

**First Universalist Church of Minneapolis  
Board of Trustees Meeting  
March 21, 2013**

**Agenda**

*In the Universalist spirit of love and hope, we give, receive, and grow.*  
First Universalist Church

Treats provided by....TBD

6:30 Call to Order

-Chalice lighting and centering meditation - TBD

6:40 Consent Agenda:

-Approve February minutes

-Approve new members

-Affirm Mary Bohman ordination

6:45 BOT Recruitment Update from NomCom - Cindy Marsh

7:00 Conversation w/Sr. Minister

-Sr. Minister Report

7:20 Finance Committee Report

7:50 Governance Committee Report

8:25 Meeting Review

8:30 Meeting adjourned

**Attachments:**

President's Report (Craig)

Feb 2013 Board Minutes (Dan)

Sr. Minister's Report (Justin)

Governance Committee Report

President's Report  
March 2013

Dear Board:

Heading from my office to my car yesterday, I noticed a twinge of balmy air. Later on, I saw potted daffodils (that harbinger of Spring) for sale at my neighborhood co-op. I've actually enjoyed this winter a lot, but those signs of Spring can be intoxicating.

The reactivated Governance Committee sprung forward into a policy driven monitoring session earlier this month. They will share their findings and also some recommendations to the board. The minutes are extensive yet engrossing for a policy wonk, which we all aspire to be in our most idealized state :). The report will touch on many of the topical matters we've covered this year.

The Finance Committee met just days ago. The discussions and scenarios being deliberated were held within the larger board/staff aligned goal of proposing a balanced budget. Board and staff are using this year's budget plus returns from the recently concluded pledge drive to form an updated baseline. The report will be distributed outside the board packet.

In addition to discerning Justin's report, the board will be asked to vote to affirm Mary Bohman's ordination ahead of a congregational vote.

Also, as the recruitment period for open board positions next year will have closed by the time we convene, Cindy Marsh will be providing us with an update on the candidate pool as they continue their discernment on the selection process.

I look forward to seeing you all.

In Faith,  
Craig Bierbaum

**First Universalist Church of Minneapolis Board of Trustees Meeting**

**Thursday, February 21, 2013, 6:30 p.m.**

**Board Members present** (absent): David Bach, Dan Berg, Craig Bierbaum, Craig Bishop, David Leppik, Paul Robinson, Pam Vincent, Lark Weller, Karin Wille

**Clergy present:** Justin Schroeder

**Others present:** Susan Claeys (attended Finance Committee Report portion of the agenda)

<b><u>Agenda Item</u></b>	<b><u>Presenter</u></b>	<b><u>Discussion</u></b>	<b><u>Action, if any</u></b>
Opening Words/ Meeting Preparation	Dan Berg	The meeting was called to order at 6:31 p.m. Dan Berg read a poem by Lisel Mueller, "Monet Refuses the Operation."	
Consent agenda	Craig Bierbaum	Approve December minutes. Approve new members (an updated version was distributed at the meeting) ( <a href="#">Attachment A</a> ).  <b>Action: Motion to approve Consent Agenda.</b>	<b>Passed</b>
Conversation with the Senior Minister Part 1	Justin Schroeder	Lessons and reflections from the past month...  The Board entered an Executive Session at 6:42 p.m. Dan Berg reviewed the purpose and best practices regarding Executive Sessions, and referred the Board to an article from Board Source on the topic.  The Executive Session included reflections from Justin Schroeder regarding the January Board meeting and subsequent discussions with the Board. Craig Bierbaum also provided a recap of the Board's Executive Session meeting on January 30 for Justin's benefit, specifically discussing the themes that emerged at that meeting.  The Executive Session concluded at 7:31 p.m.	

### First Universalist Church of Minneapolis Board of Trustees Meeting

Finance Committee Report	Paul Robinson	<p>(Susan Claeys joined the meeting for the Finance Committee report.)</p> <p>Paul Robinson introduced the Gift Acceptance Policy draft that was included in the <a href="#">Board Packet</a>. There were a few clarifying questions, mostly about the provision that allows the Board to use 10% of an undesignated bequest to the operating budget in the year received. The Policy was not specific about the time frame for such a decision, so an amendment to the Policy was suggested to clarify that this option was available "within the fiscal year that the gift was received.</p> <p><b>Action: Motion to approve the Gift Acceptance Policy as amended.</b></p> <p>The modified, approved version follows as <a href="#">Attachment B</a>.</p> <p>Several undesignated bequests have been received this year that will be subject to this 10% option. A decision regarding the 10% option on these bequests was deferred. Paul thanked those who had contributed to the drafting of this Policy.</p> <p>Paul provided an overview of the 2<sup>nd</sup> quarter financial report which had been reviewed by the Finance Monitoring Team and is included in the <a href="#">Board Packet</a>. The most significant variance from budget was a reduction in projected pledge revenue of \$54,000. This adjustment was based on a more accurate staff analysis of unpaid pledges in previous years.</p> <p>Paul also drew attention to the bottom line and how a \$40,000 deficit had been approved in August for an upgrade of the accounting and database systems. As detailed in the December minutes, much of this expense was subsequently capitalized, and a decision was made to only install the accounting system at this time, nevertheless, the second quarter report shows that the other variances result in a net deficit of \$37,000. This might be reduced by \$28,000 if the Board opts to retain 10% from this year's realized bequests, as allowed by the Gift Acceptance Policy.</p> <p>Paul reported on a discussion at the recent Finance Monitoring Team meeting about the church's reserve funds. Various sources recommend that an organization retain 2-4 months operating cash flow in reserve. The church's policy has been to reserve two months, but this amount has not been updated recently. There was Board consensus that the FMT should address the need reserve policy.</p> <p>Justin and Karin Wille extended special thanks to Paul for his analysis of the church's financial history and his work to build a financial plan document. Everyone agreed that the effort was very useful and could provide a model for budget presentation in the future. Included in Paul's documents (which were distributed by email and hard copy to the Board) was a graph showing membership and average Sunday attendance from 1986-87 to the present. It was decided that these documents should not be attached to the minutes, as they are for illustration purposes only.</p>	Passed.
--------------------------	---------------	---	---------

