

CENTRAL TRI-DEANERY MEETING NOTES
AUGUST 5, 2006
ALL SAINT'S WATSONVILLE

APPROXIMATE ATTENDANCE: 35 representing 10 churches from the deaneries

SPEAKERS: NANCY COHEN, KEN WRATTEN, GEORGE LOCKWOOD, DAVID BREUER

David Breuer opened with prayer at 10:15am. David continued with opening remarks and talked about the Guidelines for the Forum that included presentations on the pros and cons for the Mission Model (presented by Ken Wratten) and the Shared Structure (presented by Nancy Cohen). Each presenter was given 10 minutes to present their structure, followed by a presentation by George Lockwood of common themes shared by both structures.. A summary of these presentations can be found in the PowerPoint presentation used during the talks, and several handouts that were available.

The following questions, answers and comments followed the presentations:

- Q: Will the committee recommend one of the 2 structures? A: NO
- Q: When will changes be decided regarding the need to re-write the constitutions and canons in October of 2007? A: Convention 2006 will decide most things, so that changes to canons can begin.
- Q: Since delegates to convention under the Mission model would be 175 people – some would be involved in Convocation, some in governance and administrative functions, and some from Convocations would be on the Great Commission Council (GCC). Does this overburden some, and leave some people out if they are not elected? There is a concern that a lot of people in the pews will not really be involved. A: These people could work on committees of the Convocations and GCC.
- Q/C: Are ASA numbers the fairest way to determine how many delegates a congregation can have and why can't the congregations determine what deanery makes most sense for them to be a part of? A: It was determined by the committee that this was the most accurate reflection on the real numbers of active members.
- Good Shepherd in Salinas is better placed in the Salinas Valley Deanery.
- QC: The first step is whatever the convention decides will determine how many deaneries there will be, and then why not let the congregations determine which deanery to be a part of? There should be a minimum of 2 delegates per church.
- C: There would be better accountability to combine the Salinas Valley and South Coast Deaneries. The deaneries should have a say in this, too.
- C: St. Philip's in Scotts Valley not a good idea – should stay in Santa Cruz Deanery. Santa Cruz does more with Salinas people than those in Morgan Hill or Gilroy. A: A member of St. Philip's suggested their being in Santa Clara.
- Q/C: Leave it to the deaneries to decide how to arrange themselves. Don't impose this decision from the top down. Form by mutual consent? A: One

- problem is the one on the outside being left out and the difficulty of some deaneries making decisions that affect other deaneries.
- C: ASA should be used but not an absolute. People lie about ASA. Baptized members are lied about, too.
- Likes ASA as a qualifying measure of precise membership.
- C: Viability of different deaneries is as good as the leadership. Need to be sure all deaneries are vital. A/C: In the Mission model, it raises the bar for involvement due to decision making and funding. Money going back to convocation is a lure to participate and be viable. 3 deaneries make more sense than 5 or the present 7.
- C: Likes ASA – make sure it is correct. Make it “pledging units” and include numbers for youth.
- C: Some missions have very few or no pledging units due to cultural reasons.
- Q: What about accountability in each model? A: Mission model – brings a corporate culture and ideas by identifying metrics for measurement. The GCC will define metrics and periodically review for signs of health and growth. Policies and procedures must be discerned to determine what are best practices. Newcomer retention rate is an example of a measurable success. The Canon will be a part of the GCC to help determine if we are following our vision and if it is a prophetic witness – driven by the Bishop. A: Shared model – has similarities to the Mission model with Council/Corporation oversight with checkpoints along the way.
- C: Need a clear organization chart with clear lines of authority.
- C/Q: Mission model – 3 deaneries have responsibilities for programs. In the Traditional Model, responsibilities same as today, but encourage projects and programs. Need a critical mass in each deanery for Mission model to work. A: Visiting consultants to ECR say some deaneries work well, others don’t (by their experience in other dioceses). A: If the deaneries don’t work, shut them down and merge them with another that does work.
- C: Concerned that deaneries will not work because it takes more time than working people can invest. A: Should be dependent on activity level. (Response: if deanery work interferes with other things, the deanery work will be dropped – not considered a priority).
- C: SLO Deanery is tightly structured and works well. South Valley too big. Questions how they work or don’t. Until more people are in the pews, deaneries will meet and continue to just tread water.
- C: Leadership style and gifts of a new bishop are important to us. Are the 2 structures requiring a different type of Bishop for one or both? A: Both need to be collaborative/horizontal management – need great communicator and ability to work with others with diverse opinions. All agree it may be a matter of degree between the 2 models with the mission model needing a Bishop who will give up more control with less involvement in the programs of the diocese.
- C: Both models need a Bishop who is collaborative and has a servant leadership style.
- Q: Shared model – Are deaneries encouraged to take on mission programs funded by the diocese? A: You will need to apply to Council/Corp. at a time

