

Thomas Jefferson Memorial Church
Unitarian Universalist
BOARD OF TRUSTEES NOVEMBER MEETING
January 28, 2014

DRAFT MINUTES

TJMC Covenant Statement

In order to create the beloved community we all desire for ourselves, we, the Congregation of Thomas Jefferson Memorial Church Unitarian Universalist covenant to:

Communicate with compassion and respect, especially when we disagree
Celebrate diversity and nurture our inclusivity,
Promote social justice within our congregation and the larger community,
Generously support the ministries of the church with time, money and
enthusiasm, and
Lovingly call each other back into covenant when we have fallen short.

Board Goals 2014-15

1. Facilitate the implementation of the Strategic Plan.
 - a) Create and task an Information and Communication Task Force.
 - b) Create and task a Governance Task Force.
 - c) Create and task a Campus Maintenance Plan Task Force.
 - d) Support the development of a Capital Plan.
 - e) Support the Facilities Plan as adopted by the congregation.
 - f) Adopt Disaster Preparedness Plan.

Board Members Present: Breck Gastinger, Ian Sole, Bev Thierwechter – Vice President, Amy Wissekerke – Past President, Marlene Jones, Kathy Philhour, Sally Taylor – President, Walt Megonigal, Amy Davis, Ann Salamini – Secretary, Laura Horn – President Elect, Jamie McReynolds – Treasurer, Erik Wikstrom – Ex Officio, Leia Durland-Jones – Ex Officio

Board Members Absent:

Guests In Attendance: Sue Hess, Trish Schechtman, Al Reynolds

I. Opening--(15 minutes total) Opening/Closing Words (Breck), Snacks (Breck), Time Keeper (Amy), and Process Review (All)

1. Opening words – Breck

2. Check-in

3. Acceptance of Agenda

MOTION: Add to the Consent Agenda purchase of a \$50 gift certificate for each staff member in gratitude for their work in 2014.

Unanimously approved.

MOTION: Accept the Agenda.

Unanimously approved.

4. Public Comment –

5. Correspondence –

Patricia E Schechtman
102 Overlook Drive
Charlottesville, Va. 22903

Sally Taylor
Board President
Thomas Jefferson Memorial Church
717 Rugby Road
Charlottesville, Va. 22903

Dear Sally:

It is with mixed feeling that I offer my letter of resignation from Thomas Jefferson Memorial Church as the Director of Admin and Finance. Since my start in October of 2012, I have found my employment experience both rewarding and challenging. I knew when I took this position that it wouldn't be boring or repetitive and that has been the constant.

I leave because a great opportunity has presented itself in the past few weeks that will eventually lead to me being an owner of a local business.

I appreciate all the support and guidance that the board and the TJMC community have been to me during my tenure. And I would like to specifically mention working with Erik and Leia has been a team I will truly miss. Their support and trust never wavered.

I would love the opportunity to work with the board, personnel committee and

staff in the selection process of my replacement and being a part of the transition. As the first person who has had this position with TJMC, I have some ideas on the future structure and feel my input would be helpful. With that said, I would like to propose an end date of on or before April 30th depending on timing and further discussions.

Sincerely,

Patricia E Schechtman
Director of Admin and Finance

II. Reports (attached)

1. President's Report (written) – Sally Taylor

Trish's last day has moved from March 31st to April 30th. This allows a bit more time for the search for her replacement.

2. Vice President's Report (written) --- Bev Thierwechter

3. Treasurer's Report (written) --- Jamie McReynolds

A note of gratitude was expressed that co chairs have been named for the Spring Auction which is budgeted to raise \$10,000.

4. Minister's Report (written) ---Erik Wikstrom

Erik was a guest at Ebenezer Baptist Church last Sunday. Pastor Bates had asked for financial support of their medical supplies ministry in St. Kitts and Erik presented a gift from the minister's discretionary fund at the service. Pastor Bates has also suggested scheduling a pulpit exchange in November. The two ministers are also looking at ways to collaborate on a public witness initiative around anti racism work.

There is a Facebook page aimed at getting the UUA to be more proactive in justice issues, including a poll of congregations that would be willing to put "Black Lives Matter" banners on their churches.

5. Director of Faith Development Report (written) – Leia Durland-Jones

6. Director of Administration and Finance Report (written) – Trish Schechtmen

7. Membership Report (written) —Sally Taylor

8. Board Liaison Reports (written) ---

Pledge Drive Update – Kate Fraleigh

III. Consent Agenda/Electronic Motions:

1. **MOTION**: Accept the resignation letter of Trish Schechtman, DAF.
2. **MOTION**: Approve the proposal for TJMC to pay an employer share of the cost of the silver plan premiums, which is defined as up to 80 % of the cost of UUA’s silver plan premiums for full-time staff and a comparable pro rata share for part-time employees, based on the number of hours worked. For half-time employees, the employer percentage share would be 40% and for ¾ time employees, the percentage share would be 60%. If an employee chooses the bronze plan, then TJMC would pay only the requisite percentage of the bronze plan. If an employee chooses the gold plan, TJMC would pay only the requisite percentage of the silver plan and the employee would pay the difference in cost between the gold and silver plan. If an employee chooses to go on the market or use a spouse’s plan, TJMC would not make any employer contribution to a non-UUA plan.
3. **MOTION**: Purchase a \$50 gift certificate for each staff member in gratitude for their work in 2014.
4. **MOTION**: Approve the December 2014 draft minutes.

MOTION: Approve the Consent Agenda.

Unanimously approved.

Thanks to Personnel Committee for putting together the employee health care proposal.

IV. Old Business

1. Triune Staff Leadership Model – Erik, Trish, Leia (30 min)

The Lead Minister, Director of Faith Development and Director of Administration and Finance introduced their idea of a collaborative model for senior staff to replace the Lead Minister as CEO model at a recent board meeting. They asked for questions at that time to include in the body of their formal report, which follows:

A New Paradigm: the collaborative triune leadership model
by Erik Walker Wikstrom

PART I: How It’s Always Been Done *

The vast majority of churches – Catholic, Protestant, and Unitarian Universalist – are organized in a similar way. In some it is affirmed that God is the head of the church; in others it is said that a Board of Trustees or Elders are the primary

authority; and still others say that the power of the congregation lies *with* the congregation. Yet in virtually every case, no matter what is asserted to the contrary, the way congregations *actually behave* is that the ordained clergy are in charge. This has led to what is now nearly universally recognized – the ordained minister as C.E.O. model – and this has the corollary consequence that other religious professionals are relegated to a second-tier status.

It is no doubt not coincidental that for quite some time – and only relatively recently changing in some denominations while remaining rock solid in others – the ordained clergy tend to be men. It is also not coincidental that, as an example, religious educators have long tended to be women. In the dominant culture that prevails both in society-at-large and in the majority of religious institutions, the work of women – and especially women who are working with children – is not held in the same regard as the work of men.

In his 1983 Berry Street Lecture the Rev. Gene Navias said,

“Gradually, I believe, many ministers came to assume that their work was only with adults. Gradually, religious education moved from being a central function to a sideshow. The upstairs-downstairs status of church and Sunday School occurred. The relative regard and power for parish ministry and the lack of such for the ... DRE [Director of Religious Education] and MRE [Minister of Religious Education] came as a fact of church life.”

The only quibble I would have with Rev. Navias’ assessment is that I am not convinced that “many ministers” and the congregations they serve came to this assumption “gradually.” I am not aware of a time when religious education was considered a “central function,” on a par with the Sunday morning worship experience. (It is my experience that in many people’s minds, even if only at an unconscious level, “church” and “Sunday worship” are essentially synonymous.) If there was such a time, it is certainly not part of common knowledge or institutional memory.

Thus – whether we have arrived here or remain here – by far the prevailing model of church organization is that the ordained clergy person is the pinnacle of an organizational pyramid with other religious professionals and lay leaders in subordinate positions.

PART II: Questioning Current Assumptions

In its 1997 report, *Interdependence: Renewing Congregational Polity*, the Commission on Appraisal of the UUA wrote:

“We ought to reshape our understandings of lay and professional ministries, both to resolve current tensions and to meet new needs for religious leadership. ... On the one hand we place high value on religious education for children. On the other hand, how we think about religious educators is sometimes inconsistent with how we think about religious education as a program that is central to faith development. Religious educators have a special identity that is rarely understood or affirmed as a central aspect of congregational life in our movement.”