Dan  
Yesterday, 8:57 PM  
Added Text

### **First Universalist Church of Minneapolis Board of Trustees Meeting**

Conversation with the Senior Minister Part 2	Justin Schroeder	<p>Review Monitoring Interpretations...</p> <p>Craig Bierbaum reviewed the various sources that inform this discussion, including several articles and submissions in the Board Packet. Justin reviewed the content that he provided, and summarized his understanding of the interpretation and monitoring process: First the Board and the Senior Minister enter a “zone of collaboration” to interpret the policy and define the metrics for adherence; then the Senior Minister submits the agreed upon monitoring reports; finally—if the Board is not satisfied that the reports are reliable—it may seek direct inspection. There was considerable discussion about this third phase—what triggers direct inspection and what is appropriate. Some members of the Board expressed the opinion that Justin’s view of monitoring—especially direct inspection—is unduly negative. Craig Bierbaum, Paul Robinson and David Bach all offered that we can modify our form of Policy Governance—that we are not locked into a strict Carver model—as long as there is a good mutual understanding of what our structure will be and how it will be played out in monitoring expectations. We shouldn’t cleave so closely to the strict model that we bypass opportunities for growth, even at a risk, as long as we understand “...at what cost.” Justin responded to clarify his position, and to affirm the importance of clear communication and trust.</p> <p>Karin Wille provided perspective in reviewing the process that led the Board (at the January 30 special meeting and online discussion that followed) to set aside interpretations of the Visionary Goals as a Board priority, in favor of a focus on monitoring. She also questioned whether we are ready to develop a monitoring plan when there may be doubts about the Visionary Goals themselves. Discussion ensued as to whether the Board really knows what it wants. Karin suggested that the Board needs to do some homework and perhaps meet in executive sessions to take charge of the process. Justin expressed concern that this would not be a collaborative process. He acknowledged, however, that the Board needs to own the mission and the vision and have a clear sense of its role.</p> <p>Craig Bierbaum proposed that the Governance Committee frame this discussion and bring it back to the Board (in March?). David Leppik asked and Karin agreed that she would draft amendments to the Visionary Goals that would incorporate “...at what cost” language, per the Carver model.</p>	
2013-14 Budget Discussion	Paul Robinson	<p>The Board had a brief discussion about the process and timing of the 2013-14 budget approval. Justin asked whether the Board needs more information to consider a budget deviation in the current year to hire an accounting manager, or whether the Board has already made this decision in the negative. The Board asked some clarifying questions but did not ask for additional information in favor of a hire this year. Paul Robinson provided three year plan example as something that would help us to see the impact of deficit spending along with other needs and its impact on reserves. David Bach asked for a comprehensive staffing plan that would accompany the next financial report and the 2013-14 budget. Although there was no board action on this request, there was general consensus that this plan would be an important addition to the proposed budget.</p>	

### **First Universalist Church of Minneapolis Board of Trustees Meeting**

Conversation with the Senior Minister Part 3	Justin Schroeder	<p>Remainder of the Senior Minister's report...</p> <p>Acknowledging the time, Justin referred to his report in the Board Packet. He asked for action on his request for a letter of support from the Board affirming a permanent waiver of the three-year rule so that Ruth MacKenzie can continue as Director of Worship Arts. There was consensus that the President should prepare a letter of support as requested.</p> <p>Paul Robinson asked a question about the church's commitment of \$60,000 to Habitat for Humanity. Justin explained that staff expects to raise this money through a "Greater Good Project" led by Jen Crow in the fall. Although the church has not signed a pledge to Habitat, Justin says we are obligated. There was discussion about what this means and whether it can have a negative impact on the bottom line. Although it can, Justin assured the Board that there are other sources to make up any Greater Good shortfall. There were questions about how the Greater Good initiative might impact other fundraising efforts including the annual canvass. Justin indicated that research shows a positive impact as congregations embrace the spirit of generosity through an initiative like Greater Good. When asked, he indicated that the staff has weighed this concern and is confident that the rewards outweigh the risks.</p>	
Meeting Review/ Wrap Up		Closing words were offered by David Bach.	
Adjourn		The meeting was adjourned at 9:12.	

#### Important Dates:

Next meeting: March 21, 2012  
Treats for Next Meeting: Lark Weller

Prepared and submitted by Dan Berg, Secretary

Dan  
Yesterday, 8:51 PM  
Added Text

**First Universalist Church of Minneapolis Board of Trustees Meeting**

**Attachment A**

**First Universalist Church  
Statistical Report  
February 21, 2013**

**MEMORIAL SERVICES: 1**

Robert Moe, service Feb. 11 – Rev. Justin Schroeder

**MARRIAGES/SERVICES OF COMMITMENT: 0**

Jan 6, 2013: Nathan Elliott and Lisa Harn – Rev. Justin Schroeder

Jan 19, 2013: Kevin Lynch and Louisa Quast – Rev. Justin Schroeder

**MEMBERS FOR APPROVAL: 3**

Karma and Brian Hughes, Minneapolis

Keith Washington, Minneapolis

**MEMBERS REINSTATED: 0**

**MEMBERS FOR REMOVAL: 5**

Robert Moe, deceased

Ken and Mary Abeln, moved to Lake Minnetonka UU church, nearer their new home

Paul and Cheryl Reiswig

**CHILDREN DEDICATED: 0**

	To Date 2012-2013	End of Year Totals			
MEMBERS		2011-2012	2010-11	2009-10	2008-09
(Fiscal Year)	45	76	98	75	72
<b>TOTAL MEMBERS:</b>	<b>970</b>	<b>953</b>	<b>927</b>	<b>849</b>	<b>840</b>

**TOTAL MEMBERS AS OF THE LAST MEETING: 972**

**To be added: 3**

**To be removed: 5**

**TOTAL MEMBERS: 970**



## **First Universalist Church of Minneapolis Board of Trustees Meeting**

### **Attachment B**

#### **First Universalist Church Gift Acceptance Policies**

February 21, 2013

##### **Purpose of Policies and Guidelines**

Current and planned gifts are solicited by the Church to fund ongoing operations and to secure the future of the Church. These policies and guidelines govern the acceptance of gifts by the Church and provide guidance to prospective donors and their advisors when making gifts to the Church. The provisions of these policies shall apply to all gifts, including annual pledges, memorials and bequests, planned gifts, as well as other gifts received by the Church for any of its programs or services.

##### **Unrestricted Gifts**

Donations of gifts for unrestricted or general purposes provide maximum flexibility to the Church. Annual pledges and payments from the membership are considered unrestricted gifts, as are other current gifts from members and others that are not otherwise restricted by the donor for a specific purpose.

Unrestricted bequests and other estate gifts under \$10,000 will be allocated to the general fund. Unrestricted bequests and other estate gifts equal to or greater than \$10,000 will be allocated to the Legacy Fund, however 10% of each such gift may be retained for the general fund within the fiscal year in which the gift was received, at the discretion of the Board of Trustees.

##### **Restricted Gifts**

The Church will accept gifts for specific programs and purposes, provided that such gifts are consistent with the stated Values, Mission and Visionary Goals of the Church. Gifts that violate the terms of the corporate charter, gifts that are too difficult to administer, or gifts that are for purposes outside the programmatic priorities of the Church may not be accepted.

The Board of Trustees, upon recommendation of the Gift Acceptance Committee, shall have final authority regarding the restrictive nature of a gift, and its acceptance or refusal.

##### **Gift Acceptance Committee**

The Gift Acceptance Committee is charged with making recommendations to the Board of Trustees about gifts other than cash and publicly traded securities given to the Church as outlined in these policies. It is composed of:

- President of the Board of Trustees
- Treasurer of the Board of Trustees
- Member of the Ministerial Team

**First Universalist Church of Minneapolis Board of Trustees Meeting**

- Chair of the Planned Giving Team
- Chair of the Pledge Team
- Director of Finance and Administration

## **First Universalist Church of Minneapolis Board of Trustees Meeting**

### **Types of Gifts**

#### **1. Securities**

Gifts of publicly traded securities shall be acknowledged as of the date received by the number and identification of the shares transferred. The value that the Church recognizes as a contribution (per IRA regulations) is based on the mean of the high and low trading values of the security on the date received by (subject to control of) the Church. The tax deductible value of the gift should be determined by the donor. It is the policy of the Church to sell securities promptly following receipt.

