

MISSION DESIGN MEETING
Notes - March 22, 2003
Portland, Oregon

In Attendance:

Barbara Borkowski - Seattle Stake President
Brad Shumate - Westside Regional Administrator
Bill McFarlin - Region Financial Officer

Alaska: (Brad Shumate and Bill McFarlin representing Alaska)

Seattle:	Southern Oregon	Evangelists:
Bob Coleman	John Campbell	Marge & Tore Nilsen
Stan Corrington	Bob Dobkins	Recorder:
Liza deGuzman	John Wigle	Elva Eliason
Steven Pomeroy	Southwest Washington:	
Stacie Simmons Bates	John Berger	
Northwest Oregon	Jim Erlandson	
Leon Fuhrman	Netta Groat	
Janelle Jeggli		
John Stephens		

Welcome:

Barbara Borkowski opened the meeting, speaking to the ongoing process taking place: the spirit of unity and desire to become more than what we have been prevailing throughout the process. Barb conducted a short worship service with each district represented with a prayer.

Consensus - A decision making model:

Jim Erlandson presented a written (see Attachment #1) and verbal explanation of consensus and how it can be used as a model for decision making. Mission centers will deal with many issues: possibly feelings of disenfranchisement; needing resources; shrinking of people who attend conferences; shrinking of people willing to participate; moving from being an exclusive to an inclusive, from a unique to a cooperate, from an apologist to an innovative organization. There is a need to find new ways to bring about change and our mission. Good work has been done in developing a consensus model; now need to make that an ongoing model.

Meeting Ground Rules:

Cards, green for "yes," yellow for "could support but not ready to vote yes," and red for "can't support," were to be used to determine consensus. Displaying a red or yellow card required an explanation for why full support was not possible.

Learn to deal with passions: need to feel safe in expressing passions and need to respect each other's passions.

Parking lot: A "parking lot" list would be developed of those items that could not be dealt within the time constraints of this meeting, but were worthy of further discussion at a later time. (See Attachment #2)

Timeline: A timeline to be established to keep all on task.

Avoid judging: Allow others their opinions without judgement.

Listen: Listen to each other carefully.

Mission Center Concept:

The advent of Mission Centers came from the adoption of church Bylaws as presented by the President. The Mission Center format has been successful in other areas. A fluid structure is needed. Final decisions come from the World Church Leadership Council. Feeling of all the people needs to be represented at all times. Need to look at what was important about what we have been -- the paramount question asked during congregational meetings where values were identified.

Timelines:

Seattle completed the values work in June; developed a task force that met in September through December. The Region held values sessions from September to January 2003. In January 2003 a cross jurisdictional meeting was held to identify the number of Mission Centers. The number of mission centers and their boundaries, along with the outcomes of the values summary went out to the congregations on February 9, 2003. On March 10-11 stake and region leaders met to create a draft proposal for review by a design team. The current March 22 meeting began the design for the proposed Mission Center. Reunions and camps this summer will allow for more discussion. The hope is to submit a final draft in August.

Name:

The version-title for the draft proposal was "Chinook Mission Center." Final proposal submission will contain a name that is reflective of our geography.

Draft - Field Organization Proposal Guidelines and Format:

Westside Regional Administrator Brad Shumate conducted a review of Version 1 of the draft. The draft was corrected on-screen following consensus on each section.

Input during introduction:

Regional assessments - enrollment doesn't show attendance or support from congregational members. The old model was being told what to do - now need to get permission before enacting. Two facets - determining when it was the best way to go and when should go out and ask for more input. (Parking lot issue: Need calendar and scheduling missionwide.)

Section III - Key Learnings and Issues Raised - B.

Clusters will not be imposed on others - will be able to choose.
Clusters can be organic; or for a need.
Clusters could expand away from the geographic to a communicative email site for instance.
Talk about differences - need to reflect on similarities as well.
How do we deal with togetherness and differences.
Starting out with "disposition" of campgrounds creates an immediate negative response.

Section IV - Promotion of Mission:

Financial Officer Bill McFarlin spoke of the creation of a new environment where there would be the need to cultivate the attitudes of a healthy self-image. There are resources available to help with that process. (Parking lot issues: Building esteem in congregations and involvement of the 70.) It was noted that facilitating visiting ministry and facilitating elders to function as ministers of mission were important elements. All priesthood should be involved but there would be a need to hold up the elder in the office of ministers of mission. All these elements need to be written down so that they can be transferred into the Mission Center culture. There will not be a "flip of a switch" in January; there is a need to continue to do what we are doing now. There is also the need to have something measurable.