In light of the change within a growing number of our congregations from having a Director of Religious Education (who is understood to be primarily involved with the religious education of children and youth), to a recognition of these religious professionals as directors of “lifespan faith development,” the Commission’s observation becomes even more starkly apparent. In fact, one might argue that the role of “faith development” within congregational life is not merely *a* central aspect but, instead, *the* central aspect. What is it that we do within our congregations that is not, to some extent at least, directly related to the development of the faith of our members? As I propose in *Serving With Grace: lay leadership as spiritual practice*, this extends to what has often been seen as merely “the work” of the church. Even worship, that *sine non qua* of congregational life, is a means toward faith development, isn’t it? Pastoral care and support certainly is.

So why is it that the ordained clergy person – whose role has historically been understood as primarily worship and pastoral care – the most logical candidate for “C.E.O.”? Why isn’t the Director of Lifespan Faith Development the person assumed to “run” the church, with the ordained clergy person subordinate to (predominantly) her? Because clergy generally have more training than religious educators? Because clergy are better suited to the role and its responsibilities? Because “we’ve always done it that way?”

As the Commission on Appraisal recommended nearly two decades ago, “We ought to reshape our understandings of both lay and professional ministries ...” In 1931, more than *seven* decades ago, the Rev. Clarence Skinner declared: “We may set our hands to the task of building a new kind of church adapted to the new age, thus creating a demonstration center that will prove what can be done by a radical reconstruction.” And yet here we are in the twenty-first century with a church structure that looks remarkably like the Protestant church of the nineteenth. Isn’t it time to really question our current assumptions?

A great deal of money, time, and effort is expended both by individuals and by our Association in the training of our clergy. And while it is true that the majority

of ordained ministers *are* more highly trained than the majority of professional religious educators there are at least two generally unchallenged assumptions in this reality.

First, we seem to think that clergy are in some way trained to be the C.E.O. of the churches we serve. This is becoming increasingly the case, primarily because so many clergy have been crying out, “We weren’t trained for this!” As an example, when I was in divinity school in the 90s I had *one* one-semester course which covered administration, finances, budgeting, fund raising, conflict resolution, and congregational polity. One semester. By contrast I had two semesters of Christian church history – somewhat but not entirely useful in the running of a religiously diverse Unitarian Universalist church. If clergy are complaining that they are not being trained to perform the role they are being asked to play, it is an assumption that the answer to the problem is to train them differently. Another possible response would be to rethink the role(s) we’re asking our clergy to play.

Additionally, the observation that ordained clergy are more trained than our religious professionals includes the assumption that this is right and appropriate. This is, certainly, the way it has seemingly always been done – the tradition of “the learned clergy” runs deep in our DNA – yet that does not necessarily mean that that is the way we should do it today. We could respond to this disparity by giving more resources – money, time, and effort – to the training of our Lifespan Faith Development directors. The Religious Education Credentialing of the UUA – a program that “recognizes religious education as a profession and supports and fosters those people in religious education” – is a step in this direction, but more could be done. We could decide that more *should* be done if we want to truly take to heart the recommendations of the UUA’s own Commission on Appraisal.

Another assumption in the Ordained-Minister-As-C.E.O. model is that it is necessary to have one person as the ultimate authority; that it is necessary to have a place where the buck stops and that that place can be occupied only by one person. This is a hierarchical understanding of organizations and, dare I say it, a child of patriarchy. It is also, as it plays out in congregations, an inherently inconsistent approach.

Imagine that there’s a problem with the performance of a Director of Lifespan Faith Development. That problem is brought to the ordained Minister as the congregation’s “chief of staff.” If the clergy person takes the top spot, this makes sense. Yet if there is a problem with the performance of the ordained Minister, it is generally brought to the Board. Who, then, is the “final authority?” Sometimes one person and, apparently, sometimes someone else. This is one of the reasons that problems with “lower” staff members can often be resolved much more

quickly than a problem with the “C.E.O.” clergy person.

While there are other issues that could be addressed, one more should suffice. Whether it is acknowledged or not, beneath the assertions that ordained clergy are better trained, or more suited to be the primary leader, or the most logical final arbiter, is the assumption that ordination makes the ordained Minister more of a minister than anyone else, and since a congregation is a “church,” the “Minister” should be in charge. Asked directly, of course, very few – if any – Unitarian Universalists would say that they hold this view in any kind of conscious and considered way, yet it certainly seems to be an attitude at work.

In 1992 Commission on Appraisal issued the report *Our Professional Ministry: Structure, Support and Renewal*, in which they observed:

“Ministry is the vocation of every person of faith, and Unitarian Universalism, as a democratic faith, affirms the ‘priesthood of all believers’; ... This belief in the ‘priesthood of all believers’ is *central* to who we are as a religious movement.”
[Italics, mine.]

How can we authentically assert our belief in the “priesthood of all believers,” how can we affirm the vision of “shared ministry,” if we simultaneously assert that the ordained Minister is *the* Minister as we do in both our words and our behavior? Simply put, we can’t, and for us to be true to our own claimed identity, something needs to change. Again, “We ought to reshape our understandings of lay and professional ministries ...”

PART III: How It Works In Practice

Before describing the experiment currently being carried out at the Thomas Jefferson Memorial Church – Unitarian Universalist in Charlottesville, VA, it should be explicitly noted that this new “triune leadership model” may not be replicable in all congregations in all places. The majority of Unitarian Universalist congregations have 100 members (or less), and many can barely afford the services of a part-time clergy person, much less a full staff of religious professionals. Of necessity some Directors of Lifespan Faith Development – by whatever title they’re known – are well meaning, well intentioned, extremely competent volunteers. And there are Unitarian Universalist congregations that desire to be entirely lay-led, eschewing professional leadership of any kind. Thus, the triune leadership model is perhaps most applicable to larger congregations and those that embrace professional leadership.

At Thomas Jefferson Memorial Church – Unitarian Universalist we have a full-

time Lead Minister, a full time Director of Lifespan Faith Development, and a three-quarter time Director of Administration and Finance. (We also have, in part-time positions, a Ministry Associate, Director of Music, Office Administrator, and Religious Education Assistant.) Without bragging, it can honestly be said that each of these staff people are extremely competent and well-suited to their jobs.

That said, and all of this background understood, and in the spirit of experimentation, the Lead Minister, the Director of Lifespan Faith Development, and the Director of Administration and Finance recognized that no one of them has – or is capable of having – a truly comprehensive vantage point from which to keep abreast of the full breadth of congregational life. Together, however, they can indeed approach a 360° view. Rather than bemoan the often challenged notion of “separate silos” within the church, we have chosen to view these as different lenses through which we look. By bringing together these lenses we effectively increase our vision while, at the same time, fundamentally model a way of being in community which dismantles those historic divisions.

The current *Guidelines for Professional Religious Educators* (LREDA) points toward such a model. In Section 11 – Professional Staff Relations – it says, in part:

a. Shared Leadership

The professional staff is engaged in common enterprise and *shared leadership* within the congregation. Means and occasions (such as staff meetings and retreats) should therefore be regularly provided for the exploration and development of program and direction of the congregation by the staff *acting as a team*.

b. Trust, Partnership and Collegiality

Essential to the well being of any congregation is a harmonious and coordinated relationship among all staff members. These may include ministers, religious educators, music directors, program directors, volunteer coordinators, administrators, and other staff positions as designated. It is desirable for the religious educator to be visible to the entire congregation as a religious professional.

Each professional staff member has special competence within her or his particular sphere of expertise. In the conduct of congregational responsibility, she or he shall have freedom and support to exercise professional discretion. Each professional staff member shall protect and encourage one another’s gifts and specialties.

[Again, all italics mine.]

This makes sense, doesn't it? Yet quite a number of our congregations – perhaps the majority of them – come nowhere near to embodying this *Guideline*. In addition to the various theoretical rationales for keeping things as they have been and as they are, there is, perhaps, another, more pragmatic reason that at least plays into the current state of affairs. It seems telling that when the *LREDA/UUMA/UUMN Task Force for Excellence in Shared Ministry* (which issued its recommendations in 2013) facilitated conversations at each of the three professional groups' annual conferences, they noted a tremendous disparity in turnout.

The Task Force reports that when they invited participants to attend a workshop on excellence in shared ministry at the UU Musicians Network conference, 26 people attended. At the Liberal Religious Educator's conference, 20 people came out to discuss this important topic. At the meeting of the Minister's Association, a mere 4 participated in such a discussion. There are no doubt many reasons for this disparity. It seems telling, nonetheless.

