

TVUUC Board MINUTES ZOOM Meeting of January 18, 2022

<<https://us02web.zoom.us/j/87554992710>>

Having established a quorum, President Ryan McBee called the meeting to order at 6:32 pm.

Present (in alphabetical order): Matthew Blondell, Chris Buice, Bill Cherry, Eddie Chin, AB Coleman, Will Dunklin, Heather Kistner, Viren Lalka, Ryan McBee, Jeff Mellor, Mark Mohundro, Claudia Pressley, Linda Randolph, Mary Rogge, Ken Stephenson, Jamie Watts, Alice Woody.

1. Review Minutes of December 21, 2021 Board Meeting

Members present helped reconstruct the motion in point 7 of the minutes to read: Ryan moved, Ken seconded establishment of a task force to review the above issues and report to the Board in advance of its April meeting with a suggested plan of action.

Approval of the minutes thus reconstructed was moved by Jeff and seconded by Ryan. Unanimous.

[11:29]

Updates:

1. Building and Grounds Update – Ken [11:57]

Ken gave an update on Buildings and Grounds focusing on the replacement of the gas stove in the kitchen that had had a history of minor leaks. B&G had come to a decision to purchase a commercial electric range with a double oven and a ceramic top. The estimated cost is \$1500 and already approved funds are available for this purchase. Junk B Gone removed the stove this afternoon. Will Dunklin reported that some minor electrical work will be needed to connect the new stove at an estimated cost of a couple hundred dollars. Mary asked if any other equipment in the church requires a gas connection since the new stove will be electric. The fireplace in the McKendry Fellowship Hall is gas and there are two water heaters in the church, one of which is probably gas, but no one knew for certain. There are also twelve heating/cooling units on the roof that are gas-powered. As these roof units reach replacement age, it is foreseen that they will be replaced by electric units. Five of the twelve are rather new, having been replaced in the course of work on the roof. The remaining seven are at or past their design life and will need to be replaced in the near future. The source of funding for these replacement units is not yet determined. [19:50]

2. 8th Principle Task Force / Article 2 Study Commission – Mark Mohundro

Mark began discussion of the Article 2 Study Commission with a brief review of its structure and mission. Every fifteen years, a UU-wide study examines our mission, our identity as a religious organization, and our funding sources. This process is currently underway. Within the framework of this study, we will consider addition of new principles, e.g. the Eighth Principle, and amending the First Principle to include all beings, and even some discussion of the Fifth Principle. The Commission is soliciting input from congregations. Mark had recently distributed a survey in this regard:

<<https://docs.google.com/forms/d/e/1FAIpQLScYfdvPAnUGHU60U5UZ4AHB5m9IXTG0t9kVAiyfYGcQ0A238w/viewform>>. The timeline for this process is as follows: 1) this GA will include numerous discussion

groups and working groups for wordsmithing, 2) the Commission will present these results to the UUA Board by January 2023, 3) GA 2023 will hold a first vote on the results (including changes or non-changes), 4) a year-long study by the congregations of the resulting draft will take place, 5) FINAL VOTE for adoption will take place at GA 2024. Overall intent of this process is to examine who we are as a denomination and what

directions our denomination should take in the future with our Principles and Sources. Mark will also distribute the survey via the Newsletter starting next week. Rob Spirko (Foothills congregation) is on the Commission and he and Mark are trying to organize a presentation on this matter for the regional cluster of congregations stretching from Holston Valley to Chattanooga to generate discussion and input. Mark requested an expression of support from the Board for this process. He shared this link as well to provide an information basis for this work: <<https://www.uua.org/uuagovernance/committees/article-ii-study-commission>>. He opened the floor to questions and discussion. [26:32] Linda noted that she, Denise and AB were attending a leadership effectiveness course that addressed the questions Mark had just discussed. She expressed a desire not to overlap with the efforts Mark had been making, and Mark welcomed inclusion and collaboration on these matters. AB noted that his later discussion on the TTF would address this. [28:20]