#### **2. Real Estate**

Gifts of real estate may be accepted at the discretion of the Board of Trustees upon recommendation of the Gift Acceptance Committee. Because each parcel of real estate is unique, the acceptance and completion of a proposed gift will depend on the facts and circumstances of the potential gift, including any debt associated with the property. Therefore, following preliminary review by the Gift Acceptance Committee, a gift of real estate recommended for consideration will be handled in two phases:

- Review and due diligence including a qualified independent appraisal, an environmental assessment, and a title search. There should be a clear understanding with the donor as to who will incur related costs of this due diligence.
- Transfer of Title with both donor and Church advised by their respective legal counsel, and approval of final documents.

The Church will seek to sell most gifts of real estate and will apply the net proceeds according to the donor's wishes, subject to the other terms of these Gift Acceptance Policies. The Church may retain the services of a third party agency to receive and manage the sale of a gift of real estate.

#### **3. Tangible Personal Property**

The Church may accept gifts of tangible personal property if there is an immediate use for the property within a program of the Church or if the gift can be easily converted to cash. Gifts with an estimated value of less than \$5,000 for which there is no immediate use within a program of the church will not be accepted. For gifts estimated to be valued at \$5,000 or more for which there is no immediate use within a program of the church, acceptance is subject to the approval of the Board of Trustees, upon recommendation of the Gift Acceptance Committee. If the donor intends to claim a tax deduction for such a gift with an estimated value of \$5,000 or more, it is the donor's responsibility 1) to obtain at his/her expense an independent qualified appraisal of the property documenting that the property is valued at \$5,000 or more, and 2) to establish that the property satisfies the IRS "related use" rule.

**First Universalist Church of Minneapolis Board of Trustees Meeting**

All accepted donations of tangible personal property immediately become the property of First Universalist Church with the understanding that the gifts for which there is no immediate use within a program of the Church will be converted to cash as quickly as possible.

## **First Universalist Church of Minneapolis Board of Trustees Meeting**

### **4. Life Insurance**

The Church may accept gifts of life insurance when the Church becomes both the owner and the irrevocable beneficiary of the policy. It also prefers life insurance policies that are fully paid. All partially paid policies must be accompanied by a written agreement regarding future payment of premiums. The Church shall retain the right to surrender the policy at its sole discretion. Proposed gifts must be presented to and approved by the Board of Trustees, upon recommendation of the Gift Acceptance Committee prior to acceptance by the Church. Gifts will be recorded as of the date that the transfer of policy ownership is recorded by the insurer.

### **5. Qualified Retirement Plans**

The Church may accept gifts of assets from qualified retirement plans, subject to IRS regulations. It is most advantageous for the donor to name the Church as a primary or secondary beneficiary of such plans in documents held by the plan custodian. Note: Intended gifts of retirement plan assets are revocable and, consequently, do not result in an income tax deduction.

### **6. Other Gifts**

In addition to outright bequests, gifts of Charitable Gift Annuities, Charitable Remainder Trusts and Charitable Lead Trusts are welcome and are subject to the applicable provision of this Gift Acceptance Policy. Information is available from the Planned Giving Team or the Director of Finance and Administration.

## **Recognition of Gifts**

First Universalist Church shall acknowledge all gifts and donations in a manner that respects and honors the wishes of the donor. The Church may presume that donors or their authorized representatives permit public announcement of any features of a gift. If a donor indicates a desire for anonymity or confidentiality, such requests should be made in writing and the Church will undertake its best efforts to hold details of the gift and investment information in confidence.

## **Planning of Gifts**

First Universalist Church encourages donors to disclose their bequest intentions to the Church in writing to ensure the Church is able to carry out their wishes and that the gifts conform to the principles stated in this Gift Acceptance Policy.

---

## **Definitions**

**Current Gifts.** As distinguished from Planned Gifts, these are gifts from living donors. These may be one-time, outright gifts, or pledges to be paid over a period of years. They may be restricted or unrestricted in purpose.

### **First Universalist Church of Minneapolis Board of Trustees Meeting**

**Planned Gifts.** These are commitments—or the result of commitments—to make a gift in the future, usually at the death of the donor. They may be simple bequests (an amount or a percent of an estate designated in the donor's will or living trust), life insurance or retirement fund proceeds, or "split income" gifts such as charitable remainder trusts or charitable gift annuities. Split income gifts are financial instruments that provide income for life or a period of years to a living beneficiary (which may be the donor) and, at the end of the term or the beneficiary's death, the "remainder" of the trust or annuity goes to the charity. They may be restricted or unrestricted in purpose. Planned gifts are also sometimes referred to as "estate gifts."

**Restricted Gifts.** These are gifts made with some stipulation by the donor regarding the use of the gift or its proceeds if the gift is illiquid. The restriction may be in purpose, time or both. Restricted gifts that are not specifically solicited for a restricted purpose (such as a capital campaign or an endowment fund) may be rejected by the charity if the donor's restriction is contrary to the plans or best interests of the charity.

**Unrestricted Gifts.** Gifts that are not restricted in their purpose or the time in which they must be used. These are the most flexible and desirable gifts because they allow the charity to apply the proceeds to the greatest needs, now or in the future.

**Tangible Personal Property.** Gifts of things rather than cash or marketable securities. Tangible personal property may be accepted and retained by a charity because it is needed or useful in meeting its charitable purpose, or it may be liquidated (sold) with the proceeds used by the charity for restricted or unrestricted purposes. The tax regulations that apply to gifts of tangible personal property are complex and must be reviewed carefully by the donor. For gifts valued at \$5,000 or more, the donor must obtain a qualified appraisal in order to claim a tax deduction for the current value of the gift. Generally the charity will not acknowledge the value of such a gift; the gift acknowledgement will only provide a description of the property. The charity may reject a gift of tangible personal property at its sole discretion.