Here at TJMC-UU we are trying to take shared ministry to what seems its logical conclusion. (Or, maybe more accurately, we are experimenting with how far it can be taken.) When the Lead Minister was installed, so were the rest of the professional staff, as was, indeed, the entire congregation. If each of us is a minister it makes sense to stop reserving the term – and the “reverence” associated with it – for the ordained minister alone.

Each week the Senior Staff at TJMC – the Triad – meets to discuss all that we know of importance in the life of the congregation. We discuss pastoral issues, upcoming worship services, opportunities and needs within the lifespan faith development programs, finances, building usage, etc. No major decisions are made without consultation. As noted in LREDA's *Guidelines*, “Each professional staff member has special competence ... [and] expertise,” and the Senior Staff draws upon these differing competencies to better serve the congregation than any of us could do alone.

PART IV: Benefits of the New Paradigm

“Two heads are better than one,” the saying goes. With the Triune Leadership Model there are three heads working together – collaboratively – to care for the life of the congregation. As Gene Navias noted back in 1983, “[M]any ministers came to assume that their work was only with adults.” Many congregations have made, and continue to make, the same assumption.

Yet in nearly every conversation about church growth and the future of Unitarian Universalism it is said, as if a given, that a key to our survival as a religious movement is to deepen our ministries to families with children. If this is key to our health and vitality, shouldn't the person who works most directly with the congregation's parents, youth, and children be in a correspondingly key position of leadership?

As noted earlier, many congregations note the problem of "silos," in which various spheres of interest and involvement operate largely independently of one another. In virtually every case where this is true it is seen as an impediment, a hindrance, to church growth. Yet it is a reality that is reinforced and nurtured by the currently prevailing leadership model. It is more likely, rather than less, that this situation will continue when the leadership itself is placed not only in silos but organizationally in silos of different importance.

Further, the many clergy who bemoan the fact that "running the church" is not what they'd signed on for when pursuing ordination can relax. With this Triune Leadership Model she or he is no longer expected to. Rather, the ordained minister is called on to use their particular gifts and talents in service of the congregation in collaboration with other (lay) ministers who are using their gifts and their talents for the same purpose. This actually extends throughout the entire congregation (although that is a conversation for a later time), yet most certainly it applies to the shared leadership of Senior Staff.

PART V: Questions & Responses

Who is ultimately responsible? In this shared ministry model, all three members of the triune team are equally responsible. Decisions are decisions made by the Triad.

What if the team members disagree with each other? With a consensus decision making process a final decision is not made until the group has reached an agreement. There are times, of course, when a decision is needed relatively immediately, when there is not time for the sometimes lengthy process of developing consensus. In these instances one of three things can happen:

- If two of the three agree with one another, they can "overrule" the third. For this to be possible without damaging friction, of course, there would need a great deal of trust and shared commitment to the good of the church. This model requires that anyway.

- If no agreement can be reached, the matter could be taken to the Board, the Executive Committee, or, perhaps, the Board President. After all, within the congregational polity upon which Unitarian Universalist congregations are based it is the congregation which has ultimate authority and the elected Board is the congregation's designated representatives.
- Finally, if the issue under discussion fall into the "particular sphere of expertise" of one of the team members, that person has "freedom and support to exercise professional discretion." The Lead Minister could, for instance, claim the final word on an issue regarding Sunday worship. The Director of Lifespan Faith Development could make the final decision on a question regarding one of the congregation's youth groups. The Director of Administration and Finance could make her or his own decision about building use.

How would staff assessments be handled? As things currently stand we have one process for the ordained staff and a different process for all others. At this time there is a "long form" – in which input is solicited from congregants and lay leaders who work closely with the clergy person and which is then used to inform an assessment interview with the President, President Elect, Past President, and the ordained minister. One plan had this being done every two or three years. (Although the .) There is also a "short form" which involves a conversation between the three Presidents and the clergy person, looking at how well the previous year's goals were met and what goals should be set for the future.

Non-ordained staff are currently assessed by their immediate supervisor (with the exception of the Director of Administration and Finance who is assessed by the Board President). A standard form is used to direct the assessment, and the process is overseen by the Personnel Committee.

It is clear that, while this has been our established practice for a while now, it lacks coherence. Different staff positions have different assessment processes carried out by different people. In the Triad Model there would be greater clarity. The same assessment tool would be used for all staff positions. The Director of Lifespan Faith Development will continue to assess the RE Assistant; the Director of Administration and Finance will continue to assess the Office Assistant; and the Lead Minister will continue to assess the Director of Music and the Ministry Associate.

But how will the Senior Staff be assessed? The Personnel Committee is proposing a model in which the assessment of Senior Staff will be overseen by the Personnel Committee. For each assessment the Committee would solicit input

from the other two members of the Triad, as well as the three Presidential officers and relevant lay leaders who work closely enough with the staff person to be able to assess her or his performance. The results of these interviews will be taken by the Personnel Committee which will then write a draft report that will then be discussed by the President and the staff person. [For more details, see the Personnel Committee's proposal to the Board for the January 2015 meeting.]

Why is there no mention of the Director of Music? Shouldn't she or he be included in this Senior Staff Triad? The answer is a decisive yes and no. On the one hand, as the credentialing program for UU Music Directors has been demonstrating, there are a growing number of Music Directors who want to step into such a larger leadership role (and there are many who already have). In the vast majority of our congregations, however, the ministry of music is focused almost entirely on the Sunday morning worship experience. The gifts musicians bring to our collective worship cannot be overstated. (I have frequently said that I could imagine a worship service without a sermon, but cannot conceive of worship that does not include music.) Yet, however necessary the Music Director's role is to the depth of experience on a Sunday, this does not create for them a distinct "lens" through which to view the life of the congregation. Unquestionably there should be mutual respect and profound collaboration among all the staff, yet the Triune Model is designed to engage in co-equal leadership those staff members who have distinct vantage points and perspectives.

On the other hand, there are some congregations in which the ministry of music is more integrated within the whole life of the congregation. In some places it is an integral part of pastoral care, bringing a portion of the choir to the hospital, or the home of a hospice patient, in order to deepen the love and care the congregation can offer. In some congregations there is a program of music lessons for all ages, in some respects replacing the often cut public school arts programs, and helping congregants explore this rich form of creative expression. In situations like these, it would certainly makes sense to expand the Triune Model to a Quadratic Model.

What about salaries? At the moment there is not only a power differential at work in our congregations, but a salary differential as well. Simply put, ordained clergy are usually compensated at a higher rate than are other religious professionals on staff. In part this is because of the historic difference in education and training – ordained clergy are expected to have at least a Masters degree but this is not required for other staff. Another reason is the assumption that the clergy person is the C.E.O. and, so, shoulders more of the responsibility for "running the church." (Of course, there is also likely an historic root cause for

this difference in the aforementioned disparity between the greater respect given to the work of men to that of women.)

A logical consequence of the Triune Leadership Model is that, in time, the relative compensation rates among the Triad Team would be equalized. This would, naturally, coincide with the greater levels of training implicit in this model. As more Directors of Lifespan Faith Development and Directors of Administration and Finance receive training at a Masters level, the current compensation differential will undoubtedly be addressed.

This might work with the current staff, but how could we be sure we could recruit staff equally up to the challenges of this new model? When congregations search for a new ordained minister, they generally go through a fairly rigorous process of discernment to be able to articulate just what it is they are looking for. These expectations – and hopes – are then communicated to potential candidates, and only those who think that their temperament and skills sets are a match tend to apply. That said, though, the vast majority of congregations have enough interested applicants that they have to choose among them.

Within our movement today there are a number of tremendously skillful Directors of Lifespan Faith Develop and Administration and Finance. In the majority of congregations that these professional serve, the currently prevailing leadership model fails to allow them to work to their greatest potential. Many of these professionals are – and have been, and fully expect to continue to be – doing the best they can in a system which dismisses and disparages their worth.

Congregations which adopt this Triune Leadership model, then, will be considered “plum” churches and will draw the very best candidates from these pools. There will be no shortage of extremely competent and perfectly suited applicants for any position that opens. There may be some relatively greater difficulty in finding an ordained minister who will embrace this model, due to the difficulties most people experience when asked to give up power and prestige, yet many clergy would find this kind of egalitarian, collaborative model extremely exciting.

Things seem to be going well the way they are now. Why make this change?
Here are three reasons:

- No one person can have a fully inclusive view of the entire life of a congregation, even if that person is ordained! The Triune Leadership Model increases the range of vision, recognizing the interconnectedness and interdependence of the various

aspects of a congregation. No one person is expected to know everything, be equally competent in everything, or hold responsibility for everything.

