, Susan (staff) and council as a whole
 - iii) Volunteer Cultivation – **Kevin**, Lori, Steve (Walter) and Rachel (staff)
 - e) Beth – maybe there should be a survey of skills and interests.
 - f) Rachel – new database with area for skills and interests being introduced in office.
 - g) Andrea – would like temporary committees – for 1 month meet over phone or e-mail to look at their category; what do they need from other category council members; report back; what input is needed. Only have 10 meetings to revise structure of church.
 - h) Kevin – would like assignments between council meetings.
 - i) Torrie – used to have subcommittees on council; need to find happy medium.
 - j) Lucyann – thought there would be more information disseminated on the Congregational assessment, and wonders about communication regarding second meeting and results.
 - k) Susan – we did have formal results available.
 - l) Andrea – does not feel the Congregational Assessment really relates to the structural revisions/visioning/goals. Andrea – 13 people is very hard to actually accomplish work. Smaller subgroups can address these questions. October council meeting should be report from first subgroup.
 - m) Kevin – assignments for these 3 subgroups should be short-term.
 - n) Cheryl – which materials would 3 sub-committees use to reference for re-structuring?
 - o) Beth – here’s where we are now; where are we going? Assessment was the first step, but report not clear.
 - p) Chad – assessment gave us information about how congregation works; internal and external models available. Best practices could be homework to be done.

- q) Susan – good to make announcement to congregation as to what council is working on.
 - r) Lori – all three areas need to be worked on at the same time.
 - s) Adam – reservoir of congregational structure is small, and structural diagram was confusing.
 - t) Finance Committee needs proposed budget by May at latest (March or April).
- 12) Pastor's Report – Susan and Chad gave report on pastoral care –
- a) more visitation than usual in past weeks; ongoing financial and mental health issues; noted need for wisdom in being wise and welcoming at the same time;
 - b) Susan will be participating in a same-sex wedding, but not officiating; she has notified Atlantic Coast Conference; does not anticipate any problems. Chad, Susan and Chris have been talking and planning regarding children and youth care.
 - c) ACC Conference will hopefully process the true welcoming of Fraser Mennonite Church; Chad is on Executive Board of ACC, Susan is delegate (Kevin is also a delegate). Susan supplied information on an ACC leadership seminar regarding leadership and discernment process. Chad will be traveling in October.
 - d) Susan and Chad have been doing more of church retreat planning. Good registration with lots of new folks attending. Budget-wise maybe a few thousand dollars more because of lower registration.
- 13) Pastors were dismissed. Council continued meeting. Julia distributed current structural document information on definition of Staff Relations Committee and Council.
- a) Staff Relation is responsible for supervision of staff; currently pastors sit in on staff relations. There is some confusion presently on the accountability and supervision—does it come from Staff Relations or Council?
 - b) The discussion on possible Youth Pastor brought up possible prioritization of staff responsibilities and duties. Julia received e-mail:
 - i) Are all paid staff working and filling all responsibilities and duties?
 - ii) Are staff job descriptions inaccurate?
 - iii) Church structure rewrite needs to address congregational needs, staff-wise.
 - c) Discussed the confusion over who is responsible for pastoring youth.
 - d) Council needs to authorize Staff Relations to make recommendations for need for another position. Council then goes to congregation to get authorization for additional staff.
 - i) Andrea – this is a much larger issue than just a Youth Pastor. We need a report from Staff Relations about division of job descriptions. Does feel that Staff Relations needs to speak to what is happening with staff. Concerned about risks to the church.
 - ii) Julia – Dan Hess has been meeting with Susan and Chad about staff job descriptions. Susan's sabbatical has delayed this process. Susan was hired as lead pastor; Chad was hired as associate pastor. Staff Relations has a plan and is working on it, but feels it cannot reveal anything personal.
 - iii) Lois – Council does not need to know confidential process; council needs to get recommendations from Staff Relations.
 - iv) Kevin - Council needs to change church structure document to reflect that Staff Relations is responsible for roles and responsibilities of staff. Wonders what the reporting mechanism from Staff Relations is.
 - v) Julia – Is offering to do a monthly staff relations report. She will report concerns back to Staff Relations.
 - vi) Torrie – Staff Relations will bring a recommendation for action, but the details of process need to stay with staff relations.

vii) Council is responsible for checking back with Staff Relations, and ask for an update on where the process is at.

viii) Kevin –

(1) Content of SRC report?

(2) Frequency of SCR reports?

14) Kevin made motion to add language to Staff Relations responsibilities to be responsible for staff roles and responsibilities.

(1) Lori seconded the motion.

(2) Motion passed.

15) Staff Relations needs to meet without staff present, and Julia will talk with SRS regarding this.

Adjournment: at 9 p.m.

Next meeting **October 22, 2014, 7 p.m.**

Respectfully submitted, Rachel Kraybill Stahl, Admin. Asst.