

CALVARY LUTHERAN CHURCH COUNCIL
Special Meeting- September 19, 2017
6:30 p.m.

Members Present: Craig Anderson, Rick Bode, Thomas Bonhiver, Jim Borowick, Paul Carlson, Washington Castillo, Rich Graversen, Dan Hanson, Marisa Houghland, Heather Hosfield, Sondi Johnson, Tim Johnson, Dave Kufal, Cory Maass, Scott Madson, Susan Mork, Christine Olkives, Steven Opheim, Connie Otto, Lisa Paulson, Mary Jo Peterson, Craig Recknagel, Lisa Reesnes, Carol Rudd, John Swanson, Steve Thompson

Staff Present: Jerry Gates, Jason Beaver, Pastors Jason Roton, Dave Gleasne, Carol Skjegstad, and Skip Reeves

Members Absent: Susan Bagge, Alan Dewey, Pete Duelo, Rosealba Hernandez, Anne Kaluza, Suzanne Kersten, Philip Nelson,

Other members present: Mick Lee, Todd Loncorich, and John Russo (Governance Committee)

Devotions:

- Heather Hosfield

Welcome of Pastor Dave

- John Swanson: There will be a “Happy Hour” hosted by the search committee before our September 26th meeting, starting at 6pm. Please come early to celebrate.

Purpose of this meeting is to discuss the Governance proposal presented last month

- Instructions given by Dave Kufahl
- Clarification of reason for request not to discuss with congregation. It is not meant to be secretive, instead it was meant to improve discussion at this meeting and future communication with the congregation once a decision is made.
- Overview of where this is in this process of the requested change from council
 - This is one of six points where this committee is choosing to bring to council for approval.
- Charter: Council created an implementation committee to formalize the organizational structure and constitutional changes necessary to transition the Calvary Council to a Board of Directors model (ranging between 10-12 members) that would relentlessly pursue Calvary’s mission and priorities. The newly formed committee will draft necessary constitutional changes and guidelines to implement a Board of Directors model, for review and approval by the Council and ultimately the congregation at a later date.
- This would likely not be completed until the annual meeting 2018, currently we are asking council members to provide input

- This is not a discussion about whether a 33 member council works, instead it is related whether we can do it better, whatever the size is.
- Thank you for everyone that sent out feedback via email. It has been helpful to start this discussion
- Ground rules:
 - Be respectful.
 - Respect for time, please keep comments to 3-5 minutes
- 75% approval only includes those council members in attendance tonight.

Brief overview of how we got here

- Overview of the process given by Todd Loncorich
- In 2012: a few council members at that time had a frustrating year, approached the EC to form a committee to look at the current governance structure.
 - They were chartered to “fix council” or come up with a new model (focused only on the what- not how)
- In 2013: the committee completed high level research, internal (staff and lay) and external (church similar to our size)
- In 2014: The committee:
 - Interviewed internal and external contacts
 - Communicated to the congregation
 - Came up with two structure possibilities from the charter
- In 2015: the committee gave two options to council at that time, improve the current model (keeping 33 members) or change council structure (to a smaller number)
 - Council voted to change structure (consisting of 11) and created the implementation committee
- Implementation Committee Overview
 - Overview given by Jim Borowick
 - This is the first step of six. The approval tonight wasn’t in the charter, is about working through the changes of the constitution and bylaws.
 - The recommendation includes
 - 11-member council
 - 4 year terms
 - Changes to nominating process
 - Changes to selection officers
 - What does success look like? Why the change to council?
 - These changes are expected to add more agility and continuity to council. It will allow for better management of those willing to serve on council, clarifying roles and responsibilities of key players in the church.
 - We are looking for 75% approval from this council
 - We need the support of this council to move forward as this has required a lot of work to get to this point, as well as

the nature of this change. It will be a large group effort if approved to start moving to the next step.