Discussion then turned to the Eighth Principle with these updates. Some posters with proposed wording of the Eighth Principle had been ordered and places to put them up in the church were being identified. Roddy Biggs has joined the Task Force. Discussions of the Eighth Principle in upcoming services up through June is planned with Roddy and Jametta taking the lead. Inclusion of Asian American/Pacific Islanders is foreseen for a May service. Further collaboration with the Worship Committee and Adult RE personnel is also planned. Challenges of doing this given virtual / ZOOM-mediated interactions were noted. No questions were raised at this point. [30:11] In further matters, Mark mentioned a proposal made by Chris at the December task force meeting that had Catherine's approval to rename the High School Youth Group room after the late Elandria Williams. Chris noted that Elandria had occupied the highest volunteer position in the UUA during a difficult time in our denomination, rife with conflict. She was made a recipient of the UUA Distinguished Service Award. If we make this change, he would ask the family to take part in the dedication ceremony and incorporate information about her role in the UUA in the RE program. At present Erven and Elnora do not know of this specific proposal, and Chris has already discussed with them possible ways of honoring her and has been compiling some of her writings for inclusion in RE documentation. Enthusiastic support of this proposal was expressed by Jeff, Mary, Ken and others. Chris and Claudia reported that there were no specific policies or prescriptions governing naming rooms in honor of individuals. As members of Buildings & Grounds, Ken and Claudia will be able to inform that committee of changes that occur.

Matthew moved, Alice seconded that the High School Youth Group room (Room B) be renamed after Elandria Williams.

In discussion, Chris said he would call Elnora promptly after the decision of this action. Mark will see that an article in an upcoming Newsletter will announce this and this matter will be incorporated in a future service. This action was thought to be particularly appropriate both because Elandria had been a strong advocate for youth in the UUA and because she had grown up in our youth program. Chris put this in the context of the ongoing process of highlighting the historical role of our congregation in the civil rights struggle in Knoxville with pictures and displays. Renaming of this room will not displace the existing recognition of Tom Innes in this area.

Motion carried. Unanimous. [39:15]

4 Safety Update – Chris

Ryan called on Chris to provide a safety update. Chris repeated that the information he is supplying will also be included in the Newsletter. Our region is still in the SEVERE category regarding COVID and so our services will remain virtual until the VERY HIGH category is reached, when vaccinated people may attend. At MODERATE, additional relaxations have been set forth in Board policy, so that the general public can again be welcomed to our services. He asked if Board members had heard any responses on this matter. Ken cautioned

that the progression from SEVERE to VERY HIGH to HIGH to MODERATE requires a two-week interval for each relaxation and our messaging needs to be clear on this matter. The change in Knox County reporting from daily updates to weekly was also noted, resulting in information that was not as update as hitherto. The Covid Task Force will be conferring on this as well, given these changes. Chris noted that a proposal to the Board will be forthcoming when the situation on the ground warrants. He asked if Board members were aware of reactions to this. Ryan reported he had received one email saying something to the effect “Please don’t close the church!” while expressing an understanding for the restrictions we had undertaken. Ken reported generalized concerns on COVID’s fragmentation effect on our community. Chris re-emphasized the value of keeping an open channel for feedback and sharing information with church leadership, especially since we are all weary of the situation and the number of infections in the church is higher than ever. Feedback on these matters should be directed to church leadership, executive team, Board and staff. [44:44]

Another related issue regards services and predictable activities in the summer. The FBI had issued two warnings about domestic terrorist threats to churches, including one just today at the synagogue in Texas, for which reason we are not adhering to a fixed, predictable schedule. There was a warning one time that kept church staff away from the building all day. It appears that these threats will be on the increase, so heightened caution is warranted both for indoor and outdoor events. He emphasized the difficulty and importance of distinguishing between alarmist responses and precautionary measures in the current environment. He distinguished the roles of the Board as making **policy decisions** and the COVID task force as making **advisory health recommendations** to the Board. [48:17]