Approved by the Board of Trustees 2/21/2013

Dan Berg, Secretary

February Attendance

	2013			2012			2011			2010			2009			2008			2007		
Adults	9:30 AM	11:15 AM		9:30 AM	11:15 AM		9:30 AM	11:15 AM		9:00 AM	11:00 AM		9:00 AM	11:00 AM		9:00 AM	11:00 AM		9:00 AM	11:00 AM	
1st Week	301	319	620	302	364	666	270	337	607	167	305	472	120	288	408	148	282	430	143	278	421
2nd Week	271	244	515 *	305	470	775	230	229	459	136	287	423	190	450	640	94	302	396	125	349	474
3rd Week	291	373	664	228	300	528 *	205	252	457	188	408	596	104	303	407	150	398	548	139	298	437
4th Week	317	293	610 *	315	331	646 *	283	295	578 *	209	491	700	132	287	419	127	247	374	47	126	173
5th Week	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Monthly Total	1180	1229	2409.00	1150	1465	2615.00	988	1113	2101.00	700	1491	2191	546	1328	1874	519	1229	1748	454	1051	1505
Avg for February	295.00	307.25	602.25	287.50	366.25	653.75	247.00	278.25	525.25	175.00	372.75	547.75	136.50	332	468.50	129.75	307.25	437	113.50	262.75	376.25
Church School																					
1st Week	144	133	277	151	157	308	127	90	217 *	69	181	250	60	196	256	67	131	198	61	111	172
2nd Week	151	141	292 *	184	147	331	120	97	217	58	68	126	90	210	300	47	51	98	97	65	162
3rd Week	117	105	222	140	116	256 *	110	88	198 *	91	165	256	66	179	245	75	112	187	80	108	188
4th Week	188	136	324 *	181	168	349	135	100	235	92	174	266	72	61	133	63	117	180	27	54	81
5th Week	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Monthly Total	600	515	1115	656	588	1244	492	375	867	310	588	898	288	646	934	252	411	663	265	338	603
Avg for February	150.00	128.75	278.75	164.00	147.00	311.00	123.00	93.75	216.75	77.50	147.00	224.50	72	161.50	233.50	63.00	102.75	165.75	66.25	84.50	150.75
Combined Avg	445.00	436.00	881.00	451.50	513.25	964.75	370.00	372.00	742.00	252.50	519.75	772.25	208.50	493.50	702.00	192.75	410.00	602.75	179.75	347.25	527.00
Notes:				Notes:				Notes:													
Services:				Services:				Services:													
Week 1:				Week 1:				Week 1:													
Week 2: Sharing Sunday/Pres Day weekend/				Week 2:				Week 2:													
threat of big snowstorm that didn't materialize				Week 3: President's Day weekend				Week 3:													
Week 3:				Week 4: Missing data/estimated				Week 4:													
Week 4: Pledge Drive wrap-up				Week 5:				Week 4: Pledge Wrap Up													
Week 5:								Week 5:													
Church School:				Church School:				Church School:													
Week 1:				Week 1:				Week 1: Children's Chapel													
Week 2:				Week 2:				Week 2:													
Week 2: Sharing Sunday/Pres Day weekend				Week 3: No 7-8gr class/Jr Hi overnight				Week 3: no 3rd Graders @ 9:30													
Week 3:				Week 4:				Week 4:													
Week 4: grade 11/12 in 2nd service				Week 5:				Week 5:													
Week 5:																					

## **Sr. Minister Report for the Board of Trustees, March. 2013**

**Mission Statement:** In the Universal Spirit of love and hope, we give, receive, and grow. First Universalist Church.

**Visionary Goals** (*Shorthand: “We are all Love’s people, held by a Love that will not let us go. As Love’s people, we do holy work: we welcome, affirm, and protect the light in each human heart; we act outside our walls for justice and equality; we listen with our whole being to where Love is calling us next.”*)

**The people of First Universalist Church grow in their UU faith: we are equipped to live out our values and experience worship, spiritual practices, and rituals that challenge, comfort, celebrate, and heal.**

- Our worship associates continue to bring their unique and powerful voice to the worship service. Through this worship associate program, we are making our theology “come alive,” as we truly demonstrate our belief that each and every one of us contains truth and wisdom, and that truth and wisdom is not confined to one text or one person.
- Our Small Group ministry continues to diversify. We have a grief group, lead by Laura Smidzik, our Cummins Ministerial Intern, and a Grief Support Group, lead by congregants.
- Our boy’s choir performed on March 10, 2013.
- The Pathway to Membership is deepening the way that we onramp new members into Unitarian Universalism, and into First Universalist, in particular.
- We’ll be offering a weeklong “Chalice Camp” this summer for our children. (More information in the Program Guide.)
- Our “Sex and Spirit” sermon service was well received. Congregants are asking about a “Part 2.”

**First Universalist Church is a home for ageless wisdom. People of all ages find opportunities to engage in an intellectual and spiritual search for deeper meaning and understanding in the UU tradition, both as individuals and in community. We know our roots, find our wings, and apply our knowledge and wisdom to all our endeavors.**

- Please see the Spring Program Guide for a full description of the variety of Programs we’re offering, that help us “know our roots,” and “find our wings.” Our Elder programming is expanding, and we’re planning an “Elder Sunday” service in May. Here’s link to the Program Guide:  
<http://firstuniv.org/sites/default/files/Spring%20Program%20Guide%20-%20Final%20Small.pdf>.



**First Universalist Church is an intergenerational community of mutual caring and support. We build this community by actively welcoming all and encouraging each other to discover, develop and share their gifts.**

- Congregant involvement in both the choir and the instrumental groups of the church continues to grow.
- Our Small Groups leaders are beginning to understand themselves as “Spiritual Leaders,” welcoming, caring for, and tending to those in their Small Groups.
- Our intergenerational services speak across the age range, and our children are engaged.

**The people of First Universalist Church work to build a just, loving and sustainable world. We are a visible, influential voice, and we act to shape the larger community into a more just and equitable society.**

- The Congregation gave over 1600 hours of service to the community on our 3<sup>rd</sup> Annual Day of Service.
- We are continuing our Racial Justice commitment with a variety of programming (see the Spring Programming Guide.)
- In the Fall of 2013, we'll offer a Racial Justice Training. (**Reminder:** This racial justice work is not a one year project. This is a multi-year, multi-decade project that we're beginning this year. It is important and urgent work, but there is no set end point. It is important to have the Board involved and committed to this journey.)
- Finally, our **ministry of generosity** continues to flourish. On Feb. 3, and, Feb. 24, we gave \$1300 and \$1727, to Habitat for Humanity; on Feb. 10 and 17, we gave \$1,022 and \$1,076, to the Unitarian Universalist Association, and on Mar. 3, we gave \$1605 to the MN Coalition for Reproductive Rights.