- The congregation does have final approval

Council Discussion

- Steven Opheim: Created a document that was sent out last week to council. It was created after 2 years of work of listening and talking with members at Calvary. Music and Worship were changed without approval by the council. Instead this large change was decided by a smaller group. In August 2015, the CMC wrote a letter related to decisions were being made by a small group of people, not by the council. If worship and music can be changed then anything can be changed. As churches get larger, the council or board tend to handle policy and the church staff manage. Trust has been lost and we need to change that before we ask the congregation to change to the constitution. My recommendation is to follow what I outlined in my document. If we are successful, then we can look to changing the constitution. This follows steps outlined in Dayton Soby's document recommending a large council. My experience I have gained on this council helped me to be a good member on the Lead Pastor search committee. Why keep others from the possibility to serve Calvary on the council and making us a better leader here. If we have challenges, then we need to address those. Our congregation needs us to do policy principally. These changes need to be done when trust has been regained.
- Rich Graversen: Not having the council involved and worship and music changes was a huge problem because not everyone had a voice in the process. Two things that help run this congregation is the governance structure and council. There isn't a anything that says we cannot talk about stragegy with 33 people. We should use the governance structure as is and make changes to how the council handles strategy.
- Paul Carlson: Question related to hiring of associate pastors. Currently when we hire, we do this by call. Is it correct, this plan recommends this is a hiring, not a call? The council would approve, but the congregation would not be involved. What is the rational for not having it be a call?
 - Rich G.: The original charter did not include anything about pastor calls
 - Mick Lee: As we were reviewing a large number of congregation and constitutions, it is more common than not, that a call is used for a senior pastor, but not associates. This seemed like a best practice that we wanted to bring to the table. The senior pastor that is called, needs to be able to orchestrate good staff seemed like a best practice. Instead of handling the HR issues back to the congregation, these problems could be handled by the Senior Pastor and Council.
 - Craig Recknagel: can this be amended and items removed if this is a sticking point?
 - Jim B: We are willing to "kick it" to step two to allow for more discussion. It provides more nimbleness in pastoral staff. It doesn't preclude the senior pastor from calling a call committee to help find an

associate. If this is something that we need to talk about separately we are willing to do that.

- Mary Jo Peterson: Do the churches that do this have a senior pastor that had left as ours did
- Jim B.: senior pastor is accountable to and council, EC
- Dave K.: A reminder that the council would need to approve the hiring
- Rich G.: I understand best practices but as a Lutheran church the process is a faithful, prayerful one, not a hiring process
- Skip : this is something that the new senior pastor should be able to have a say in this. The call committee must be honest about the current state of this issue. Remember the candidate are interviewing us, as well. They must be able to have time to form their own opinions. - Clarification: only related to the associate pastor
- Lisa Paulson: Remember, just because other churches are doing it, does that mean we have to do it too? If it isn't broken, then don't fix it.
- Sue Mork: this is not something that wasn't in our charter, but everything else in this was something that your predecessors have asked us to do
- John Russo: The pervious council was socialized and educated related to this information and only after they were educated they voted unanimously. You are in a difficult situation to further a process that was started by another council. This is part of the problem with the turnover in this process.
- Rich G.: what is the best term, 1/3 every year, 1/2 every 2 years? With a smaller group, there are fewer people getting a say.
- Sue M.: How can we make people be heard?
- Steve Thompson: in my experience, I have had very little experience in leadership, but in the interest in leading disciples into leading disciples. I am concerned about stability in the congregation. We are not feeling settled. These proposals are very thought-out but the timing may not be the best.
- John Swanson: We can make both options work, my concern is that this would be too controversial. We do not need to bring controversy into the church. The congregation has lost trust. We need to regain that trust. We should focus on finding a good senior pastor, proceed with some of these recommendations without changing the size. The constitution is vague about who decides who decides? We should stop and not go to step two until the new senior pastor.
- Jason Roton: We keep talking about when the new senior pastor comes, they extended an offer to three candidates with a council structure like ours, all three stated if you change your structure, we will come. There is a possibility that new pastors will see this as an old model and it will turn away new pastors.
- Cory Maass: There has been a discussion about the loss of trust, but there are a few people that consider that the issue is related to the structure as it is. Many people ask how we get anything done with a

council this large. We are not a business or a city, but Maple Grove has 4 members and the city is represented. There are few people that speak up but a lot of members do not speak. When I was on the search committee with a smaller group everyone was engaged and everyone was involved.

- Rick Bode: I am favor of this move. Past council members have stated that they did not feel as though they were used properly.
- Pastor Carol: one of the issues that we need to discuss is trust. The trust in leadership is broken, we need to rebuild it in order to have a congregation to surround this idea. Trust and timing is something that we need to look at. Called vs. hire, I was called by the Holy Spirit to be a pastor, it was working in my heart and in the congregation to bring me here. Taking it to a hire, may be the norm at other churches, it doesn't have to be the norm here.
- Jim and John: We need active support, not passive support of council.
- Mick Lee: I have been a member at Calvary for 55 years, this isn't the first time I have been tasked to look at governance. Jesus didn't call us to come and debate and vote. He called use to come, listen and go. I am a strong proponent, of changing our governance structure. I have served on council and as president. There will not be a good time to do this. This came out of a time of turmoil. I would be shocked if the previous call committee didn't have this as an issue that came up with pervious call committee (call committee members: we lost a few great candidates because of this structure). We aren't called for a vote because it causes us to divide.
- Dave K.: Can we table the motion tonight to associate pastor position of this process? I would rather we spend our time to focus on other elements of this process.
- Skip R.: There is the potential to have this be a large enough issue that the congregation will be unable to decide.
- Dan Hanson: why don't we vote to take that out completely?
- John R.: We should vote whether or not to include the pastor call/hire issue.
- Cory M.: Move to we remove the associate pastor constitution/by law changes out of this process.
 - Motion carried, opposed Craig Anderson
- Skip R.: Do we have a policy that we require a giving amount to be on council?
 - Dave K.: Giving is not a requirement for serving in leadership
 - Rick B. asked Pastor Dave, do you have any comments on this?
- Dave G.: My fundamental question is, the mission of the church as it is defined in God's word is how we structure ourselves. Let's say we have a 33-member working optimally? Then we have an 11-member council working optimally? Is there a way to work through one structure is more optimally? The church is not a democracy, it is for us to follow Christ as he has called us. There is a question of your new Senior Pastor in the