Input:

Need to point out that reconciliation ministries need to be done; everybody is not going to be satisfied with the final decision so need to work with everyone.
More visits in the congregations are needed so that people's concerns can be acknowledged.
Emerging identities: perhaps Evangelists should be included as part of the congregation visits and the reconciling ministries. (Parking lot issue: Including Evangelists)

Section IV- Promotion of Mission - Input (Continued)

Everyone: those who want to be part of decisions, those who want to be told, congregations wanting to do their own thing; want them to feel empowered to be a part of the Mission Center.

Need to want ownership in something more than congregationwide - to think of the partnership with the mission center.

Some smaller congregations, the marginal people, might get left out if they don't have critical mass and resources, need to communicate with them. Include this in the piece of congregations sharing with poorer congregations.

Need to be sensitive to not make the format sound top down. Congregations know what they need - need to respond to their needs.

A specialized ministry to seniors is a growing need; many congregations are primarily senior and they have the contact/history with the community. (Parking lot issue - senior ministries)

IV-B:

An explanation of the "Sharing Goal" is needed early on. (Parking lot issue - develop an explanation of the Sharing Goal as an attachment.)

Section V - Structural Recommendations - D - Leadership Team

Staffing: Westside Regional Administrator Brad Shumate reported that Apostle McLaughlin's recommendation is that Barbara Borkowski will serve as Mission Center president. That will be the recommendation presented to the World Church Leadership Council which makes the final decision. Intent has been to align people with their passions: Barb's is in the administration of the church; Brad Shumate's in the health of the congregations. Bill McFarlin will serve both the East and the West side as Financial Officer if the Leadership Council approves.

Staff Roles:

Financial Officer - everyday financial piece would seem the logical item to pull from the financial officer's duties. Routine items should be handled by someone else so they don't keep the FO from the administrative role. Data input into Shelby is time consuming. MIS access would be part of what the FO would do as well as an annual audit of all congregations. At this time there is no plan for counselors to the Financial Officer.

Mission Center President - will have a knowledge of where the funds are throughout the Center - expenditures would be the same type as the regional Council considers.

Other Roles:

Mission Center coordinator will be a voluntary role.

Proposed assignments of Congregational Supporting Ministers were provided.

Perhaps a pastor or two will serve in that capacity. Probability of staff, excluding volunteers, will be 1 to 13 congregations. The listed CSM assignments are based on a 1-9 congregations which is the current staffing. Administrative line will be the pastor, Mission Center President and then the Field Apostle. The pastor will determine if there is a need to go to the Mission Center President.

Staff reductions considered represent 25% of the field administrators, to include the T-2000 people; some of whom are jointly funded.

What is wanted is the staffing as it is now as that is vital to the success of the Mission Center, but World Church makes that decision. Have to find ways to make this model work between what we know now and what might happen.

There is no priority assignment list set up - will probably draw on volunteers as support ministries.

Guest ministers are the kind of people who could provide ministry at the district level.

Those volunteers would become a staff person for the mission center and would receive reimbursements.

Communications will be part of the design. Probably will need a communications coordinator position and the Mission Center President would decide on who and where placed.

Section V-E - moved to later in the agenda.

Section V-F: Proposed Council Structure: Council members would be appointed. Counselors would have to be sustained by vote of conference. Number of counselors would be 7 - a deliberate choice to keep the group small: 3 from Oregon, 3 from Washington, 1 from Alaska.

A council of pastors, as a second advisory body, was suggested. Other councils might be a camping council, a reunion council. (Parking lot issue - Council of Pastors; other councils for leadership needs.) World Church guidelines indicate there should be one official "council" and the others advisory groups. Some language guidelines are needed so that all are talking about the same thing. (Parking lot issue - language as would be needed in a corporal structure.)

Section V-I: Funding:

Financial Officer Bill McFarlin noted that it is helpful to identify the challenges and opportunities of funding for the mission of the church. Numerical hurdles alone can be intimidating. As the church grows and develops, more mission centers will be needed. Challenges seem brutal in the time of downturn of economy and of war, all of which impact the world church monetary status. At the time where we should be excited about new opportunities, we are looking at staff cuts at the same time we need the support of more fulltime ministry. Challenge is how can we respond to that financial need in the midst of this uncertainty.