- The Triune Leadership Model is more consistent with our theology which emphasizes our individual and collective worth – the “priesthood of all believers” and the vision of shared ministry. In this model no one person is held up as “more” than everyone else, even while recognizing the different and specific skills each individual has.
- Whether we recognize it or not, things *aren't* actually going all that well as they are now. In gatherings of religious professions other than clergy, there is a general sense of frustration and disappointment. Being treated as “second class citizens” within communities which claim to affirm “the inherent worth and dignity of every person” is wearing and wears a person down. And among the ordained clergy there is frustration as well with how things are – it is not at all unusual to hear complaints about feeling overworked and overburdened, being expected to be all things and do all things for all people. This new model addresses all of these issues.

PART VI: A Final Thought on the Role of the Ordained Minister

A question that will undoubtedly be raised by this model is, “what will the ordained minister do? We have become so accustomed to thinking of the clergy person as *the Minister* and as the person who “runs the church,” that it’s hard to imagine what they would do otherwise. Traditionally, the role of the clergy was summed up in the alliterative phrase, “pastor, prophet, priest.” In the radically shared ministry paradigm which is a logical context for the new leadership model being discussed here it will be *all* of the ministers of the congregation – ordained and lay – who will carry out these ministerial efforts, yet still these could still be said to be the “particular sphere of expertise” for which the ordained minister has “special competence.”

In the Triad Model, then, the ordained minister would be responsible for the *pastoral* dimensions of congregational life, those aspects that might answer the question, “how is it with your soul.” These would include, but in no way be limited to, support for the pastoral needs of church leaders (including other staff): oversight and coordination of lay pastoral visitors; an awareness of the pastoral needs of the congregation in worship; and an toward discerning and deepening the pastoral dimensions of all that the church does. (The concept of “lay leadership as a spiritual practice” is an example of a pastoral dimension in church life that might otherwise not be seen in that way.)

As *prophet* the ordained minister, because of her or his position, provides a “face” and a “voice” for the congregation’s values in the public square. Involvement with justice efforts in the wider community will certainly continue to be in the Lead Minister’s portfolio. Additionally, addressing issues of justice through worship, and the support of our many and varied social justice efforts is another aspect of this role. Freedom from the expectation of “running the church” will allow for greater involvement in this important work. It could even be argued that advocating for a paradigm shift such as this is an example of carrying out the prophetic imperative. Challenging the congregation to stay true to its mission and values, to take risks, to be, as it is sometimes put, “a ship that does not simply stay safely in the harbor but sets out into the ocean” – all of this will continue to be a part of the ordained minister’s portfolio.

The *priestly* role is perhaps the least understood in the Unitarian Universalist context. Creating and holding “the space” during weekly worship is an example, as are weddings, memorials, and other formal – and informal – rites of passage. Those situations in which people have been likely to say, “We need a word from the minister here” also fall within this dimension of ministry.

Additionally, the ordained clergy generally have particular training and skill sets that are helpful in the tasks of religious education and faith development, mentoring (as with the Worship Weavers Guild, for instance), and articulating the interconnectedness of “church” with “daily life.” And all of these are the things in which the clergy have traditionally received training. Freed from the imposed necessity of “running the church” there will now be more time and energy for “ministering” to, through, and with the church.

The Chair suggested that we continue by asking any remaining questions and then each make a statement of how we feel about the model.

- Is this report, up to the question section, what you presented to the 2016 General Assembly planning group? The first part is taken from a report by Pat Ellwood given at the LREDA conference. The following background and justification are similar to what we presented to the GA planning group.
- Will the Board be taking an action at the end of this discussion? Yes, because we need to know whether this model will be followed before a new DAF is hired.
- Will approval of this model be made by the Board rather than by a congregational vote? Yes. There will be some Bylaws ramifications of this model which would be approved by congregational vote.
- Would each senior staff member have a say in how the other

members of the triad carried out their areas of expertise? There will be collaboration on how best to conduct each church function based on the views of all senior staff members, but no ability to order another staff member on particular points.

The following opinions on the model were voiced:

- This in depth report gave a good background for understanding the triune staff model. It's exciting to be involved in exploring the model. The compensation and fairness issues will have to evolve.
- Looking at this from a business background, it doesn't seem workable. But the church is not a business. The model depends on the ability of the senior staff to work in this way. The Board may be called on to make decisions when staff cannot agree.
- The 360 degree perspective provided by the different lenses of the senior staff as opposed to the silo model is appealing. Also, the description of how disagreements are to be handled, if acknowledged up front, seems workable.
- Whether we approve it or not, this is the model that has been in place for a long time and has been very successful. The staff do disagree and they do work through it with collegiality and listening abilities. The church is a spiritual enterprise where people, even in their work, are trying to be their best selves according to their spiritual principles. As far as transparency with the congregation, the three positions were installed together. It may have seemed like lip service to the notion that the DFD and DAF would have equity of voice with the Lead Minister, but we have to live into the model by continuing to demonstrate that these traditionally less respected roles have an equal part in the direction of our church.
- This proposal downsizes the Lead Minister staff position to director of worship, pastoral care and social justice without a compensation adjustment. Is the congregation well served financially?
- It may be a happy coincidence that our current senior staff have been able to work within this model. There is great pressure on the DAF Search Committee to replace one spoke of the wheel. This model adds another dimension to the requirements of the new candidate.
- The DAF candidates will be higher caliber because it is a more responsible position. In previous times there have been disagreements among the staff, and the Board settled it rather than the Lead Minister. The buck stops at the Board, which is responsible for the hiring and firing of staff except for the Lead Minister.
- Replacing any of the senior staff will be more difficult with the model.

- It will be good for the church to choose a new staff member who is collaborative.
- This proposal is presented as a justice issue. We should be aware that there may be budget implications in equalizing staff compensation.
- A model which involves giving up power appeals to me as a UU and a feminist and a humanist. Any model will work with people who have good intent. This model says about this church what we would want to have said. It should be much easier to hire great people with this model in place. And we have to look at compensation.
- The Lead Minister has a separate letter of agreement and separate benefits, so the equality of these positions has significant ramifications.

MOTION: The Board accepts the triune staff leadership model and recognizes that the Personnel Committee will have to explore the implications of salary and benefits for the 2016-17 budget cycle.

Discussion – Compensation decisions are sometimes commitments before they can be acted upon. When the church is not in the position to ‘do the right thing,’ a commitment is made along with a plan to achieve it.

Passed with 9 in favor, 1 opposed and 2 abstentions.

2. Recommendation for Executive Team assessment model – Sue Hess and Bev (15 min)

Personnel looked for a way to involve the pertinent people in the evaluation of the senior staff while trying not to burden the system. We would propose one change to the evaluation of the Lead Minister based on recent discussion with the President. Rather than have all three presidents involved in an interview process with all three staff members, Personnel would draft the interview documents and one presidential position would be matched with each of the three staff to do the interviews. A member of Personnel would be present to document the conversation on the assessment form.

The forms are set up to put emphasis on goals, both on the self review form that the employee would fill out in advance of the interview and also in terms of what the supervisor would fill out.

Draft 1/15/15

Performance Review Process for
TJMC Senior Staff

- Personnel Committee (PC) would be given the responsibility for and the authority to conduct assessments for the Executive Team (Lead Minister, Director of Faith Development (DFD), and the Director of Administration and Finance (DAF)). A different PC member would be responsible for coordinating and drafting each of the three assessments. (Other assessments (OA, RE Assistant, DOM, Min Assoc.) would continue to be conducted by their immediate supervisors.)
- PC would provide assessment forms for use in performance reviews and coordinate the performance review process, gather inputs from those selected to provide input, compile the inputs, and draft the written assessment to be reviewed, approved, and signed by the President of the Board.
- Each performance review would be designed to solicit input from those who work most closely with that senior staff member. Those providing input might vary from year to year, depending on priorities and goals for that year.
- Step 1. Lead Minister, DFD, and DAF complete a Pre-Performance Review Form. (This is a self review form that requests information on employee priorities, strengths, areas of growth, personal growth goals, job goals and training needs.)
- Step 2. PC would gather Input from other two members of the Executive Team, using Performance Review Form, which would be tailored to the specific performance elements described in the job description of the employee being assessed.
- Step 3. Gather Input from those working most closely with the Team Member being assessed, as follows:
 - For the Lead Minister, this would include in-person interviews with the President, Past President, and President-Elect, input from the Committee on Ministry, and Performance Review Forms completed by a representative of the Worship Weavers, Associate Minister, and Director of Music. (Lead Minister Performance Review Form might be organized by the “Fulfilling the Call” categories.)
 - For the DFD, this would include an interview with the President, Past President, and President-Elect, and Performance Review Forms completed by a representative of the RE Committee, and RE Assistant.
 - For the DAF, this would include an interview with the Board President, Past President, and President-Elect and Performance Review Forms filled out by the Vice President (if working closely with DAF), Treasurer, representative from Fa-

cilities Task Force (or other person working closely with DAF on facilities), and Office Assistant.