#### Updates:

Inform/Consult/Approve	Item	Relevant Policy and Comments
Inform	Pledge Drive Update	<p>Policy D. Communication to the Board and Congregation. <i>Inform the board in a timely manner of any relevant trends, issues, or events affecting the health of the organization.</i></p> <p>We are in the final stages of wrapping up our pledge drive. At this point, it appears that our pledge base for 2013-2014, although greater than the pledge base in 2012-2013, will be less than projected in</p>

<p><b>Inform</b></p>	<p><b>Personnel Updates: Office Manager</b></p>	<p>the five year budget plan that was outlined in the Strategic Plan. I can speak more to the “whys” of this at our Board meeting. This has implications for other aspects of the Strategic Plan timeline, and implementation. Specifically, unless directed by the Board, we will not be increasing PSD or UUA dues in the 2013-2014 budget, nor will there be staff salary increases, or any staff adds. Going forward, we will need to readjust the pledge assumptions in the 5 year budget that is part of the Strategic Plan.</p> <p>Policy D. Communication to the Board and Congregation. <i>Inform the board in a timely manner of any relevant trends, issues, or events affecting the health of the organization.”</i></p> <p>Our Office Manager, Trish Greene, has resigned, effective March 30. We are grateful for the many gifts and office improvements that Trish brought to First Universalist. The Management Team is updating the Office Manager position description, and should have the position posted by the time of the Board meeting. It is likely that we’ll have a temp in for a month or so, to help with coverage until the new Office Manager begins.</p> <p>As I’ve previously communicated to the Board, the administrative needs of the church are greater than they’ve been in the past, and much of this workload rests with the Office Manager and the Director of Administration and Finance. The Management Team is exploring ways to cut back on certain administrative tasks, so that the administrative team can have a sustainable work load during the 2013-</p>
----------------------	---	--

<b>Inform</b>	<b>Personnel Updates: Coordinator of Youth and Young Adult Ministries</b>	<p>2014 church year, and we can live within our means.</p> <p>Our Coordinator of Youth and Young Adult Ministries, Katie Heaton, has also resigned, effective March 27, to pursue her career in counseling. We are grateful for her many years of service, and will have a chance to celebrate her time with First Universalist on Sunday March 24. Ruth MacKenzie has graciously agreed to fill in an interim capacity to help with Coming of Age and Youth Sunday. During this interim time, the Management Team will be assessing the needs of the Youth Program, and how best to move forward.</p>
<b>Inform</b>	<b>Personnel Updates: Intern for Next Year</b>	<p>First Universalist will have a ¼ time intern next year. This intern, Terri Burnor, is a student at United Theological Seminary, and will focus on Elder Programming during her internship. Jen Crow will supervise her. The cost for this internship is \$2000.</p>
<b>Inform</b>	<b>Personnel Updates: Minister of Membership and Small Groups</b>	<p>At the Board meeting, I'll have an update on this position.</p>
<b>Inform</b>	<b>Creation of Community Investment Team (Giving Away the Plate Team).</b>	<p>Policy D. Communication to the Board and Congregation. <i>Inform the board in a timely manner of any relevant trends, issues, or events affecting the health of the organization."</i></p>

<p><b>Inform</b></p>	<p><b>Staff Leadership Retreat</b></p>	<p>I am in the process of creating a “Community Investment Team,” a group of church lay leaders will who help recommend where the Sunday morning offering plate is going each month. I am thrilled that the congregation will now more formally own this “Community Investment” ministry, as it makes recommendations to the Management Team about where the Sunday offering should go.</p> <p>Policy D. Communication to the Board and Congregation. <i>Inform the board in a timely manner of any relevant trends, issues, or events affecting the health of the organization.”</i></p> <p>On February 19 and 20, the Ministers, Intern, and Program Directors meet for a two day retreat, to focus on goals for 2013-2014. Highlights from this retreat include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In 2013-2014, in conversation with congregants, we will explore various options to address the shortage of religious education classrooms we’re experiencing, due to the abundance of children and youth who are registered in our program.</li> <li>• In 2013-2014, we’re focusing on “shoring up,” tending to, and strengthening the infrastructure, communication, and systems that we have in place.</li> <li>• We’ll continue to consolidate and strengthen the Membership Engagement Continuum, serving the needs of our newest members as well as our long term members.</li> </ul>
----------------------	--	---

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• We'll focus on lay leader development (across all program areas) in 2013-2014 as well.</li> </ul>
--	--	--

# First Universalist – Finance Committee

March 13, 2013 – Minutes (DRAFT)

Attendance: Riley Owens, Dan Berg, Bill Elwood, Paul Robinson, Craig Bishop, Justin Schroder, Susan Claeys.

## 1) Gift Acceptance

We reviewed the gifts that have been or will soon be received by the church. Knowing that there is a projected shortfall this year and a need for these funds in the General Fund the Committee recommends that the board approve allocating 10% of the unrestricted bequests to the General Fund for 2012–13. The remainder of the bequest will be allocated to the Legacy Fund.

Donor	Total	10%	90%	Comments
Total Donor 1	61,265.96	6,126.60	55,139.36	
Total Donor 2	35,942.67	3,594.27	32,348.40	
<b>TOTAL RECEIVED</b>	<b>97,208.63</b>	<b>9,720.86</b>	<b>87,487.77</b>	
Total Donor 3	185,000.00	18,500.00	166,500.00	Pending receipt in March 2013
<b>GRAND TOTAL</b>	<b>282,208.63</b>	<b>28,220.86</b>	<b>253,987.77</b>	<b>Includes pending and received.</b>

## 2) 2013–14 Budget – Overview

The committee spent a majority of the meeting addressing items related to the 2013–14 budget.

Robinson started with stating that the Committee goals for this discussion were to identify items where we wanted to make a recommendation to the board or to highlight an issue where the committee needs board direction.

Schroeder handed out a copy of the visionary goals and a big picture reminder about what we were trying to accomplish. We briefly talked about all the good things that are happening, membership is approaching 1,000 members, pledge revenue has increased. (roughly from \$ 750,000 to \$1,120,000 or 48% during Schroeder's tenure) We are headed into a couple years of dealing with some tough financial issues, regrouping, to be able to move forward on a strong footing into the future.

Schroeder and Claeys handed out a big picture 2013–14 budget. This showed that based on their current projections they would need to cut between \$40,000 – \$66,000 in expenditures to balance the budget.

The spirit of the conversation was to have an open and honest exchange of ideas about the budget and look at all options. Schroeder said that he has asked all of his departments to look at their budgets and see what could be reduced or where there could be savings.

Schroeder stated that he was assuming that the guidance and direction he has been given was to create balanced budget for 2013–14. There was some general consensus around this but later in the meeting some options were discussed for using reserves for select projects.

Schroeder and Clays gave an overview of their initial work on the budget.

The most significant item on the revenue side was a reduction in the pledge revenue expected for 2013–14. At this time they are projecting a net pledge revenue that is \$28,000 less than what was budgeted for in 2012–13. This included changing the amount of pledge write offs from 3% to 6% based on the most recent data, and a recognition that a number of people who increased pledges this year for miracle Sundays did not build on that increased pledge amount for next year, and no additional miracles Sundays.

While the overall pledge number is reduced the line item included revenue increases of \$25,000 in new pledge revenue from holding a brief pledge Sunday or short pledge drive for those who did not pledge this year, and \$20,000 for first time pledges throughout the year.

This led to a discussion about what is being done to collect delinquent or unpaid accounts. It appeared after some discussion that this was an area where volunteers could help staff. All members of the committee said they would be willing to make calls. Robinson said he would organize.

Generally for revenue and expenditure staff was looking at making more conservative forecasts for next year. Therefore RE fees, rental income and others line items were being reduced to levels substantiated by current year projections.

There was some confusion about the reduction of the line item listed as “other” from the amount projected for 2012–13 this was not resolved.