Further discussion touched on the continued policy regarding small groups (church groups and non-church groups): 1) approval for meetings requires advance application, 2) there is an online application form for requests to meet, 3) barring some unusual circumstance, no further examination by the COVID Task Force is warranted, but the form comes to Claudia who determines additional details on the size of the group, the meeting times and other requisite information. Based on staff availability and requirements to clean up after the meeting, Claudia can — under current Board policy — approve the meeting. Claudia referred the Board to the calendar posted on the church website documenting the ongoing small group meetings currently taking place, e.g. Personal Beliefs and Commitments and Welcoming Congregation. Each such group is also encouraged to have a ZOOM option. Under this policy, all small group members must be vaccinated and must wear masks throughout the time in the church. No food or drink is permitted during these events. [51:25]

The door unlocking procedure was reviewed. When the door is locked, the normal circumstance – unless there is constant in-and-out traffic of multiple persons with business at the church – ringing the doorbell can reach any church staff member present who can talk to the person at the door and open it from where they were located. [53:02]

5 Financial Review – Claudia / Viren

Viren began discussion of financial matters by reviewing his ten recommended revisions to current financial procedures under the following rubrics: 1) Hybrid Accounting System, 2) Financial Reporting Year, 3) Audit of Church Financial Records every 3 years, 4) Check Signing over \$10K, 5) Undesignated -Bequests, 6) Gifts in Memory of Someone, Donations, 7) Noncash, and Cryptocurrency donations, 8) Buy vs Lease Solar Panels, 9) Building Rooms Rental, 10) An equitable and efficient Budgeting Process. All these recommendations were set in the context of the existing TVUUC Finance Manual <<https://tvuuc.org/governance/Section7/PP01201.pdf>>

1) Up to now, the church has adhered to a cash accounting system. He recommended a shift to a hybrid accounting system, whereby extraordinarily large capital expenditures, such as the recently completed roofing,

be depreciated over the useful lifetime of the item, not treated as a cash item in a single fiscal year. Cash accounting for such items negatively distorts the true picture of church finances. He likened this to mortgages that are retired over an extended period of years, not expensed in a single year. His recommendation is that only expenses over \$10k for items with an extended life of over 5 years be treated in this manner. The hybrid accounting method is in use by many non-profits. Even if this change ultimately requires congregation approval, this is his recommendation. [56:43] Ken noted that the roof was immediately paid for through the SBA loan and asked how this would be affected by or treated in a hybrid accounting system. Viren noted that this large item in the income and expense statement (in commercial terms referred to as profit and loss) still impacts our operational finances, even though the roofing is completely paid off via the loan, and could lead to misunderstandings of our financial picture in the congregation. Future possible expenditures, such as a solar system, which would not be covered by the SBA loan, would need to be treated as a depreciable item. The integrity of financial procedures would still be maintained and, in fact, 95% of our budget would continue to be done on an annual cash basis. To illustrate his point, Viren referred to the December statement which shows an Actual expenditure of \$67,662.07 for Capital Maintenance where \$0 was budgeted. This huge discrepancy, which is the result of the cash accounting procedure, presents an unrealistically negative financial picture. Depreciation of such large capital asset expenditures provides a truer picture of church finances. Viren encouraged continued consideration and discussion of this recommendation he strongly endorses. [62:26] Speaking from his experience and understanding of accounting procedures, Bill asked who would benefit from this change. The church does not file taxes and does not report to investors, so who would care about this matter? Viren stated his belief that a discrepancy of the sort reported for December (\$67,662.07 ACTUAL vs. \$0 BUDGETED under cash accounting procedures) could easily cause concern in some members of the congregation, whereas treatment of such capital expenditures in terms of depreciable assets will be more easily understood. [64:42] Matthew expressed his view that, if the money actually expended is \$50,000, but only \$2500 is shown as a depreciation expense, then the congregation might also be confused, just as evidently some Board members were at this point. Viren thought that perhaps a few additional examples might help clarify this matter for the Board. [68:43] Bill suggested that it might be helpful for Viren to run two parallel presentations (cash basis vs. depreciation model) to help Board members (and ultimately church members) understand the benefits of this shift. [69:22] Referring to Linda's question about 'writing off' expenditures, Viren clarified that this was a technical term of accounting meant to provide for replacement of a depreciated item over the period, not 'writing off' of our Federal tax obligations, which we do not have. Linda restated this as a way to track our eventual need to replace an item decreasing in usefulness. Viren supplied the accounting term 'replacement value.' [72:04] Because our physical plant is subject to deterioration over time, the ability of the church to acknowledge this will increase over time and the depreciation model is one good way to do this.