- Step 4. PC produces a draft written assessment, based on the input received, for review by the Board President. (The forms submitted by each reviewer would also be provided, so President can review original input, if desired.) Draft written assessment will include a matrix for assessing common elements applicable to all TJMC jobs (quality & quantity of work, job knowledge, interpersonal skills, etc.) The President provides additional comments and revisions, as appropriate.
- Step 5. The employee assessed reviews the assessment, provides any comments.
- Step 6. The employee meets with the Board President, discusses assessment, and both parties sign and date the assessment.
- In the case the employee raises a problem or grievance, the employee will meet with the three Presidents to discuss and agree to a resolution or agree to disagree.

Notes.

In-person interviews would be conducted to reduce the workload and time that the three Presidents would need to devote to performance reviews of the Executive Team.

A more in-depth assessment of the Lead Minister would be required every 3 years. PC would work with the Committee on Ministry and the Board to design such an assessment process, which would include review of the latest Pulse Survey. This in-depth assessment should not be done during a sabbatical.

Annual assessment of the Executive Team is separate and not linked to the TJMC budget process and will occur in the March/April timeframe.

Discussion – Why do we do assessments?

- To set goals and evaluate the previous year's goals.
- To make recommendations.
- To look for areas for improvement based on a 360 degree review.
- To provide two way feedback and a valuable communication and reflection process.

The discussion continued around two themes, openness and transparency of the assessment process regarding both input and results versus trust in delegation of the process and confidentiality of the results.

Openness and transparency:

- There should be a short, well publicized open period for members of the congregation to comment.
- Results of the assessment should be shared with the full Board more fully than as a summary.
- Results were not shared with the Committee on Ministry last year to help in their work to “monitor, interpret and support.” (Erik reports that the goals have been shared this year and COM will be involved in the future.)
- The Pulse Survey, though not an assessment tool, should align with the results of staff assessments.

MOTION: Extend this topic for 10 minutes.

Unanimously approved.

Delegation and confidentiality:

- There are parts of the assessment process which are and should be personal, intimate and confidential.
- Comments made must be owned during an assessment. It may be difficult for a president to conduct an evaluation based on comments beyond her/his personal experience with the staff member.
- The assessment process has been delegated to Personnel and the Board presidents. It is not a completely transparent process, nor is it designed to be.
- Publishing of senior staff goals may be desirable, excepting goals of a personal nature.

Following is the section of the June 2014 Board meeting minutes summarizing the discussion, under closed session, of the assessment of the lead minister. This is the only report available to the congregation as a whole:

“Best practices suggest that details of Part 1 of the evaluation (focusing on the nine areas of ministry) should remain confidential according to Human Resource principles. Overall the review showed strength or satisfactory in most areas, though there were also areas for improvement. Rev. Wikstrom and the Board subcommittee created both personal and professional goals based on the evaluation which will be reviewed periodically during the year. Many of the goals are quite specific and measurable.”

Discussion – The assessments are meant to be completed toward the end of the church year so there is a body of staff performance to assess. The timing of assessments has nothing to do with the budget cycle or salary determination.

MOTION: Approve the Performance Review Process for TJMC Senior Staff.
Passed with 9 in favor, 2 opposed and 1 abstention.

3. Recommendations on Ministerial Assessment Process by last year's COM members – Ann (10 min)

Discussion – There should be options available for comment, whether in person or in writing. No anonymous comments can be accepted. We are a congregational denomination. When we don't provide a chance to comment, we are training people not to take personal responsibility.

It should be possible to have an open period for comments prior to staff assessments, whether to COM or Personnel. At the same time, the comments should be evaluated as to whether they are worth addressing. It's important for people to have a voice and feel their concern is going somewhere, but some comments may be complaints based on personal preference while others refer to significant issues that do need addressing. Not all comments should automatically be entered as part of staff assessments. It would be simple to add an open comment period into the proposed performance review document.

Committee on the Ministries Report to the Board
Recommendations on the Lead Minister Assessment Process
January 2015

In 2013, in the third year of a new ministry, our lead minister had yet to undergo a formal assessment, although yearly assessments are stipulated in the letter of agreement. There was an undercurrent in the congregation ranging from concern to dissatisfaction which arose in the form of conversations and emails with COM and Board members and among congregants. With a growing sense that a more formal, participatory avenue of communication needed to be provided to address this discontent, the Board asked COM to develop and recommend an assessment tool.

The formal assessment developed provided for considerable input from congregants active in broad categories of church activities. COM initially invited over 20 congregants plus staff to fill out the form. The information collected was collated and passed to the three Board Presidents to inform their final interaction with the minister.

In addition to asking specific congregants to participate in the formal assessment, COM held a series of congregational conversations on the same topics covered in the assessment. The rationale was to provide ample opportunity for all

congregants to be heard and to make sure all views were fielded and discussed in COM at least.

After the assessment was completed, COM reviewed the process among themselves and with the presidents prior to refining and recommending an ongoing process. Several major points came to light:

- Only participants who have active, current, personal interaction with the minister should participate in the evaluation.
- Participants should only comment in areas of personal, current interaction with the minister, using Not Observed for all other categories.
- No second hand or anonymous comments are appropriate to include.
- More than one check mark can be used, since A Strength could also be considered An Area For Growth.

Our initial assumptions have been reviewed as well.

- *Wide participation in the evaluation is valuable and reassuring to the congregation.*

There aren't very many congregants who have interactions with the minister that rise to the level of pertinence in the assessment process.

The three presidential positions and the staff really do have something to say which is germane. The Pulse Survey and personal communication with Board and COM members reveal the concerns and suggestions of the congregation very well.

- *Providing opportunities for conversation between COM members and congregants will bring out needed information and ideas and reassure the congregation that their input is valued.*

Turnout was very limited for the conversations. Some misconceptions were corrected or clarified and COM heard a very few new comments. Scheduling a number of conversations tended to overload the church calendar. If an effort is made to publicize COM membership, some congregants with concerns and suggestions will communicate with them. Board members are also frequently chosen for these communications.

- *The assessment tool was developed as a response to perceived dissatisfaction among congregants.*

In a stable ministry, this reactive assessment process requires much more input from COM, Board, lay leadership and staff than is necessary to efficiently evaluate the lead minister.

- *COM assumed that the results of the assessment would inform the ongoing work of the COM. Some congregants also felt the results should be published.*

The nature of the assessment as a Human Resource document should be clarified. Its purpose is to review past goals and develop new goals between the Board presidents (as proxies of the congregation) and the lead minister. It is a confidential document and process.

The Board is currently considering an executive staffing model which is based on parity between the Lead Minister, Director of Faith Development and Director of Administration and Finance positions. The Personnel Committee has been asked to develop an assessment process for the DFD and DAF. After meeting with Personnel to share COM experiences with the Lead Minister assessment, we feel it appropriate to deemphasize the Lead Minister assessment by following a similar process as for the other executive staff. Tasking the Board president/s to follow over elaborate processes is burdensome.

Respectfully submitted by

Ann Salamini

(2013-14 COM members were Ann Salamini, Deborah Rose, Pamela Philips, Donna Baker, Al Reynolds)

MOTION: Extend meeting until 8:50PM.

Unanimously approved.

Break

4. Disaster Preparedness Plan – Erik, Trish, Leia (10 min)

There is no action to be taken on this plan tonight. The development of a Disaster Preparedness Plan is a Board goal which has been delegated to the staff. A review with the Fire Marshall has yet to take place, but the goal is to have this section finalized for the May Congregational Meeting.

The following comments and suggestions were made:

- It would be helpful to the Board for a group of congregants to undertake a thorough review of the plan and make suggestions.
- The automatic 911 call needs to be carefully explained to congregants. A Do Not Resuscitate order cannot be honored by the rescue squad unless the patient is able to refuse their services. Entering the hospital with the rescue squad can bypass a DNR order and put one in exactly the situation one had hoped to avoid. The staff view is that the only responsible choice for the church is to automatically call 911. Advance Directives need to be filed with the hospitals and one's own doctors.
- Is a preparedness team being formed? That will await approval of the plan. Such a team will develop in a collaborative and conversational way, among greeters and ushers, for example, with feedback from professionals.