Current expenses showed a net decrease in the overall expenses of \$21,500. To do that the initial budget worksheet removed all dues payments to the UUA and PSD. We did not take the time to understand the detail behind each line items but took the numbers provided at face value and focused our time on specific issues and items that were either in the 2013–14 budget worksheet or were missing from the worksheet. A summary of the items discussed is included below.

**Audit** – Robinson had assumed that the 2012–13 year would be audited and that should be added to the budget for next year. The audit was projected to cost between \$15,000 and \$21,000. After some discussion there were divergent views ranging from no need to audit to having an audit. In the end the Committee decided, based on a suggestion from Elwood, to recommend to the board to have an independent financial review completed in lieu of an audit. The rationale for this was it would cost less, rough estimate was \$5,000 (needs to be better researched, Robinson was going to check on the cost) and that this would provide a level of scrutiny that would be sufficient given the current budget constraints.

Robinson suggested that an audit or financial review be funded from the Churches reserves. In the future monies should be set aside on an annual basis to fund financial reviews, currently an audit is guided for every three years. Since no one knows when the last one was done this appears to be a liability that has spanned a number of years. Because of that the committee recommends that the Board allow this activity to be funded from reserves.

**PSD and UUA Dues** – We spent a fair amount of time discussing this item. The first question for the board is what is our position and/or commitment to Denominations Connections? There were several members of the Committee that did not like the idea of cutting UUA dues. It was mentioned that through the strategic plan approval we discussed adding \$5,000 a year to the UUA/ PSD dues to start to catch up to fair share. There was more contextual information provided within the memorandum provided to the committee. There was some discussion about members of the church donating directly to the PSD and UUA. The next question to the board is what should the finance committee be addressing related to the level of financial commitment. Is our target fair share? Are we holding close to what was shown in the strategic plan? Should we be going through a process to better determine what we believe to be fair share and bring that back to the board? (Attached is a history of our denominational giving – this was not available at the meeting)

**Additional Revenue** – There was some discussion about the need to look for another major tenant. The example that was discussed was a school but that would not necessarily need to be the model. The initial suggestion was for a tenant that took up possibly one floor and not two with the idea that we would get half of the revenue. There was not unanimous support for this idea. However a consensus of the majority was that this should be considered and that this would be a recommendation to the board.

**Collection from the Plate** – There was some discussion about sharing less of the collection from the plate. Going 50% – 50% vs. 70% – 30%, Schroeder stated that in his experience and anecdotal data from the church's experience that the amount that goes to the church \$25,000–\$30,000 stays consistent no matter what the % of share is.

**Miracle Sundays(or similar)** – Schroeder was open to having additional Miracle Sundays but cast a little differently. There a subtle consensus that if staff thinks they can be successful with an additional special funding request that the Committee would not stand in their way.

**Bequest** – There was some discussion about the \$ 66,000 set aside in the Board Designated funds. Robinson was going to try to find more information about the board's intent for these funds.

**Membership Data Base** – Robinson mentioned that he felt one of the needs of the congregation was a better way to tap into the skills and abilities of the congregation. For the past two years we had budgeted for the implementation of the data base. It seems like a capacity building need. There was some limited discussion about this. The consensus of the committee was to add that back into 2013–14 year. Staff needs



to figure out the true cost of buying and implementing the system. For the time being we used \$15,000 as a placeholder. Staff had budgeted \$10,000 in 2012-13. There was some discussion about this being a longer term need of the church and a one-time expenditure. It seemed like this would be another example of an activity that could be funded by reserves. The committee recommends that the board include the membership data base in 2013-14 budget and allow it to be funded through reserves.

**Sabbatical Costs** – Schroeder said that if they hire a minister to replace Heidi that most of the Sundays could be covered with existing staff. While this is not yet in the budget they believe that they may need to hire guest speakers for a few Sundays and would need to budget \$ 2,000 for that. Schroeder said he still needs to get board approval for his sabbatical but at this point he is contemplating asking for a shorter time period possibly between January and March.

**Significant Items not in the 2013-14 Budget** – We briefly touched on the items not funded by the 2013-14 budget.

Staff Positions / Salary Increases – While there are some limited increases for select staff this budget does not fully address the issues raised in the staffing compensation study. This study has yet to be reviewed and accepted by the board. This also does not address adding additional staffing to address the administrative capacity concerns raised earlier this year. These items could cost between \$ 140,000 – \$225,000 if fully funded over time.

Other Items – There were a number of other items shown in the summary that we did not have time to address.

**Real Tough Decisions** – We did not get to the heart of the real tough decisions. In part because this is primarily staff role and in part because we need some board direction on some of the items above, for example UUA dues for staff to understand the magnitude of the cuts that are needed to balance the 2013-14 budget. There was some discussion that everything is on the table and that could include both cuts to programming and other areas of the budget.

**Additional Meeting** – The option was left open for staff to ask for a special meeting on the Finance Committee....in the March 28 timeframe....

- 3) **Updates** – updates happened rapidly
- (a) Quick Books Implementation – Basically done. Staff needs two weeks to complete the finishing touches.
  - (b) Financial Policy Interpretation – Distributed again will be a future agenda topic.
  - (c) RFP for Auditor – Once we get direction from the board on the audit the Committee will proceed with selecting an auditor or financial reviewer.
    - (i) Quarter Financial Report – This was not addressed. Staff will provide a report on the status of the Capital Improvement spending as soon as it is done.

(d) Request to Consider Investment Policy Modification – this was briefly discussed. The Committee agreed that we do not have the capacity to address this until next year.

- 4) **Reserve Policy** – We did not have time to review. Robinson asked members to send out comment via e-mail between meetings. While there is general broad agreement to reserve between 2–3 months on expenditures the details have not yet been worked out

Upcoming Meetings – Long range schedule/summary

- **April** – Pledge Income – Fact and Figures, Budget Recommendation to Board, Reserve Policy
- **May** – Review Audit RFP and Select Auditor, Other Monitoring Activities of the Finance Committee (review Justin’s GPH Interpretation, and other examples) – 3<sup>rd</sup> Qtr Report
- **June** – Breath In, Breath Out – Annual Meeting
- **July** – Loan Start Refinancing Discussions, Annual Work Plan
- **August** – Review Audit Outcome (may happen in Sept)
- **September** – Cash Flow Analysis

<b>Meeting Summary</b>	
1 <sup>st</sup> Universalist Board of Trustees—Governance Committee	
<b>Location:</b> 1 <sup>st</sup> Universalist Cummins Room	<b>Date:</b> Tuesday, March 5, 2013 <b>Time:</b> 6:30-8:30 p.m.
<b>Attendees:</b>	
David Leppik	
Pamela Vincent	
Lark Weller (Notetaker)	

### **MEETING GOALS/EXPECTED OUTCOMES**

- Committee members will gain clarity on what we're trying to monitor, why, and how (including appropriate self-evaluation activities).
- Committee members will identify any gaps in existing policy language that make it difficult to clearly identify appropriate monitoring activities.
- Committee members will begin to define appropriate monitoring activities (and, possibly, evaluation activities) that are linked to specific GPH policies. It is anticipated that this process will help us identify any policy gaps that we need to address.

