

**First Unitarian Church
Board of Directors Meeting
6:30 PM in Social Hall
17 May 2011**

Members Present: Rob Leland, Geri Knoebel, June LeCrone, Tom Wofford, Jane Hendley, John Kwait, Anne Marie Silva, Erika Johnson-Jimenez, Kelly Street, Alice Demi

Members Absent: Nancy Kilpatrick

Members Ex-Officio: Angela Herrera, Christine Robinson

Guests: Ken Callahan of Solar Energy Task Force, Laura Hall of La Puerta de los Ninos

Major Discussion Points	Action Items
<p>6:30 pm Chalice lighting and reading: Le Crone</p> <p>I. Consent agenda</p> <p>A. Minutes for April: Johnson-Jimenez</p> <p>B. Finance report for April: Knoebel</p> <p>C. Staff report: Herrera</p> <p>D. President's report: Leland</p> <p>E. General Assembly attendee approval proposal: Herrera</p> <p>II. New business</p> <p>A. Welcome to Christine: Herrera</p> <p>B. Worship Committee request: Lunt Would like to do a service on leadership on a path to spirituality. Asking Board members to talk for a few minutes during service about our paths to leadership and our spirituality development. Worship Committee will assist and this will be for both services. Rob volunteered and others will consider. Knoebel will communicate with Lunt.</p> <p>C. Discussion of Finance Committee Report: Knoebel</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Last year we had a \$20,000 surplus. YTD, we are approximately \$11,000 under projected income. • Discussed expenses under "other matters" on page two of the Finance Committee Report. • Robinson is preparing an article for the messenger to emphasize the importance of being current on pledges. <p>D. Discussion of General Assembly delegates.</p> <p>E. Policy governance approach: Kwait</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Kwait educated the Board about the Carver approach and the Hotchkiss approach and suggested that we need to adopt one of these approaches to policy governance. The great majority of the churches he referenced were following the Carver approach. The way policies are written is exactly the same. • Carver's approach is modeled on nonprofit organizations and Hotchkiss is specifically created for 	<p>Motion to take Item A off the consent agenda. Demi moved, seconded, all approved.</p> <p>Motion to take Finance Report off the consent agenda as well as the General Assembly attendee approval. Kwait moved, seconded, all in favor, none opposed.</p> <p>Motion to accept consent agenda by LeCrone, seconded, all approved.</p> <p>Motion to accept Treasurer's report. Wofford moved, seconded, all approved.</p> <p>Motion to accept Robinson, Herrera, Vance Bass, and Diane Ross to be delegates to the General Assembly and to authorize Herrera and / or Robinson to authorize any other delegates. Knoebel moved, seconded, all approved.</p> <p>Action: Knoebel will send this</p>

churches.

- A past Board has started this process when Stefan Jonasson presented on policy governance.
- Kwait is proposing that the Board decides on an approach, then form a Task Force to review all the material and present the information for decision.
- Discussed whether we can continue working on this one subject at a time or whether we need to spend 9-12 months forming a policy handbook and going from there. Perhaps the committee can work on the Finance Committee policies first and implement those policies, then continue to work on policies and approve them as they are completed.

F. Building Project: Leland

- Report from first joint meeting of Synchronizing Group (reps. from Board, Design and Construction Team, Stewardship and Financial Task Force). Members are currently: Leland, Robinson, Herrera, Linda Skye, Geri Knoebel, George Bakula, Gwen Sawyer, and Nancy Kilpatrick.
- Discussion: charge of the Synchronizing Group and how they will interact with the Board. Perhaps the committee exists to help complete the project and to help all the committees get the work done by the established deadlines. The Synchronizing Group has no decision making authority, but is a formal method of communication.
- Discussion: what will be decided by the Board and what will be decided by the task forces. The big decisions are made by the Board and the committees are tasked with making other decisions. The question is whether the committee prepares the plan, the Board approves the plan, then the plan goes to the congregation for approval of the plan. Another method may be that the committee is tasked with preparing the plan and presenting it to the Board and the congregation (not for approval). The site plan must be submitted to the city by July of 2011.
- Discussed bylaws related to congregational vote on construction. We have congregational approval for the Master Plan. We will need a congregational vote for the construction loan and approval of the project in January.
- Discussed whether the Board is willing to delegate decision-making authority to the DCT on decisions that may be in conflict with Board values and at what point, if any, does the Board need to approve the site plan and architectural plans.
- Consideration of charges and charters for Building

background out to the Board.

Action: Kwait will send out further information to the Board. Kwait, Leland, and Knoebel will work on a more specific charge to the Board for next month.

Action: Leland and Herrera will continue to work on the charges for the various groups involved in the Building Project Task Force to be formalized at a future Board meeting.

Motion to ask the DCT to proceed with submitting a site plan to the city in a timely fashion, without approval from the Board. Demi moved, seconded, all approved.

Action: Robinson and Herrera will further develop the charter to the DCT to include four core values (timeliness, environmental mindedness, financial limits, and considering input from congregation and Board). The charter will include a final up or down vote from the Board on the final architectural plan.

Action: Knoebel, Robinson, Leland, and Kwait will get together to work out the questions that need to be asked in order for a five year plan to be

Project Task Forces

- Consideration/approval of joint Building project slogan/logo: Leland
 - i. Discussion whether Board should have some input into the slogan / logo or not. This is something that the Synchronizing Group can work out and the Board will assist if there is conflict.
- Report from Design Charrette: deferred
- G. Long range strategic plan approach: deferred
- H. Long range budget approach: Knoebel
- I. Discussed having a “budget hearing” at the time in which we are making the budget, likely in September

III. Future agenda items

- Working sessions on Board strategic goals (strategy, policy, finance)
- Personnel policy review
- Bylaw change for 2012 annual mtg. re signature authority
- Talk about having a budget hearing

IV. Important dates

- A. May 17, 2011: Joint meeting of reps from DCT, Campaign, Board
- B. May 31, 2011, 6:30pm: Debrief with Barry Finkelstein on Feasibility Study Results
- C. June 12, 2011: Board Town Hall mtg.
- D. June 21, 2011: Board Meeting
- E. July 19, 2011: Board Meeting
- F. August 16, 2011: Board Meeting

developed and that this discussion will be a major agenda item for the June meeting.