- Sally, Jamie and Laura, who conducted congregational conversations on the Safe Congregation Policy, will make recommendations so that can be incorporated into this master plan.
- There should be a one page summary for use by the worship leader.

5. Contract with Martin Horn, Inc for Summit House Renovation / Next Steps – Ian (10 min)

The Board needs to approve and the President sign this contract. Our lawyer has reviewed and approved it as acceptable. At this point all the major tasks are covered for less than the budgeted amount, including a \$15,000 contingency fund for unforeseen complications. The Facilities group is pleased with Martin Horn and the project manager.

MOTION: Approve the contract with Martin Horn for the renovation of Summit House.

Discussion – The plan is to spend the full budgeted amount. Facilities has already identified a list of items which can be added to the project if the contingency fund is not otherwise needed. The contractor will be keeping open books on the project so costs will be known as they come in.

Who will approve changes to the contract? The primary point person is the DAF, who has authority to work within agreed upon line items, but changes beyond that would need approval. Work will start in May after RE is over for the year and will take six to eight weeks. Trish recommends that electronic voting be in place to approve major changes.

Approved unanimously.

Note: the contract can be viewed in the church office.

V. New Business

1. Search process for new Director of Administration and Finance / Charge to DAF Search Committee – Kathy Philhour and Bev Thierwechter / Approval of Search Committee members (15min)

The DAF Search Committee has been selected. Proposed members are Kathy Philhour – Chair, Bev Thierwechter, Dawn Dirks representing Personnel Committee, Rosali Simari representing Finance, Lynn Heath representing IT, Sean McCutcheon representing Facilities, and Bob Gross representing the congregation.

MOTION: Approve the DAF Search Committee members.

Unanimously approved.

The first meeting will be held Feb. 4. An advertising budget of \$1000 is requested. The church's Wiki account has been revived to help interested Board and Staff members stay up to date on the process. The search will use the existing

job description.

- Trish has recommended that the payroll function be removed from the job description as it is time consuming and could be outsourced for about \$2000. The actual candidates who come forward will impact whether that is helpful or unnecessary.
- The suggested upper salary range will be very close to that currently being paid. (\$41,137, which is $\frac{3}{4}$ of the midpoint for Business Administrator for midsize church 3 under the 2014 UUA Salary Guidelines) The lower range would be \$33,225.
- The search committee will set a timeline to include immediate advertising with a deadline for applications at the end of February. Initial interviews will be held in early to mid March. Final interviews of top candidates will be held the following week. The final candidate will hopefully be hired and on board by mid April to have two weeks of time working with Trish.
- The search will be very broad and national in scope.

MOTION: Approve up to \$1000 for the DAF search.

Discussion – The Treasurer and DAF will find money to reassign to this purpose.

Unanimously approved.

2. Pledge Drive participation for Board members – Sally (5 min)

Sally hopes that many Board members will attend the Saturday afternoon pre pledge event and that all of us will pledge before the opening of the pledge drive on Sunday, Feb. 1.

Adam Slate sent a letter to Board members and other church leaders about participating with Stewardship visits. This is a wonderful way to connect with members and talk about how this church has changed our lives. It does involve some talk about money, but that becomes easier. About half of the Board is already involved. The goal is to schedule visits with people we already know well. Also, a reminder that phone banking is traditionally a job for Board members. Kate Fraleigh will contact us with dates for the phone banks.

Please also sign up for the pledge suppers/brunch being held February 12, 13 and 14.

VI. Closing Activities (10 minutes)

1. Process Review (all):

Our love and gratitude to Trish were not expressed in the Consent Agenda, but they are very real.

This was a packed agenda. Perhaps we could make more use of email discussions to help us process the information and shorten/clarify discussions at the meetings.

Another possibility is to introduce a topic at one meeting and come back to it for action at a later meeting.

It's important to remember that very few of our decisions must be made in one night. When we feel that a topic needs more time, we can ask to table it until a later meeting.

The support of the Board is very important to the staff to make the triune leadership model work well.

The TJMC experience with the triune staff model will be important to document the possible effectiveness of the model.

2. Things to Communicate—

Ian and Walt will draft an alteration to the Staff Assessment proposal to include language on congregational comments period, etc.

Sally, Jamie, Laura will make recommendations for folding Safe Congregations Policy into the master plan for disaster preparedness.

All – sign up for pledge meals, pledge early, consider making stewardship visits (talk to Amy), plan to help with phone banks.

3. Closing words – Breck

Upcoming Dates

- Jan. 28, 2015 – Board meeting
- Jan. 31, 2015 – Pledge Leadership Event
- Feb. 1, 2015 – Pledge Drive Informational Forum
- Feb. 12, 13, 14 – Pledge Dinners
- Jan. 31 to Feb 6 – Women's PACEM
- March 9, 2015 Community Life Council
- May 4, 2015 - Social Justice Council
- May 31, 2015 – Congregational Meeting
- June 10, 2015 – Community Life Council

Previous Agenda Items Awaiting Feedback (Requested date if known)

Future Topics for Board Meetings

- Review the electronic voting process - February
- Proposed changes to Short Term Public Witness process – Social Justice Council

- Tweak the assessment proposal for senior staff – February

- Campus Maintenance Plan
- Capital Expenditures Budget
- Revise Erik’s letter of agreement – February

- Budget calendar

President’s Report

January, 2015 President's Report

Trish Schechtman has submitted her resignation as Director of Administration and Finance effective March 31, 2015. We have contacted Sue Hess, Personnel Committee chair, and asked the committee to create a DAF search committee as quickly as possible. We have also asked the Personnel Committee to work with Trish to revise the DAF job description to reflect our present needs. One of Trish’s primary recommendations is to hire an accounting firm to take over the tax and payroll component and the accounting part of the DAF job to allow the new DAF to serve more in the role of “property manager” for the church.

On Dec. 7 Laura Horn with Erik’s help led a Congregational Conversation about the Safe Congregation policies and the response of congregation members to what we have in place and what needs to be done in the future. Jamie and I led a second Congregation Conversation on January 11. About 25 individuals (most of them older and long term members of the congregation) attended these four meetings. There were some suggestions about how this policy could be improved and concern that the two groups (the Conflict Resolution Committee and the Sexual Misconduct and Abuse Response Team) required by the policy are not present in today’s governance structure. The suggestion that these committees be composed not of specific individuals but instead by individuals holding specified positions (Board past president, Pastoral Visitor Chair, minister, etc.) was greeted positively. Since many in the congregation were unaware of this part of our policy manual, this attention to it is long overdue. I am hopeful that consideration of these issues will be timely as we will also be considering the staff’s disaster preparedness plan this year.

Although we have limped along without a Building Committee or Chair for many years, it is now time to address the need for a Buildings and Grounds Committee and Co-Chairs who will oversee the prioritization and implementation of our Campus Maintenance Plan, develop a Parking Plan and implement our Capital plan as monies become available. All of these are essential to the Strategic Plan which we as a board have agreed to make happen.

We have found leadership for the Spring Auction. Janine Jakim and Jen McCutcheon will be co-chairs with lots of help identified for the various parts of the effort. The date will be Saturday, April 18, 4:30-7:30 pm. We hope that it will be a truly intergenerational event with auction items appealing to both adults and children. We will be selling slices of pizza in addition to the cash bar and usual donated finger food and desserts. Once again artwork and dinners will be displayed several weeks ahead of the auction. There will be raffles. We are exploring the possibilities of having on line bidding prior to the event.

The Leadership Development Workshop, Let's Do This! on January 17, 2015 reintroduced our Strategic Plan to attendees and we are slowly putting the plan into place. We have a contract with Martin Horn for the renovation of Summit House to consider at our January board meeting and soon we will be focusing on the design of the renovation of the Lower Hall. The Facilities Task Force created a Capital Plan and the beginnings of a Campus Maintenance Plan last year and we will be fleshing this out later on this spring. The Communications Task Force ably led by co-chairs Deborah Rose and Achsah Carrier, will be meeting for the first time this month. It includes the following members: Jennifer Springer, Chip Bumgartner, Holly Dilatush, Paul Fritz with consultants Lucy Edwards, Josie Pipkin and James Smith helping as needed. Amy Davis will serve as Board Liaison. We are still looking for a secretary for the group. We have postponed the charging and recruiting of the Governance Task Force. The Stewardship Committee is now fully involved with Pledge Drive efforts. The Pulse Survey is being written and will be in place by March.