*If a monitoring activity can't be tied to a policy, it's either not in the board's "bucket" or there is a policy oversight that should be corrected before we go on.*

### **DISCUSSION**

**Agreement on what we're doing and how to get there:** The board is charged with "establishing a monitoring process through the creation, application, and reporting of policies that will hold the board, the staff, and the congregation accountable for fulfilling the mission and visionary goals" (GPH Sect. III.B.b., page 6).

The GPH further states that, "A 2011-2012 board goal is the adoption and implementation of an effective monitoring structure. The monitoring committee will include that structure [in the GPH] once it is developed. (A link will be added here for the monitoring schedule specific to each church year)" (GPH Sect. I.C, page 12).

We see the appropriate path to developing a monitoring and evaluation plan as follows:  
Ends→policies→monitoring activities, schedule→evaluation tools, activities, schedule

**Identifying gaps in existing policy language and identifying appropriate monitoring activities:** Lark noted that our existing (above) GPH language says nothing of the "what good,

for whom, at what cost” test that Karin has brought up. This should be corrected in the GPH in order to provide greater clarity of direction. See examples from Unity (St. Paul)’s and Rochester’s policies. Rochester, in particular, includes good language about this “test.”

*“The board defines in writing its expectations, which are called policies. The written policies instruct the parish minister to achieve intended results, for intended recipients, at a specified cost. These policies are developed systematically from the broadest, most general level to more defined levels. They are called Ends policies.”* (Rochester Board and Church Governance, Sect. 2.2.2, page 7).

“The board’s specific contributions are unique to its role and necessary for proper governance and management. The job of the board is to represent the congregation, to assure that the Ends (desired results) are achieved and Limitations maintained through regular monitoring of Ends and Limitations. Therefore, the board must

a. write and monitor policies that at a minimum address the following four areas of governance:

i. Ends: Desired results, impact, benefits, and outcomes (*what good, for whom, at what cost*).....” (Rochester Board and Church Governance, Sect. 4.2.1, pages 14-15)

The committee discussed the balance between revising policy language and beginning to identify what we need to monitor through the end of the church year. Pam stated that revising language is important, but we need to ID what we need to monitor from now until end of church year. We should see if the language in our policies allows us to do that monitoring and how; if not, how do we tighten up language to provide for monitoring? Revising policy language may take us well into next year, but it’s important to begin our monitoring activities. Lark feels that it’s important to start from the “right” policies. We should be monitoring to assess how we’re meeting our Ends, not for the sake of monitoring. Dave stated that the congregational survey covers monitoring visionary goals as they are written, because it is a point-by-point survey of the VGs. We need language about limitations in the VGs, but they needn’t be reflected in the survey. Other instruments-- such as grievance and financial reports-- are probably more appropriate.

Committee agreed that it likes Rochester’s monitoring language and schedule. The committee used Rochester’s monitoring schedule as basis by which to begin to check how we may monitor/ evaluate our own policies—and ID any gaps in our policies. This resulted in several recommended changes to First Universalist’s policy language (recommended changes are provided below *in italics*). The committee also used a matrix format to organize some of its thoughts and recommendations, and to envision how our existing policies do/not lend themselves to clear monitoring and evaluation. That matrix is also included below.

Dave is interested in thinking about conducting exit interviews as a way to track internal trends, ID grievances/issues (including discovering more positives in-depth), etc. Findings would be available to Sr. Minister—the board’s participation in this would not be intended to conceal anything—but it would not be a public document. Would word as “board members who don’t

have any conflict of interest” would conduct an interview. The full committee was not convinced this is something that would be appropriate for us to do. Pam will inquire with Laura Park, others.

*As a part of its own self-evaluation, the committee noted that the board is currently out of conformance with the following stated goal. “A 2011-2012 board goal is the adoption and implementation of an effective monitoring structure. The monitoring committee will include that structure [in the GPH] once it is developed. (A link will be added here for the monitoring schedule specific to each church year)” (GPH Sect. I.C, page 12).*

#### Recommended GPH changes:

- *There is a numerical mistake in how the sections of the GPH are listed, both in the Table of Contents and in the body of the handbook. (There are two Section “I”s in the handbook.) Committee recommends board approval of correct numbering of handbook, and distribution of corrected version—including any changes made based on current recommendations—to Trustees. (Was this already administratively done and I just don’t have the revised version printed out?)*
- *Committee recommends changing GPH Sect. IV.D.1 (Communication to the Board and Congregation) text to read, “Inform the board in a timely manner of material external or internal changes, staffing decisions, and anticipated adverse media coverage.” This language is taken from Rochester’s policies (Sect. 2.4.2, page 8). The committee feels this language is less open to individual interpretation than our existing language. The committee identified several monitoring activities associated with this proposed language change; see the policy/monitoring matrix for details.*
- *Committee recommends directing staff to complete a staff handbook. Having an updated and actively used staff handbook would allow the board to identify monitoring activities to ensure staff treatment, grievance, and other policies are being followed. (We could eventually envision several monitoring activities taking place to link to the “Treatment of Staff and Volunteers” policies. See the policy/monitoring matrix for details.)*
- *The committee recommends directing staff to develop a volunteer handbook (called “church committee member handbook” in GPH IV.B. 7, page 14). This type of handbook is required in order to track committee member expectations, roles, lines of authority, which is linked to the “Integration of Volunteers” policy language: “Much of the work of First Universalist Church is accomplished by and through volunteer committees....Accordingly, the Senior Minister shall not fail to...ensure that committees understand their roles, objectives, and lines of authority...” (GPH Sect. IV.B.2, page 13).*
- *Committee recommends that GPH IV.B.9 (page 14) be removed. (“[The Senior Minister shall not fail to] ensure that the work of church committees is fully consistent with First Universalist’s legal and contractual obligations.”) This is, practically speaking, covered by our General Constraint language: “The Senior Minister shall not cause or allow any practice....that is illegal...or in violation of commonly accepted business and professional ethics” (GPH Sect. IV.A, page 13).*

- *Committee recommends removal of GPH Sect. IV.D.3, “[The Senior Minister shall not fail to] gather as many staff and external points of view, issues and options as needed for fully informed board decisions” (page 14). This level of direction feels a bit “micromanagy.” Board has recently discussed its own desire to gathering “disconfirming” information, which is still recommended, but the committee was not confident this is appropriate to require of Justin in written policy.*

#### Recommended monitoring:

The committee made several monitoring recommendations; these are included in the policy/monitoring matrix below.

#### Other follow-up tasks:

- Pam will follow up with Rochester, Unity/Laura Park to determine whether conducting exit interviews of staff is appropriate.

**Greater Good initiative:** The Committee discussed Justin’s announcement to the board of the Greater Good initiative (this is an opportunity for a new partnership with Habitat for Humanity). The discussion was in response to questions raised by Paul Robinson (via email), and to David Bach’s request that the Governance Committee discuss and provide recommendations on this.