certain for a grant – coming from an existing line item in the budget that is approved by Convention. Council must find ways to encourage and market so people apply for grants.

- Q: Does the diocese do this or do the deaneries find ways to fund projects? A: Unless there are line item funds available, the diocese does not have endowments to fund many projects. The deaneries would have to work with the diocese to find funding. Projects for which there is no budget would have to be planned far enough in advance to be included in a budget proposal presented to Convention
- C: It was mentioned that St. John's in Capitola has a good example of shared ministry between their rector and laity of the congregation - regardless of the diocesan structure. We need good lines of communication.
- C: It may be that certain projects will need to be put on hold and not funded at a specific time. It was mentioned that in the past, deaneries were sources of creativity for funding projects.
- C: We are presently under funded – we are in a deficit situation with funds and people resources in a minimum. We need to understand the needs of people. Hispanics are not represented at this meeting. Growth is not balanced in the areas of people and finances.
- C: Comment on highly endowed east coast dioceses that could fund many programs.
- Q: What does this diocese do for outreach? A: One program is SMUM/
- Q: Will committee members for the Shared. Model come from the Council/Corp.? A: No, from the greater diocese.
- C: Good governance is critical for success.

There was a break for lunch and a short presentation was made on 4 funding formulae by David Breuer (see presentation made and handouts). David mentioned that this was not a meeting to talk about specific line items in the budget – only the formulae. The following are questions/answers/comments:

- C: Column A (10% formula) – not a lot of funds available for programs and missions or to go back to convocations/deaneries.
- C: David spoke to the National Church assessment being reduced by Council and an intention to submit a restoration plan to the Natl. Church. The reserve for shortfall was reduced, and all 4 budgets preserve existing diocesan office staff positions.
- C: There is a typo on the last column – it should be 20% instead of 22%.

There was a lengthy discussion on the issue of reducing the National Church Assessment with pros and cons being aired. The asking of the National Church is 21%; the national diocesan average of giving is 11%. ECR is first diocese to suggest a restoration plan; others have just reduced their giving. It will be made clear that this reduction has no connotation of any disagreement with the Episcopal Church.

- Q: What will we be voting on at our convention in October? A: a) Which structure to have (Mission, Shared, or Status Quo); b) Which of the 4 formulae to

use; c) Final budget for 2007 – only the budget related to the chosen formula will be debated. A specific proposal in a and b will need a majority vote to pass so multiple ballots are possible.

There was a discussion of whether or not 10+ proponents will give advance notice of any proposals they make at this Convention. A: Although they have voiced their plan to present a proposal, no information to date has been forwarded from them to DESC, the BAC, or Council.

Q: Will Council make a recommendation on which formula to adopt? A/C Council will meet again on August 17. How many think Council should make a recommendation? A: 3.

There were several questions for clarification.

- C: Need to make sure we have enough time at convention to do a good job.
- C: Concern that the budget is the last item on the agenda for convention.
- C: A narrative budget will be available in September.
- C: We will vote on the structure first, formula second, and budget 3rd at convention.
- C: It would be good to have the top of each of the budget formula columns labeled A,B,C,D.

After thank you's the meeting was adjourned at 1:15pm.