

MEETING AGENDA - First UU Austin Board of Trustees

Meeting

Meeting Date	Tuesday, June 21, 2022
Start Time	6:30 PM
End Time	8:30 PM (CST)
Location	Zoom - https://zoom.us/my/firstuuaustin (password = 512452) Zoom ID: 940 671 9275 Dial in number: (346) 248-7799 or (669) 900-6833
Purpose	First Board meeting of the new Board year

RSVP

No response: Martha Arrendando, Donna Carpenter, Vic Cornell, Suzette Emberton, Rob Hirschfeld, Russell Holley-Hurt, Joseph Hunt, Chris Jimmerson, Mateo Kresha, Nesan Lawrence, Shannon Posern, Kelly Raley, Dave Riehl, Kelly Stokes, Nathan Walther

Agenda

1. Coming Back into Covenant

1.1. Chalice Lighting and Opening Words

Kelly Raley / 2 min. (6:30 PM - 6:32 PM)

Kelly to read the opening words

1.2. Reading of Board Covenant

Nesan Lawrence / 2 min. (6:32 PM - 6:34 PM)

With the Values, Mission and Ends of First UU Austin foremost in mind, we the leadership do covenant to:

- Treat our time together and board commitments as spiritual practice
 - Work collaboratively to clarify, assess and further our mission.
 - Respect our time together by being focused, prepared and timely.
 - Keep confidentiality when it is requested.
 - Listen actively, address concerns directly with each other in a timely manner, and encourage others to do the same.
 - Presume good faith in all our interactions acknowledging the importance of both intention and impact.
 - Conduct ourselves openly, show compassion, respect boundaries, and enjoy each other's good humor in times of agreement and disagreement.
 - Publicly support one another's decisions and leadership by speaking with one voice at the end of our deliberations.
 - Agree to be called back into covenant.
-

1.3. Confirm Timekeeper and Process Evaluator

Nesan Lawrence / 2 min. (6:34 PM - 6:36 PM)

Timekeeper: Russell

Process Evaluator: Rob

Snacks: Dave

Documents

- Board process review form.doc pgae 32
-

1.4. Approve Agenda and Consent Agenda

Nesan Lawrence / 2 min. (6:36 PM - 6:38 PM)



Items on the consent agenda include the minutes from the May meeting, April financials and monitoring report for Executive Limitation 2.8

Documents

- Minutes-2022-05-10-v1.pdf Pages 3-7
- 2.8 Communication and Support of the Board rev 06-2022.pdf 8-13
- April2022 Financials.pdf 14-17

2. Connecting with our Moral Ownership

2.1. Visitor's Forum

Nesan Lawrence / 45 min. (6:38 PM - 7:23 PM)

Christine Purcell, Transitions Program Manager , UUA

2.2. Recognition of Church Volunteers and Staff

Nesan Lawrence / 5 min. (7:23 PM - 7:28 PM)

2.3. Moment with Rev. Chris

Chris Jimmerson / 15 min. (7:28 PM - 7:43 PM)

3. Wrap-up Retreat Discussion

3.1. Board Committee Agendas

Nesan Lawrence / 15 min. (7:43 PM - 7:58 PM)

3.2. Learning & Creating the Future

Nesan Lawrence / 5 min. (7:58 PM - 8:03 PM)

Discuss plan for July and August.

Discuss Doodle poll to select Book/Podcast for rest of Board Year starting in September.

Documents

- specialcarecongs.pdf 18-31

4. Adjourn

4.1. Action Items and Announcements

Nesan Lawrence / 5 min. (8:03 PM - 8:08 PM)

Announcements:

Let's review the action items from this meeting:

4.2. Assign Roles for Next Meeting

Nesan Lawrence / 2 min. (8:08 PM - 8:10 PM)

Assign roles for:

- Readings
- Timekeeper
- Process Evaluator
- Snacks

4.3. Process Evaluation

Rob Hirschfeld / 2 min. (8:10 PM - 8:12 PM)

4.4. Extinguishing the Chalice and Closing Words

Kelly Raley / 2 min. (8:12 PM - 8:14 PM)