2) Viren addressed his recommendation on the financial reporting year. The church currently runs on the fiscal year (July 1 to June 30), but most people, the IRS, and most payrolls, run on a calendar year (January 1 to December 31). When asked how this might affect other church operations, Claudia stated her support of Viren's recommendation for the following reasons: 1) our giving statements, which show half of one fiscal year and half of another, frequently confuse members, 2) all of our recent Treasurers have been tax experts, whose busiest time of the year — the period before April 15 — *exactly* coincides with the period when the church is constructing its budget. This causes obvious scheduling problems including especially delays and rushed completion of reports. Moving to a calendar year would shift our Stewardship Campaign to a start sometime in October with a congregational vote sometime in December. People working for institutions working on a fiscal year, e.g. UT, would already know their financial situation when pledging decisions are made, rather than having to predict in February what the state will decide on salaries in the following June. She recalled that TVUUC had changed from calendar year budgeting to fiscal year budgeting when Jenny Arthur was church

administrator and recommended conferring with her about the details. Recollection was that the transition involved a short-term, interim, six-month budget in the process. [75:55] Ken asked a couple 'mechanical' questions. First off, would the Annual Meeting be shifted to December, how might that conflict with the holidays, how would budget adoption fit into this schedule? Claudia noted she had had more a decade experience with calendar year budget at her previous church position. The annual budget meeting often is integrated into a celebratory holiday event at the end of November or beginning of December. Bill and Jeff asked how the shift of budget years would affect the terms of office of Board Members, which now run on a fiscal year basis. This question would likely fall to either Board action or congregational decision; both models exist, i.e. staggered Board memberships and budget years and coordinated Board memberships and budget years. Viren renewed his observation that continued consideration and discussion of this recommendation would be required because of the complex, long-term structural implications of these changes. [79:19]

3) On the matter of Periodic (3-year) Audit of Church Financial Records, Viren observed that hiring an outside CPA firm will in any case be very expensive and very time-consuming. It is also in the interest of the CPA firm to bill more time, adding to the already substantial costs. [80:02] In view of limited TVUUC resources and substantial costs, Viren recommends a peer review and audit by a comparable UU Church team. This could be an in or out of state UU Church that can come and look at our records and issue a report. The Board will pick the UU Church and could invite a team of two or three reviewers as guests, give them access to our records and issue an assessment and recommendations from their inspection and experience, as needed. Their familiarity with UU practices should streamline the process while still adding a layer of checks and balances. [81:03] Linda reminded the Board that there is a proposed by-law change regarding periodic five-year financial review and Viren assured the Board that his recommendation and the proposed by-law changes would be dealt with in concert and would provide opportunity for us to profit from the experience of other similar congregations elsewhere who have dealt with similar issues, possibly in a better way. Alice agreed that shared experience with other congregations could be useful, but recalled that this issue had been raised in the recent past. Matthew recalled that a Board Retreat at The Mountain two years ago had viewed review of this sort, while possibly useful, did not constitute an audit. She also noted that we must consider the attendant costs of inviting outside UU reviewers as our guests. Viren suggested that this process might be handled via ZOOM or another remote option. Bill recalled that we had done something similar when he was Church administrator in 2010 or thereabouts, when a person, possibly from the Oak Ridge congregation, came in, reviewed the records, filed a report with her assessment and recommendations, received a suitable honorarium, concluding the process. With 5 UU churches in our cluster to draw from and successful experience, he gave a general endorsement of this process. [85:12] Memories did not retain how this outside person had been identified, whether she had qualifications as a CPA or might have been a church administrator in another congregation. The inspection performed did not constitute a full-fledged CPA-type audit. [86:16]