mind, and this may be a determinant. I have worked with both structures, and I have an opinion of which one works better, if it is put together in the right way.

- Craig A.: I did send out an email. I am in favor of this change. A previous version of this council voted unanimously to proceed. If this council votes no, that is a case in point of why this council does not work. Every pastor the call committee interviews will ask out about council. I know that we lost two exceptional candidates because of the way the governance is set up. There is trust to be gained. There are people looking for the council to move and make changes.
- Cory M.: is it your opinion that we might have had a different pastor as part of the last call committee process
- Craig R.: leadership training as outlined in Stephen O. about leadership training is not eliminated all of that option. It is up to us to make that happen. As Craig said, this could be going on for a while.
- Cory M.: next month we have 11 new members to educate
- Sondi Johnson: I appreciate the information sharing at council but we can do that in other ways. I like the ability of the EC doubling in size and more diverse which will allow for better decision making.
- Carol Rudd: I was not sure of my choice because there are pros and cons to both. My term on council will be up next month, the smaller feeling of the interim committee was wonderful. It allowed for a lot of collaboration. It was all in a respectful matter.
- Connie Otto: I agree with Cory, we are just now starting to feel like we can speak up. We need to remember who we are governing for, WE are serving Jesus. Change is never easy. The people have come before us have done work and prayed about it. There are pros and cons but we need to step out in faith and trust God.
- Cory M.: If we are looking to the past as to how the constitution put it together with a lot of thought, but they allowed us the chance to change it if we wanted.
- Scott Madson: Thanks to this committee. Moving from a 5 member EC to an 11 member allows of a lot of collaboration and coming together. Many of us on the search committee agreed that the smaller group allowed us more of an ability to connect
- John S.: I am prepared to support moving this to step two
- Marisa Hougland: When I am looking at these steps. To me, it looks like when we move to step two, it doesn't allow us to change items if we need to.
- Jim B.: This process allows us to look at end cases, we need your help in defining these end cases. We are looking for calcification on working through the process with council. We are looking at, are we aligned with what this means?
- Marisa H.: As we are working forward, we can changes.
- John R.: The committee might even bring changes to council.

- Jim B.; Step two is have we identified end cases and testing through these possibilities and working through those with the council. Steps 1 and 2, what are we talking about and how is that going to work?
- Marisa H.: Associate Pastor call/hire is important to me. I agree that the church has to function as a theocracy. Not everyone has a vote. We need to have trust in our leadership, through prayer. Our size and history has showed a right to expect to be heard. Transparency will also be a key part of this.
- Jim B.: I appreciate the dialog, and I appreciate the opinions we have heard tonight. We are leaders are supposed to talk about how we feel about things and have that conversation as a group. The issues of trust, in this congregation we have lost the presumption of positive intent. That is the heart of the trust issue. In that process we have lost the feeling that we are doing this together. In this culture, we have decided that differing opinions are wrong. We need council to enthusiastically approve of this.
- John S.: I think we could use some help. There is nothing in this process that helps bring the congregation up to speed. We cannot wait on this. People that don't know it happening, they will assume the worst.
- John R.: should we create FAQs or other communication pieces. We need to make sure we can hire the Senior Pastor we really want.
- Todd Long.: Council is signing up to socialize this, while the other committee completes the work.
- John S.: The council needs to be the people that go to the congregation and it needs to be a thoughtful process.
- Sondi J.: Would this be a topic of the congregation meeting?
- Jim B.: we need to have a higher level overview, but might not be at the forum.
- John R.: those are your decisions.
- Dave. K.: The congregation deserves to hear what we vote tonight
- John S. I move that we approve to move to step two. Step two.

Vote to proceed with the process

- 84% agreed to move to step two