Respectfully submitted, Sally Taylor

Vice President's Report

January 21, 2015

- **Organizing a Search Committee for DAF.** Needless to say, we will all miss Trish -- her hard work, talents, dedication, insight, and energy, but wish her well in her exciting new endeavor. In the last few days, Sally and I have been working with Personnel Chair and Committee to begin organizing a Search Committee. I was able to provide background on the previous DAF Search and we are using that as a model for this new Search. The Board will need to make some early decisions on whether there will be changes to the DAF job description and then, with Board approval, we'll be able to launch the Search effort. Kathy Philhour has agreed to be Chair, and two members of Personnel Committee will be on the Search. We have are currently recruiting others for the Search – one from Fi-

nance Committee, an IT person, a buildings/grounds person and an at large member. We have made substantial progress and are moving quickly.

- **Health Care Premium Employer Contribution.** The Treasurer, Personnel Committee Chair, DAF and I met in mid-December to prepare a recommendation for calendar year 2016 and beyond. That recommendation was then presented to the Finance Committee at its December meeting and the Committee endorsed that recommendation. The January Board packet includes a motion to approve the recommendation under the Consent Agenda, as well as background and an update on the latest research and information we have available. We have come to the conclusion that TJMC has been more generous in its employer contribution for health care premiums than most other UU churches and the potential exposure to large increases in premium costs from year to year makes the current policy unsustainable. We believe that the recommendation will control costs, so that more drastic changes will not be necessary later on.
- **Assessment Process for Lead Minister, DFD, and DAF.** The Personnel Committee has drafted a proposal for assessment of the senior staff, if the collaborative leadership model proposed by senior staff is approved by the Board. The draft has been shared with senior staff and will certainly be addressed by them when they describe the details of their proposal at the January Board meeting. Please see the proposed assessment process description in the Board packet.
- **Assessment Forms for Use in Staff Assessments.** Last year, Personnel Committee was asked to provide an evaluation form for use in the DAF performance review. After that updated form was used in the performance review of the DAF, senior staff agreed that it should be used for the 2015 reviews, which begin in March. The Personnel Committee is in the process of updating the remaining forms and will finish before the review cycle begins. Each form will be tailored to the specific job elements of each individual's job description. While the forms for senior staff will need to reflect the outcome of discussions on the senior staff leadership model (and any changes to the DAF job description), Personnel is already working to update the forms for the rest of the staff.
- **Community Life Council.** The quarterly meeting of the Council was held on January 6th. The members reviewed and approved changes to the job description for Denominational Concerns Committee, which reduce the size of the Committee to between 1 and 3 people. This reflects the fact that the job can be done adequately by one person, or at most, several. There was some interest in proposing to call it "Denominational Connections", with a more positive connotation, and this suggestion will be passed on to Jean Braithwaite, the new Denominational Concerns person. The Council also reviewed the policy on tabling at coffee hour and will be recommending some changes on this policy. I also brought up the discussion at the December Board meeting about starting the canvass earlier next year, so that the pledge goal represents the needs/wishes of the Committees and can inspire more excitement about and interest in the pledge drive. The reaction

was positive and Committee Chairs were urged to dream more when putting together their budget requests, rather than trying to request the absolute minimum needed to support their programs. I also reminded Chairs that Finance would soon be asking for their budget requests for the upcoming fiscal year. The Council Chair will be collecting Committee budget requests.

- **Personnel budget recommendations**. Senior staff will be providing the Personnel Committee information on its priorities; this will give the Committee the opportunity to have this input when it puts any Committee budget recommendations together.
- **Other personnel items**. The Personnel Chair and I will be working with Trish, so that we can finish our discussions on several possible clarifications and/or changes to personnel policies that have been on our “to do” list since last year.

Respectfully submitted,
Bev Thierwechter

Treasurer's Report

December 2014

Summary

For the half year ended December 31, we had revenues of \$279,731 and expenses of \$253,841 for a surplus of \$25,890. For the month of December, we had revenues of \$48,228 and expenses of \$56,605, for a deficit of \$8,376.

Revenues

Overall YTD revenues are 53% of our full-year budget of \$530,764 and \$16,506 lower than the same period last year.

- Combined Fair share gifts were \$43,887 for the month and \$241,217 for YTD. Combined Fair Share Gifts are \$13,862 less than the same period last year.
- Fundraising income is \$12,679 YTD, 55% of our full-year budget. We raised \$8,896 from the yard sale and received a \$2,500 rebate from our Wells Fargo credit card purchases. This year we raised \$454 from the Fall Festival, so we will be relying on the Spring Auction to raise the remaining \$10,000 of our fundraising revenue. This is a rising concern, since we don't have a chair identified for the auction.
- \$7,450 of the decline in revenue compared with last year is due to rental revenue we received last year from the Mollie Michie Preschool and U-House.

Expenses

Overall YTD expenses of \$253,841 are 48% of our full-year budget and \$14,521

higher than YTD last year expenses of \$239,319. Half way through our fiscal year, I expect our expenses to be around half of our full year budget.

- Worship & pastoral care YTD expenses are 50% of budget
- Lifespan Faith Development YTD expenses are 49% of budget.
- Community Life and Outreach YTD expenses are 44% of budget.
- Operations and Administration YTD expenses are 46% of budget
 - Maintenance expenses are 77% of budget
 - Postage is 100% of budget
 - Fundraising expenses are 105% of budget

Balance Sheet

- Our bank account balances total \$659,632 including the net proceeds of \$486,329 from sale of U-House.
- Construction in progress spending of \$11,181 represents the cost of separating the electric service for the parking lot next to U-House and structural and air quality reports.
- Our general endowment fund has a balance of \$369,274 as of September 30, 2014, and our restricted endowment funds total \$70,229.

Lead Minister's Report

Report to the Board – January 2015

Lead Minister

This month, rather than reporting on the six areas that have become the standard form for this report, I would instead like to lift up a few things:

1. Uppermost in my mind and heart right now is the resignation of Trish Schechtman as Director of Administration and Finance. I have such a vivid memory of the interviews Leia and I conducted with the Search Committee's finalist. Once having met Trish we had to work *very* hard to remain – or, at least, to appear – open to the candidates we saw after her. We knew that the Committee had narrowed down the candidates to those who truly had the “chops” for the work. Leia and I saw our job as finding the person who would best “fit” – both within our little staff community and within the larger community of TJMC. We could not have found a better partner than Trish. And beyond her practical, pragmatic skills, she so clearly has understood the pastoral dimensions of her position and demonstrated over and over again that elusive quality called, “ministerial presence.” I

will say, though, that I am always happy when someone I care about has the opportunity to pursue a dream, and so I am happy for Trish. I would note also that she has helped shape this position – and, I would add, reshape our congregational culture – to such an extent that an incredibly solid foundation has been set for her successor.

2. It has been quite a month since our last meeting! All of the activities of “the holiday season;” the memorial for Tony Perrino (with both David Morris and Leslie Takahashi returning to officiate); a Remembrance Garden ceremony for Jim Rotherham on the anniversary of his death; and the memorial for Liz Benzinger. Somehow all of these have reminded me of the many ways the TJMC community is a “family,” with all of a family’s joys and sorrows.
3. I find it interesting that within the past month Wayne Arnason, David Morris, and Leslie Takahashi have all visited TJMC. Each took time to walk through the building, both to listen to the echoes of their time here and to see what the church they knew looks like now. All three had opportunities to visit with old friends, and to meet new folks who now call this place “home.” All three reported to me that the church felt “strong” and “healthy,” and that the energy is really wonderful. As we approach the fourth anniversary of the beginning of *our* mutual ministry, I continue to find new reasons to be grateful to be here with you.
4. I would like to comment on our “For All That Is Our Life” pledge drive. I have to say that I am truly impressed with the amount of work that’s being put into this drive, and the novel elements that we’re experimenting with – the commissioning of the Pledge Drive Chair, for instance; the making of a testimonials video; T-shirts; and even a “supper with the minister” event! Building on last year’s energetic and energizing campaign, this year’s drive feels like both a continuation and an expansion. I have high hopes and, already, deep gratitude.
5. The Leadership Development event was, from my perspective, a tremendous success. Early on one of our members asked what the “so what” was of the day. I knew that the intention of the planning group was not only that by morning’s end people would be better able to remember the three strategic planning goals, but even more so that they would have had actual *experiences* of how these goals could be lived out in our congregation. From what I could see – and what I experienced myself – that is exactly what happened.