In the interest of expediency and in response to a suggestion from Chris, Ryan proposed referring Viren's additional recommendations to the Executive Team or the Strategic Planning Committee for further examination and incorporation of input from various stakeholders. Viren agreed, noting that the Endowment Committee had offered input on treatment of undesignated bequests, non-cash contributions including even treatment of cryptocurrency (#5, #6, #7) and the Board consensus affirmed Ryan's proposal. [86:59] Ryan promised to move forward and keep the Board apprised of further actions by email. [88:06]

Viren then reviewed the December Financial Reports. Pledge and non-pledge contributions have increased. The Auction yielded just under \$20k, where no Auction income had been budgeted. Overall, revenues are up by ca. \$30k+ over budget expectations. Except for the capital maintenance on the roof, the remaining expenditures are within budget guidelines. Moving into calendar 2022, things are looking good. [89:43] In response to Jeff's question about ambulance costs in the budget, Chris clarified that the church was collecting funds to ship an

ambulance donated by the city to Africa. COVID had interrupted this process, which was now restarting. Claudia noted that this money was separate and independent, in a restricted account, and did not come from operating. [91:30] Mary asked if the increased revenue might result from pre-paying, lump sum payment or early paying of pledges and might later be balanced out by a reduced revenue stream. Claudia replied that this might be the case, but could provide no definitive detail. Claudia indicated that church members could access their giving records on REALM, but that she had prepared the calendar year giving statements to send out soon. [94:35]

6 Worship Committee Charter – Mark / Eddie

Discussion turned to Worship Committee Charter review. Mark reported 1) that few substantive changes in the were warranted, but that 2) the Charter currently posted on the Church website is way out of date. A subsequent version of the posted charter had been completed, but not signed off on. Elnora brought this latest, but unposted, version to the Committee. The only changes made in this document related to adoption of the Eighth Principle. [95:44] Under “I. Event/activity organization/coordination” Gordon Gibson’s recommended wording is “2. The Worship Committee, **in consultation with the Senior Minister, will recruit and train** worship coordinators to lead or assist in leading services”. Under “K. Direction and Control” the following word change was decided upon “ including the identification of any barriers, challenges, **or opportunities** that have arisen.” [96:33] Ken reported Linda’s help in looking on REALM for charters and information, but had unable to identify name of the members of the committees there. Mark acknowledged the necessity of an update, but identified these people as Worship Committee members: Chris Buice, Catherine Loya, Jametta Alston, Claudia Pressley, Mark Mohundro, Elnora Williams, Eddie Chin, David Asbury, Dr. Reginald Houze. Worship Committee reports to Program Council, which acts as a coordinating entity for all church programs. In further discussion on reporting channels and lines of authority, AB noted that clarifying these issues was the subject of his report and activities to be addressed in the upcoming Strategic Planning / TTF Update. [103:00]

Matthew moved, Linda seconded acceptance of the Worship Committee Charter (in blue) with the stipulation that additional minor changes might result after the review in April of all Charters.

=====

Tennessee Valley Unitarian Universalist Church	Charter: Worship Document No: Committee
Approved by:	President: Signature: Date: Ryan McBee
Approved by:	Chief of Staff: Signature: Date: Rev. Chris Buice

Revised by Worship Committee 11/2021

A. Purpose of the Charter

This charter describes the membership and responsibilities of the Worship Committee of TVUUC that will, in concert with the Senior Minister, develop and implement a year-round program of Sunday morning worship services.

B. Authority

The Worship Committee operates under the authority of the Leadership Team

C. Scope

The Worship Committee task is to provide assistance and input for the creation of excellent Sunday services, assisting the Senior Minister in implementing all plans, programs and activities for that purpose.