In general, given what we were told by Justin, the committee believes that participation in the Greater Good project helps us achieve our ends of working to “build a just, loving, and sustainable world.” Our understanding is that only funds that are raised specifically for the project will be expended on it, so there should be no net budgetary impact to the church. However, when examined within the context of GPH Sect. IV.H, final bulleted item (page 16), it appears that the policy may have been violated.

Dave Leppik’s mother is on the committee working toward the Greater Good initiative, and is not confident that we haven’t made have a financial obligation. She believes First Universalist agreed to/committed to provide \$60,000. It is unclear to her whether this is a legal or moral obligation and whether we’ve formally made the commitment to Habitat yet (i.e., they know our interest/intent, but we haven’t signed anything).

#### Recommendations:

*The committee recommends that the board note a violation of the GPH where the announcement of the church’s intended participation in the Greater Good project is concerned.*

*The committee recommends that board seek clarity from Sr. Minister about the specific agreement provided to Habitat. What did we agree to, to what are we financially obligated, and what would the implications be of our failing to meet the agreement?*

**Monitoring the Strategic Plan:** The discussion was in response to questions raised by Paul Robinson (via email), and to David Bach's request that the Governance Committee discuss and provide recommendations on this.

The committee understands that the Strategic Plan was created to help us achieve our ends in a more targeted, grounded way. The activities included in the Strategic Plan should, then, by definition be linked to our policies. Monitoring and evaluating our policies should capture some level of the activities included in the Strategic Plan. The committee's monitoring and evaluation recommendations that were discussed tonight help to address the question about monitoring the Strategic Plan.

**Survey:** Administering another congregational survey along the same timeline as last year's will require an updated survey to be prepared and released in May. (It was given in May last year in order to be ready for the June Annual Meeting and to have results to review at start of new board year in July.)

Dave is talking to Katie Heaton about how the survey may be improved to solicit the opinions of youth, tied to visionary goals. There would likely be a separate survey geared towards youth, but it would probably parallel the congregational survey in many areas. Dave is concerned that the board hasn't discussed what, specifically, we want to monitor from the youth perspective—intergenerationality?

**Action items:**

- *Dave will start to go through the survey to look for needed text/language changes.*
- *Committee recommends that next all-church survey not solicit names, contact information, in order to better guarantee privacy. It may be best to include a statement at the end of the survey to the effect of, "If you'd like to speak to someone about a pastoral care need or concern about the church, etc. please contact X."*
- *Committee would like input from Trustees re: whether there is specific insight we'd like to pursue from youth.*
- *Committee plans to spend some of its April meeting on ID'g any required survey content changes. If individual board members want to recommend any changes to survey language (so it is helping us monitor/evaluate more effectively), **please provide input by our April 6 Governance Committee meeting.***

**MEETING ASSIGNMENTS, NEXT STEPS**

- Lark to send meeting summary to Craig to include in Board Packet as he sees fit.
- Discuss regular Committee meeting schedule that will be used to develop a Monitoring and Evaluation plan and schedule.
  - Next meeting: Saturday, April 6, 10:00 a.m.-noon in the Cummins Room

- *You will likely need your building door code to get in; let Lark know if you need one.*
- Pam will reach out to Rochester UU, Laura Park, a couple other larger church boards using Policy Governance for guidance on the exit interview question.



Existing Policy	Recommended revision	Monitoring recommendation	Monitoring type and frequency
<p>All the Visionary Goals, also GPH Sect. III.A, Intro (page 5)</p> <p>“It is the board’s responsibility to... develop policies and practices that ensure accountability in achieving those ends [mission and visionary goals statements]”</p>		<p>Staff “milestone” report to board about how the goals and timeline outlined by the Strat Plan are/not being met</p>	<p>Direct</p> <p>Semi-annual</p>
<p>GPH Sect. IV.A., Intro General Constraint (page 13)</p> <p>“The Senior Minister shall not cause or allow any practice, activity, decision, or organizational circumstance that is illegal, imprudent or in violation of commonly accepted business and professional ethics”</p>		<p>Monitoring and review of compliance with committee member and staff handbooks.</p>	<p>Internal</p> <p>As-needed</p>
<p>GPH Sect. IV.B. Intro, Sect. 3, and Sect. 7 (pages 13–14)</p> <p>“Much of the work of First Universalist Church is accomplished by and through volunteer committees....</p> <p>“Accordingly, the Senior Minister shall not fail to...</p> <p>“3). Ensure that committees understand their roles, objectives, and lines of authority...</p> <p>“7). Maintain a church committee member handbook that clarifies the lines of authority and support within the church; general committee member expectations....”</p>			
<p>GPH Sect. IV.B.5 through 7, and intro language, Integration of Volunteer (page 14)</p> <p>Senior Minister shall not fail to:</p> <p>“5). Coordinate the work of compensated staff and church committees to facilitate communications, efficiency, and</p>		<p>Monthly report on staff changes and high-level volunteers (those who perform “staff-like” functions) how many volunteers are involved</p>	<p>Internal</p> <p>Monthly</p>

## Paul Robinson email about Greater Good initiative.

1. **How does it relate to our Financial Policy and its Interpretation or possibly lack of interpretation?** Below is one of the policy interpretations within policy IV. H. Financial Condition.

### **Solicit funds for non-budgeted purposes**

*I interpret this to mean that I will not ask members, friends, or funding institutions for amounts greater than \$10,000 for items not included in the budget without explicit Board approval.*

The way the Greater Good item was presented was not for board approval but that this was a project underway. I love the project and it sounds great, fits within our goals, etc. ....My question is, was this something that should have been brought to the board for approval? While this is a next year project it sounds like this year we obligated ourselves to provide \$60,000 for a home next year. The funding for this will come from asking church members for partial funding and from the foundation.

If this was a heads up...hey in next year's budget we are going to be including the Greater Good Project...ok...but this sounded more like something starting now....not in this year's budget. This may not be black and white but seems to have some shades of gray and may relate to soliciting funds for non-budgeted purposes (see policy interpretation above). The questions I see here are can the senior minister obligate the church to spend \$60,000 for a non-budgeted expense and does this obligation, to be paid by asking members for donations, amount to a request over \$10,000 triggering board approval?

This may sound terrible or alarming. I don't want it to. I think that we would and will approve this project, sounds like it has great benefits for all of us, the "what project" are we are doing is the means part and I am not addressing that. But as we start to apply our policies and Justin's interpretations I think it is good to use these moments as a reality check and see if we think we have appropriate controls in place.

2. **How are monitoring the Strategic Plan implementation?** – When we approved the plan I thought we knew this would be a living document that that we would have updates and check-in on what was getting done, updates on timeline etc. I see the plan as a guide and not a directive. Justin states in his report that they were moving forward " as directed by the strategic plan" . The strategic plan for example also states that the membership data base would have started this year yet that is not being done, so not all items are seen as a directive.

Like the above comments this is not a sound the alarm issue but an example of an issue I am unclear of, and one the board may want to discuss. We know that implementing the Strategic plan would be up to the staff but I wonder if there is a role for the board in weighing or at least checking in on what items are being done and what is being given priority when choices are being made between competing priorities scheduled in the same year.