Full-time ministers are wanted but congregations would have to provide an estimated \$65,000 yearly at a time when we must deal with declining members and declining financial contributions. We have functioned in the past without paid staff; probably will in the future. There are a host of services and ministries to support. We need to respond with the sharing of our witness and resources. We must decide what our response will be.

Budget: Barbara Borkowski presented a possible budget that was developed, noting that challenges can be overcome just by coming up with solutions. She also noted that the biggest land mine is where our current differences are. The proposed budget is based on values that were heard from both the Stake and the Region. The budget document is a cascading document -- what changes at the front will affect the last of it and so it can be used to help us understand how budget changes are reflected in our assessments or allocations.

Input:

Home offices are a possibility, but need to note that home offices will have home expenses.

Seed money for Reunions might be needed. (Parking lot issue - seed money for reunions.)

A program for encouraging and supporting participation in Interfaith groups was needed. (Parking lot issue - Finances for participating in Interfaith groups.)

Strategy will be 60% local; 40% World Church. May see that there will be less going to World Church; need to find out how that strategy will work.

People will ask if we are going to see 3 times the service if we have to give that much more.

We have to demonstrate that something is happening or we will have further problems.

Funding Options: Need to look at funding programs like the Interfaith commitments with other funds, such as grants. (Parking lot issue - searching out other funds.)

Best place to save money is in the office area: farm out copy work, obtain donated office space or look for inexpensive office space in other church buildings.

We have a public image to project; that shows if we have a physical space.

Rarely have outside community in the church offices but it does give a sense of presence to the community.

Still need to look at grant programs, particularly for the training of youth in peace and justice.

Perhaps some of the volunteer positions would be tied to writing the grants.

Section V-I - Funding - Options (Continued):

Spending Down Option: A strategy could be using the earnings off of the corpus, choosing to spend down some of the corpus over a 1-2 year period and at the same time hope to phase in the congregations at a higher giving level; then over the years it would build the corpus back up again.

Funding accumulated by the dedication of the Saints that came before - it is a fiscal responsibility to maintain those funds and pass those funds on down to the children of tomorrow. Need to be paying for the services we are requesting rather than spending down what we have.

Like the idea of spending down, with the idea that we do it planning to rebuild the principal.

Could spend down 6 months worth; return the bulk of it and that would help with the transition.

Missionary Allocation: Why only \$2,000 for all the missionary work? Answer: Many of the missionary events will support themselves. The \$2,000 would be just for missionary quests but probably other monies to use for that. Ultimately the Mission Center conference will adjust the figures on this and everything we see on the budget.

Rationale for increased costs: What can I give my district as a rational explanation about the increased cost? You may have a person to write grants, but this first budget we have to pay for. It is probably in the funding of personnel because we are picking up funding for 3 or 4 people, instead of paying for 1 person we are now paying our part of 4. Answer: The cost is shared across the board for the whole Mission Center. These positions have been paid for by the donations that people have done - it hasn't come from the operating side of individual budgets, it has been from other gifts. Need to bring all of that into paying the costs for us to do business in the mission centers.

Talking Points:

Whatever budget goes before the conference, we need to create talking points. How can we as body and mass come to consensus, how to explain legitimately and truly if the ratio of staff goes down -- that isn't going to sell very well - need those talking points that are truth that we can present to them? I support what we are doing but my congregation will look at the additional dollars. Answer: If you present a picture of what has been paid for all along, it is really not costing more. What doesn't show is that aside from what have been operating budgets has been the giving we have had from others. Also the current economy has messed up the ratios. As we talk about money always having been there, we need to speak to the need to share equitably all of these costs. Perhaps a third line in there is generosity, it is the generous giving in the past that has made a difference. (Parking lot issue - Talking points to legitimately present budget.)