D. Membership

Membership in the Worship Committee is as follows

1. A chairperson selected from among the Committee's members.
 2. At least two other members of the congregation representing a blend of talents and points of view.
3. The Senior Minister, ex officio.
4. Additional members may be added on the recommendation of the chair and the senior minister.
5. Members will be chosen by the Leadership Team from a list of candidates suggested by the Senior Minister. Other candidates can be suggested by the Leadership Team in consultation with the Senior Minister.

E. Responsibilities of the Worship Committee-The Worship Committee is responsible and accountable to the Leadership Team for all aspects of the described activity including the following

1. a. The Worship Committee will assist the Senior Minister in planning year-round program of excellent Sunday services, consistent with budgetary constraints.
2. b. As a part of annual program development, the Committee and the Senior Minister will set goals to be attained during the year, and monitor their attainment.
3. c. The Worship Committee chair and the Senior Minister will prepare an annual report to be presented to the Board detailing Program accomplishments, including attendance data for Sunday morning worship.
4. d. The worship committee will be responsible for implementing the 8th Principle in our worship services, volunteer training, recruitment of speakers and other activities related to worship planning and implementation.

F. Budgeting/Funds Allocation

1. The Worship Committee will develop an annual budget request to be submitted to the Leadership Team which will review it and pass it on to the Board as part of the annual budget process. The budget will include the proposed costs for outside speakers.

G. Congregational Input

1. All members of the Worship Committee will be attentive to congregational comments regarding worship services, and pass those comments, favorable or otherwise, to the Senior Minister and Worship Committee when appropriate.
2. The Worship Committee will conduct a survey periodically to collect congregational opinions regarding the worship experience.

H. Policy Making

1. The Worship Committee will assist the Senior Minister in preparing policies and procedures that affect the implementation of the Worship Program, and will seek approval from the Board of Directors and the Executive Team as appropriate.

I. Event/activity organization/coordination

1. Worship Committee members will assist the Senior Minister in ensuring that all worship services and related activities are organized and implemented successfully. This means that members will need to take on occasional roles as worship coordinator and/or worship assistant.
2. The Worship Committee, with consultation with the Senior Minister, will recruit and train worship coordinators to lead or assist in leading services when the Senior Minister is on vacation, sabbatical or has a Sunday off.

J. Responsibilities of Worship Committee Members

1. To attend all meetings or, if unable to attend, inform the chairperson in advance. Arrive on time and be prepared for any previously assigned action items or assignments.
2. To participate in open and candid debate.
3. To accept assignments as necessary to advance the work of the Worship Committee
4. To speak in one voice outside of the Worship Committee meetings.

K. Direction and Control

1. The Worship Committee operates under the direction of the Leadership Team and, as such, will provide periodic updates as to progress including the identification of any barriers, challenges, or opportunities that have arisen.

L. Decision Making Process

1. The Worship Committee will use consensus as the primary decision-making method.
2. No critical decisions will be made without every member having the chance to provide input.

M. Meeting Frequency and Duration

1. The Worship Committee will generally meet monthly but can meet more or less frequently if it is deemed necessary.

=====

Before voting, additional discussion revealed that the

- changes to be voted on here were minor,
- the current charters and structure work reasonably well,
- no major objections to the proposed text were identified,
- the Program Council had requested that all committees update their charters, but
- few had done so, and
- often the only update needed was a change of the date of approval.

Motion carried. [112:49]