6. Lastly, I'd like to report that Leia and I submitted a proposal to the GA Planning Group for a workshop we'd like to lead on the theory (and practice) of the shared leadership model we've been experimenting with here. (Writing the report for you all has been *very* helpful preparation!) I am pleased to announce that our proposal was accepted, and so attendees at GA in Portland, OR will have the opportunity to attend *Moving From Clergy-Centric to Collaborative Ministry*.

As always, I will be open to any questions or comments you might have as we receive our monthly reports.

Respectfully submitted,

RevWik

Director of Faith Development's Report

Report to the Board January 2015

Leia Durland-Jones, Director of Faith Development

Adult Programming

-We (Erik, Deborah Rose and myself) are hard at work putting together the winter/spring offerings for Adult Faith Development. Classes will begin in February. An exciting array of learning and faith development opportunities for adults is coming together.

-The Women's Dream Quest Planning Circle has been meeting regularly to prepare for this year's Dream Quest (February 27 & 28.) This year's theme is "Dreaming for the Earth." We will once again welcome Judith Tripp from San Francisco to lead the Quest. Judith will also lead "Journey to the Land of the Soul," a workshop for men and women, Sunday afternoon March 1.

Children's Programming

-Our preschool and elementary aged classes are back into their normal routine after the holiday season. On January 11, our 1st-4th grade classes put together 94 meal packets to be distributed at the UVa Medical Center by the Interfaith Humanitarian Sanctum.

-This month, during our ministry theme of "The Heroic Journey," our children's classes are exploring topics such as: courage, perseverance, integrity and conviction.

-The Children & Youth Religious Education Committee is beginning our work of

looking at the 2015-2016 church school year and has started exploring next year's curricula offerings.

Youth Programming Highlights:

- Our 5th & 6th grade class has started their 10 session "Our Whole Lives" unit with leadership from Linda and Frank Dukes and Lucy Edwards.
- 7th & 8th grade year-long OWL continues to go well
- NGYG (Ninth Grade Youth Group) went bowling Saturday night January 17. Fun was had by all! Special thanks to John Semmelhack and Amy Wissekerke for making this event possible.
- YRUU (10th-12th grades) as preparation for their upcoming service trip to Appalachia, YRUU took a field trip to Kroger on a Sunday morning to learn about shopping on food stamps. Always an eye-opening experience... YRUU has a lock-in (overnight) at church on January 24.
- A regional youth overnight gathering is in the works for some time in February or March with youth and advisors from Waynesboro, Charlottesville, Blacksburg, Richmond, Glen Allen and Lynchburg.

Worship

- Erik and I co-led the multigenerational Solstice Service on December 21. We received lots of positive feedback from the congregation about this service. One person shared that she didn't know which service she liked better—Solstice or Balloon Sunday.
- Our annual Interactive Nativity Service at 4 p.m. on Christmas Eve was packed! A fun and inspirational time was had by all.
 - Our congregation's annual New Year's Eve Labyrinth walk was well attended with over 65 participants. Special appreciation to Patty Wallens for her leadership with this very lovely night.
 - Erik and I co-led worship on January 4 as we began this year's exploration of the Heroic Journey (January's ministry theme.)
 - Wednesday Worship continues to have a small yet steady following and is deeply meaningful to those who participate. I am grateful to Maggie Ober and Cindy Mick for weaving these services with me.
 - Children's Worship is a highlight of my week. Our church's children are simply amazing and incredibly fun to spend time with.

Other

- I am saddened by Trish's resignation and consider myself very fortunate to have had the opportunity to work with her. Our congregation is better and stronger because of her leadership and her many gifts. She will be missed!
- The Leadership Development Committee did a wonderful job with the recent "Let's Do This!" retreat designed to help us live into our congregation's strategic plan. I

was delighted to be asked to offer one of the morning's workshops on spiritual deepening.

-New TJMC UU t-shirts are coming and will be available for purchase at the end of the month. This set of t-shirts will feature the logo we are using for the pledge drive. Proceeds benefit the Coming of Age program. Many thanks to Margaret Gorman for her leadership on this endeavor.

Director of Administration and Finance's Report

DAF Report-

January Board Book

Finance

- Attention turns to preparing for Year End Financials including all year-end tax work for our employees and sub-contractors.
- Working with attorney to finalize our UUA loan pay off and make sure that Summit has clear title.

Human Resources

- Worked with sub-committee on Health Benefits for staff recommendations.
- Staff Assessment plan is now the focus.

IT and Database Management

- Comcast ran into some outside wiring issues to upgrade our internet access/speed. The plan is to have Comcast finalize wiring by January 27th.
- Following the Comcast upgrade Power Church will be moved to the on line access.
- Custom reports work from PC will begin February 1st. Training schedule coming next month.

Facilities Management

- Working with the facilities team on the bid for the Summit House redevelopment.
- Scheduled and completed all stripping and waxing work for the main church building.
- To clear up property line issues with main church building and summit – Survey work has been scheduled.

Committee and Group Work

- Finance Committee-
- Canvass Committee- Assisted canvass chair with the 2015 mailing.
- Working with Pulse Survey Group on developing the 2015 Pulse Survey that hopefully will stand the test of time.

- Communicating with Venable Neighborhood about our upcoming plans with Summit
- Volunteer Management- Wendy and I have offered our services to help update Power Church with the activities that members and supporters are participating in as it relates to groups, committees, board and councils.

Transition Plan

I have tendered by resignation however, I am committed to a transition plan that will assist the church, the board, the staff and the new hire. During February I plan to meet with different leaders to develop this plan and share with the board in my next DAF report. I would imagine that these will be the main topics:

- Finances
 - 2015-16 Budget
- Facilities
 - Campus Maintenance
 - Capital Plan
- IT and Database Management
 - Power Church
 - SAGE
 - One Drive

Membership Report

TOTAL MEMBERSHIP as of November 30, 2014: 436 including 14 youth members

Add:

Drop:

Liz Benzinger, died Dec.24, 2014

TOTAL MEMBERSHIP as of December 30, 2014: 435 members including 14 youth members

Sally Taylor

Membership Tracker for Membership Committee

Board Liaison Reports

Pledge Drive Update – Kate Fraleigh

Pledge Drive Update for Jan 2015 Board meeting: Kate Fraleigh, Chair.

There are 16 people on the pledge drive committee, some more active than others. And additional volunteers already at work. We already have the first pledges for 2015-16! 6 Pledges for \$12,500

Advance pledging: January 31st, 3-5pm event at Jeanine Braithwaite's home for Leadership Circle function/advance pledging. RSVP's yes 35. Some invitations still outstanding.

-Kick off Sunday Feb 1st. Congregational conversations after each service for those who like numbers and want to ask questions about the mailing. Susan Bremer will order balloons and cake with logo after each service in social hall. Rev Wik is doing utube we will play at the cake table or pledging table each Sunday in the social hall starting Feb 1st. We'll put it on the web and facebook too.

-Supper: Thursday Feb 12 5:30-7:15 Supper with the Minister in the social hall. Soup, bread and finger desserts. Childcare. Adult speed pledging exercise. Music. Special invites to choir being done by Susan Bremer.

-Supper: Supper Feb 13th 6-8pm School age children eat with adults then special. Special activity for children-Linda Dukes. Adult speed pledging exercise. Music. Soup, bread, dessert.

-Saturday PJs and Pancakes brunch- Feb 14th intergenerational. Food cooked by 9th graders Amy and Lorie Craddock coordinating with Leia/RE help. Special invites to RE families being done by Gayle Floyd.

Feb 15th Big promotion of pledge drive At the Sunday services. Will pass a separated basket for pledge cards. Niki has done the pledge boxes.

Theme promotion logo on t-shirts –Linda Dukes and Margaret Gorman are working on this. Children's and adult's art in the sanctuary and hall-Elizabeth Breeden has put out a call and will hang them., facebook(Charlie Heaton working on this), logo-inclusiveness part of our theme, interactive piece for pledging-done. Sunday services promotion of events and pledge drive will start Jan 24th. Phone and email invitations to attend events to follow.

Slide show/video on front of sanctuary when singing "For all that is our life"
Song will be sung often Rev Wik working on this.

Updated bulletin board-Donna Redmond doing this. Thermometer-needs work.
Pledge stickers-done by Linda Dukes

Testimonials are being signed up-Lynn Heath coordinating. 5 have been confirmed.

Visiting stewards: One on ones, person to person canvass, Training Jan 21st and 24th. 14 stewards visiting 70 pledge units. A good start.

Materials: you got the mailing

Food and volunteers for pledging events: Carol Saliba coordinating

Sign ups for pledging events: Linda Dukes and everyone doing tabling or calls working on this.