Networks:

Financial Officer Bill McFarlin spoke to the way we get connected in networks and relationships. There is a need to study the way we get together as stakes, as districts, how will that happen in the future. We may be looking at clusters. It can be studied sociologically; someone looking through on-line networks; using some mathematical modeling for some of the groups; who do we get together; find intentional ways to get together. Groups without a strong reason to get together don't have much longevity. This will be a great opportunity to establish new relationships and it will go beyond geographical areas. Need to look at how we can create communities in other ways; how can a mission center create those communities. It is an opportunity to create congregations deciding where they are going and how will we get there. We need to rethink why we get together; about getting together to empower each other as a mission. The warm fuzzy thing is good but we need to get to the more important elements as we think of our clusters.

Input:

We can find those different communities within and without our own building and in outside unchurched people as well.

Need training. (Parking lot issue - Training on how to get to the outside community.)

A resource is Dennis A. Romig's book "Side by Side Leadership - Achieving Outstanding Results Together."

Mission Design Meeting
March 22, 2003
Page Six

Next Meeting:

Stake President Barbara Borkowski closed the meeting noting that the group needs to meet again to finish the design proposal review; to have more time on scenarios for a budget beyond the glimpse that was presented at this meeting; some procedural items; how we will do our camping and reunions; explore how we will operate if we don't have a district treasurer; and all the items on the parking lot list.

Barb called for a consensus vote on whether or not to have another face-to-face meeting or conference calls. Consensus was another face-to-face meeting. An effort should be made to have the same group return. However, as that probably would not be possible, what was agreed upon at this meeting would go forward to Apostle McLaughlin as a partially completed review. The complete draft has to be submitted by the first of August with a target date of submitting it earlier by the first of June. April 19, 2003 was set as the next meeting date. Region staff will secure a meeting place.

Confidentiality:

The meeting process and subject can be shared with congregations; the actual paperwork and discussions are to be held confidential until the final proposal can be released.

Closing:

Evangelists Marge and Tore Nilsen closed the meeting requesting attendees to take this process back to their congregations, stating the reason they are willing to move forward to the mission and committing to help each congregation live our their mission. Each attendee gave a closing statement expressing their hopes and commitments. Tore gave the final blessing.

HANDOUTS

Handouts at the meeting included the following:

Field Organization Proposal - March 2003, Version 0.1

Worship Service Program

Western Field Staff Model

Chinook MC Proposal listing of congregations with congregational number and membership amounts

Congregational Supporting Ministers recommended assignments

Draft Budget dated 3/20/03

Elva J. Eliason
3/28/03

**ATTACHMENT #1
Mission Design Meeting
March 22, 2003**

A SIMPLE EXPLANATION OF CONSENSUS

Consensus decision making is

a decision made after all aspects of an issue, positive and negative, are heard, acknowledged and considered. Everyone openly understands and agrees to support and implement the decision.

Consensus decision making does not

mean that everyone agrees on the best possible decision, but that they can support the decision reached, and do not feel they are compromising their ethics, values, or interests in doing so.

STEPS TO REACHING CONSENSUS:

1. **Define the decision** to be made. This can be done by simply stating the purpose of the decision and alternatives available.
2. **Thorough investigation** of the issue *and attitudes and perspectives, either by committee or individually. Gather all information needed to consider all the angles.
3. **Engage in open discussion** of the issue, with full participation by all members. Every member should be invited to express his/her position and reasons for it. **Leader needs to pull out input from all, including those reticent to express opinions.
4. **Make a team decision** that everyone can support, not simply voting for a majority opinion. ***May feel you could live with it, but might not vote for it.
5. **Implement and support** the decision as a team. Once made, everyone on the team must take ownership for the decision and do all they can to see that it is successfully implemented.

* **, ***: Added during meeting.

**ATTACHMENT #2
Mission Design Meeting
March 22, 2003**

PARKING LOT ISSUES:

1. Mission Center challenge of calendar and schedule coordination
2. Evangelists assist with providing reconciliation ministries and healing with individuals/congregations in transition
3. Building esteem in congregations/involvement of the 70
4. Getting elders functioning as ministers of mission
5. Visiting ministry facilitated
6. Summary document re: proposal for sharing with congregations
7. Add senior ministries to slide presentation for staff model
8. Council of pastors, possibly several councils for leadership needs.
9. Ideas for language to use - i.e. setting up Remote as corporation
10. Seed money for reunions
11. Programs to encourage congregations to participate in interfaith organizations
12. Look into getting grants for some programs, especially for youth
13. Talking points to legitimately present budget
14. Training for people to learn how to meet people outside our church community