7 Strategic Planning / Technology Task Force (TTF) Update – AB Coleman [113:12]

AB reviewed the recent history of the UUA attempt mentioned by Mark to look at the big picture of denomination affairs. In this process, TVUUC is working more closely with the Southern Group in the UUA under the motto “Think Globally, Act Locally.” The Southern UUA Group is using the following model elements: develop healthy cultures to implement core programs and transform society. To implement a healthy culture these things are needed: core values and principles, a covenant, mission statement, vision, strategic planning and goal setting. The TTF is working to facilitate these aspects by applying system thinking and faith development. To this end, the task force proposed looking at core programs, charters and bylaws with specific emphasis on worship programs, fellowship, religious education, justice making, and small group ministry. In combination, the theory is that this will help implement transformational programs to reshape community. He summarized the results of a survey he had sent out to the Board. The four responses he received were very good and consistent with his already formulated thinking. Specifically, the church should establish smart objectives, state clear lines of authority and responsibility with deadlines to ensure completion of tasks, develop a system of progress reporting to track success with quarterly reports to the Board on these items. Consistent engagement between leaders and staff will ensure that all activities support the mission. Just during COVID, more visible outreach is necessary. Reinvigorated efforts are needed increase candidness in leadership activities and to engage the congregation in the stated goals. Focus on doing fewer things better is important. [118:35] He incorporated survey feedback into the Mission Canvass statement by **BOLDING** items identified as most important and *italicizing* items with more than one vote as shown:

Key Input Stakeholders (A.) 1. East Tennessee Unitarian Universalist Cluster 2. The Unitarian Universalist Association (UUA) 3. Local area donors and foundations .	Key Activities (B.) 1. Pastoring and providing pastoral care 2. Educating and actively promoting social justice 3. <i>Motivating commitment and involvement of congregation in move to hybrid church and implementation of the eighth principle</i> 4. Providing religious education and youth development 5. Promoting social justice and volunteerism 6. Providing spiritual and personal growth including opportunities to eliminate racism and oppression 7. Developing staff and church leadership Key Resources (C.) 1. <i>Technology that facilitates effective presentations, collaborative communications, accountability, and ease of use given evolving restrictions</i> 2. Virtual music program that provides inspiration and supports sermon and allows maximum participation by choir members 3. Staff members that are knowledgeable, welcoming, good listeners and problem solvers 4. Good Governance that provides and maintains focus.	Mission (E.) 1. A welcoming community that nurtures spiritual growth and challenges people to transform the world through acts of love and justice 2. A religious community where people of all faiths can find common ground and feel empowered to work for the common good 3. An atmosphere/culture that fosters creativity, authenticity, and tolerance 4. A virtual or public health compliant community center meeting place that facilitates connectivity, cooperation, collaboration, and spirituality 5. A strong commitment to welcoming and supporting LGBTQ+/TGQNB communities, people of color, women, and others that are systemically oppressed	Mission Recognition (F.) 1. Increasing community awareness of congregational activities and programs offered through virtual and public health compliant meeting spaces 2. Increasing congregation awareness of Senior Minister participation in social action, community projects, and other activities 3. Facilitating involvement with civic action groups through actively informing the community of participation opportunities 4. Actively promoting Religious Education (Youth and Adult) 5. Distributing church message through social media, video/pod casting, and newsletters	Focus Stakeholders (G.) 1. Ensure the ability to meet the needs and expectations of members and donors through persistent communications and feedback 2. Attract more people of all ages, ethnicities, religious backgrounds, and social/economic status to participate through virtual channels 3. Encourage/mentor more young people to participate in church leadership 4. Include children in all plans for future priorities especially reopening.
Cost Structure (Efficiency) (D.) Budget 1. Staffing resource support and compensation equity 2. Technology updates, management, and training 3. Building and Grounds maintenance/improvement 4. Supplies, books, curricular materials, etc. for Programs 5. UUA Fair Share Dues		Income Streams (Growth) (H.) Budget 1. Increase pledges and offerings (stewardship campaigns, fundraising events, online giving, share the plate, etc.) by emphasizing benefits and opportunities for service provided by the church to members and the community 2. Auction, Book, and Rummage sales 3. Outside Donations, Outside Fundraising Events, Grants, etc.		

TVUUC Mission Canvas Version 6 **Bold** and *Italicized* bullets reflect TVUUC Boards highest priorities.

The four top priorities identified in this way were: B3, C1, F1, G1. [119:52] In response, Board responses noted how well these priorities conformed with the overall plan as well as with other informal feedback received from the congregation and with ongoing changes in technology affecting our operations. AB affirmed that this consistency even stretches back to statements of past years prior to this process. [120:40]

From these results, he presented for discussion a ‘first cut ’of Board goals that will eventually result in ‘smart goals’ for the church as follows. He emphasized that this first cut provides a basis for discussion and does not purport to be ready for final adoption.

