

Minutes: Eliot Chapel Board of Trustees Meeting June 13, at 7 pm

This Year's Board Theme: "Living into Our ENDS"

Present: Cindy Lau, Bruce MacKenzie, Angie Bowland, David T. Cox, Karen Fuchs, Trina Priese, Dave Salivar, Todd Stark, Brian Krippner, Allison Ricks, Ted Lau, Steve Mennerick

Absent: Barbara Gadon

Meeting Called to Order: 7:00 PM

- Chalice lighting words opening and closing & Opening Reading (Todd)
- Check-in. How has your time on the Board changed you or what have you found meaningful while being on the Board?

Consent Agenda

- Approval of new members:
 - Nikki Lemley
 - David Rowan
 - Josh and Molly Evans
- Accept Meeting Minutes (Angie)
- Accept Lead Minister's Incidental Report (Barbara)
(None for June 2017)
- Accept Monitoring Reports:
 - 4.3 Compensation and Benefits Barbara
 - 4.5 Financial planning /budgeting Barbara
 - 4.8 Temporarily Restricted and Permanently Restricted Funds Barbara
- Accept Chair elect to provide assessment of the Chairs' agenda for the year (see 2.3)
- Accept calendar review:
 - June 13 June Board Meeting
 - June 21-25 GA in New Orleans
 - July 11 July Board Meeting

New Business

Review of the Bergfried Process.

- What unresolvable dilemma/s or polarities perpetuates the Bergfried Questions?
Lessons learned, what worked and what didn't work?
 - Can be multiple perspectives. We shouldn't assume that's the case going forward...perhaps the transformative experience we went through has changed how we will respond going forward. Suggest evaluating in 2 years or so
 - The congregation may not have defined how Bergfried fits into our mission.
 - Hard to tackle the status quo.
 - Our ends are new and they have not been communicated or implemented that much. We are a church that is in evolution currently and Bergfried is not the only legacy program we have. All of our programs should probably be evaluated to see if they fit into the ends, do they move our mission forward, for whom, at what cost? May have been slightly premature to make a big decision like this.
 - The process was not aligning Bergfried with the ends, it was aligning it with the mission, which was probably not the best idea.
 - We probably should have done Strategic Plans first.
 - Questions about distrust and budgets were intertwined with Bergfried.
 - Long memory and history of good intentions but separation of these Bergfried/Eliot entities. The gift was received with a stipulation that they be kept separate, but perhaps there were unintended consequences of that separation and we should talk about it. Bergfried is here to serve the Chapel, not the other way around.
 - This is an opportunity to grow towards unity.
 - If this is a recurrent issue, then we may need to address how to meet those needs met at Bergfried at a lower opportunity cost.
 - We're changing but not changed. Does some of this come from the long history of the UU denomination. We welcome those who don't feel welcome other places. Some have joined understanding there is a certain decorum and some don't seem to buy into that.
 - Trust may be the one thing that we cannot resolve.
 - Perception and reality. It's always been about the collectiveness and structure of the church. We don't support the institution equally. The lack of support in a general sense, brings the financial setup of Bergfried into the conversation periodically. Unresolved concern of the church.
 - We still have BF as a corpus fund, it's not wrapped into the general fund. People think "it pays for itself" so that perpetuates issues.
 - Polity, who makes decisions and controls stuff? Some members of the congregation think they should get to decide everything all the time. Famous place for people who have power issues to act out.
 - Watching our congregation approach this issue, it was white privilege.
 - There were voices who expressed the wishes that BF could be used to level the playing field for those who are not generally getting to the out of doors.
- Do we have divided groups of congregants? If we do, how do we move toward unity or understanding? (See Trina's notes)

Review of the Annual Meeting.

- Start check-in 10 mins early, materials not in place.
- Station someone at Adam's Hall door to funnel folks into correct line.
- Put up standards to divide the lines
- We sense a need to be more transparent with the Congregation (mean's issue that Barbara is addressing)
- DAVID - next year's topic is promoting transparency and trust

Items Removed From Consent

- 2.7 Reinterpretation (Bruce and Trina)
 - Per David - we are looking at policies to generate different interpretations, so take 2.7 and simplify it as much as possible. Cindy - too much, changed some PG verbiage, and too much data collection. "The Board will hold linkage events and ..."
- Treasurer's Report (Dave)
 - Explanation of new (simplified) report describing designations, even though the monies are wrapped into main funds.

Summary:

Transparency Report:

Bruce - all good

Assignments for next meeting:

- | | |
|--|----------------|
| ◦ 2.1 Governing Style | David |
| ◦ 2.2 Board Job Description | Todd |
| ◦ 2.3 Annual Agenda Planning | David |
| ◦ 2.4 Officer Roles and Responsibilities | Angie, Allison |
| ◦ 2.5 Board Member Code of Conduct | Karen |
| ◦ 2.9 Gifts | Dave S, Brian |
| ◦ 4.1.4c Report of Grievances | Barbara |
| ◦ 4.6 Financial Condition and Operation | Barbara |
| ◦ 4.10 Gifts and planned giving | Barbara |
| ◦ Accept 2.7 Interpretation | Trina |

Meeting Actions

- Simplify Policies in the coming year, starting with 2.7 in July
- Charlie to provide a year-end summary report by mid-July.
- Dave to ask Charlie what is the 2611 Bergfried Holding Account.

Meeting Decisions

- Consent agenda adopted
- Changes to the Annual Meeting will be in the meeting minutes (Lessons Learned)
- Accept the Treasurer's report, David/Karen

Closing Words (Todd) It's better to travel well than to arrive

No one saves us but ourselves.... The trouble is, you think you have time!

For Angie
Meeting Evaluation Form

This meeting evaluation form is intended to guide the board in assessing and improving its performance. Each meeting will have a designated meeting evaluator who will facilitate discussion by the full board of its performance at the conclusion of the meeting.

Meeting Date: 6/13/17

Legend: S indicates 'Satisfactory'; NI indicates 'Needs Improvement'; UNS indicates 'Unsatisfactory'; and NA indicates Not Applicable

	<u>S</u>	<u>NI</u>	<u>UNS</u>	<u>NA</u>
Preparation				
The Board was prepared for this meeting	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
The Chair was prepared for this meeting	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Agenda				
Items on agenda dealt with the board's job (i.e. "Ends") only	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Issues and intended outcomes were clear	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Appropriate time was allocated for each agenda item	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Action Items were assigned with deadlines	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Participation				
Each board member had an adequate opportunity to participate in discussion and decision-making	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Board Chair				
Board chair kept to the agenda	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Board chair facilitated answers to questions & issues	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
The board adhered to its adopted governance style:				
Emphasized outward vision over management	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Encouraged diversity in viewpoints	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Exercised strategic leadership more than oversight of administrative details	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Maintained a clear distinction between Board and Staff roles	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Used collective decision making	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Looked to the future	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Treated all with courtesy, fairness and dignity	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Obedied the Trustee Code of Conduct as outlined in Policy 2.5	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Any action the Board directed the Lead Minister to undertake was recorded as a passed motion	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Any authority the Board delegated to an individual or group was recorded in a passed motion that is specific and states the limitations of the delegated authority	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Transparency Issues to Consider

1. What items discussed in the meeting need to be communicated beyond the minutes? To whom, how and who is responsible for the communication?
2. Did visitors seem to have a clear idea of what to expect from the meeting?
3. Are there any outstanding transparency issues that need handling? Who will handle, how, when?

Comments:

All good!

Evaluator:

R. Blumenthal

Form Revised: Jul-2015

Thanks all folks!