Proposed TVUUC Board Goals (First Cut)

1-Document and present to board staff development and performance plans to ensure staff has the skills, tools, and motivation to meet the needs and expectations of key stakeholders consistent with Mission Canvass-G1


- Who - Executive Team supported by Strategic Planning Committee

2- Develop technology infrastructure to facilitate Mission Canvass-C1

- Who - Technology Task Force supported by TVUUC Staff

3- Ensure that TVUUC website provides awareness of activities and programs and that the church building spaces provide an inviting environment for hybrid programs and staff productivity consistent with Mission Canvass-F1

- Who - Executive Team, Technology Task Force, and Staff

4-Implement **Yammer**  to act as primary social engagement platform to supplement **Facebook** as means to discuss, provide feedback, give examples for TVUUC's Core Values (Principles}, Covenant, Mission, Vision, Strategic Plan, and Goals consistent with Mission Canvass-B3

- Who - Technology Task Force guided by The Sustainable Strategies Team

5-Create a Shared Vision to incorporate into TVUUC website, intranet, and bylaws that supports TVUUC MC

• Who - Senior Minister and Board President

Chris noted on **Point 1** that many of the skills that had proved necessary in this COVID year would have been completely unpredictable from past experience, so ongoing revision and reexamination as foreseen here will remain essential. On **Point 2**, Jeff suggested that changes in technology infrastructure could have financial consequences and that Viren should probably be integrated into these discussions. Alice cautioned that adoption of any technological changes and innovations should be done in such a way that the less tech savvy congregation members not be left behind, lose familiar and valued avenues of communication or be cut off from church affairs by a newer technology. AB noted that the TTF proposals only add a firewall and other capabilities, but do not remove any currently functioning system. Further discussion brought out that a balance between 'traditional and familiar' and 'new and enhanced' needs to be struck given the limitation of resources any organization faces. [127:05] Viren raised the point he had identified in his report for AB's attention: technology driven non-cash and cryptocurrency donations. He believes this represents a trend that we should be aware of in current deliberations and plans and asked AB to look into a company that manages such donations for churches. On **Point 3**, AB informed the Board that a new TVUUC website will be run parallel to the existing website for people to consult, comment upon and help develop before the new one goes live. Also, an internal church website will be developed to achieve the stated goals. His recent visit to the church with Bill revealed that during COVID some church workspaces had become too cluttered for efficient functioning, for which reason he included Executive Team and Staff to be integrated into achieving this goal. [130:05] Linda observed, and AB agreed, that this first cut focused on technology, but that Ministry, Programs and Resource Development ultimately also need to be addressed. On **Point 4**, AB reported that the Yammer platform in the Microsoft family was introduced to support social networking and interaction, but, unlike Facebook, remains private within the TVUUC community as a means to facilitate discussion on our UU mission and goals. Ryan noted that his personal distancing from Facebook had led to a sense of disconnect, stating that church-wide discussion of how we preserve a sense of togetherness by social media was increasingly necessary. Chris confirmed that fewer people have been coming to virtual services via Facebook and more via YouTube. One value of Yammer, AB noted, is that it is already available and does not require researching another, possibly unproven, unfamiliar product. Additional goal conversation will be needed, for example, for decisions on the Eighth Principle. Ken welcomed the idea of parallel websites in the adoption process and for Yammer demonstrations to facilitate shifting to that platform. Matthew suggested that the word 'communication' appear somewhere in the First Cut statement since the technology was in fast intended to foster communication. Discussion concluded with expressions of thanks to AB and consensus that his First Cut suggestions serve as a basis for further work.

8 Adjournment

The discussion having come to an end, Ryan declared the meeting to be adjourned at 8:51 pm. [145:21]

Respectfully submitted,

Jeff Mellor, Clerk-Secretary