MEETING MINUTES - First UU Austin Board of Trustees

Meeting

Date	Tuesday, May 10, 2022
Started	6:30 PM
Ended	8:30 PM (CST)
Location	This meeting will be in person, room 15 Visitors may attend by Zoom, but must let us know in advance Zoom - https://zoom.us/my/firstuuaustin (password = 512452) Zoom ID: 940 671 9275 Dial in number: (346) 248-7799 or (669) 900-6833
Purpose	Regular scheduled meeting
Chaired by	Toni Wegner
Recorder	Nesan Lawrence

Attendance

Present:	Vic Cornell, Suzette Emberton, Rob Hirschfeld, Russell Holley-Hurt, Joseph Hunt, Chris Jimmerson, Nesan Lawrence, Kelly Raley, Dave Riehl, Kelly Stokes, Nathan Walther
Regrets:	Martha Arrendando, Shannon Posern
Invited guests:	Meg Barnhouse, Leo Collas, Sadie Lambert, Toni Wegner

Minutes

1. Coming Back into Covenant

1.1. Chalice Lighting and Opening Words

Toni lit the chalice as Chris read the opening words

Status: Completed

1.2. Reading of Board Covenant

With the Values, Mission and Ends of First UU Austin foremost in mind, we the leadership do covenant to:

- Treat our time together and board commitments as spiritual practice
- Work collaboratively to clarify, assess and further our mission.
- Respect our time together by being focused, prepared and timely.
- Keep confidentiality when it is requested.
- Listen actively, address concerns directly with each other in a timely manner, and encourage others to do the same.
- Presume good faith in all our interactions acknowledging the importance of both intention and impact.
- Conduct ourselves openly, show compassion, respect boundaries, and enjoy each other's good humor in times of agreement and disagreement.
- Publicly support one another's decisions and leadership by speaking with one voice at the end of our deliberations.



- Agree to be called back into covenant.

Board read the covenant together

Status: Completed

1.3. Confirm Timekeeper and Process Evaluator

Time keeper: Suzette

Process Evaluator: Russell

Timekeeper and process evaluator were confirmed

Status: Completed

1.4. Approve Agenda and Consent Agenda

Items on the consent agenda include the minutes from the April meeting, the program development report and March financials.

Agenda and consent agenda were approved unanimously.

Status: Completed

Documents

- Minutes-2022-04-19-v1.pdf
 - March2022FinancialReports.pdf
 - Program Development Report April 2022.pdf
-

2. Connecting with our Moral Ownership

2.1. Visitor's Forum

Susan Thompson

Suzette led the visitor's forum discussion with Susan Thomson

- Susan shared that she has been serving as chair for a couple of committees including First UU Cares.
- Pastoral care is one of the branches/aspects she supported as part of these committees. She thanked Meg's contributions to supporting and developing that part of the ministry.
- The other branch is with regards to memorial services that Toni Wegner has been part of leading. The ministry also did meal deliveries and wrote condolence cards. Its all very volunteer driven.
- Susan also volunteers with 'Paradox Players', and 'Transformation Through Service and Connection' committees.
- As things get back to normal, recruiting volunteers for all of these ministries is the main priority.

Status: Completed

2.2. Recognition of Church Volunteers and Staff

- Luther Elmore for ushering
- Susan Thomson for Visitor's Forum

Status: Completed

2.3. Moment with Rev. Meg

Meg shared her wisdom for the Board. Rob facilitated the discussion

- What do you envision for RE (Youth and adults)? Meg would love for strong Youth program similar to past years. Adult RE has been a weak link due to lack of resources to staff. Would love for us to have college outreach if we had the resources. Some of the Frank Fund could be used for Adult RE too if possible.
- What are your top 3 attributes for the new interim/settled minister(s)? The person has a deep capacity for caring and a kind heart. Someone who is committed to UU and enriching an understanding of that. Someone who does the hard work to keep the church healthy. Someone who is transparent and has a vision for the church.
- What you had wished you had done here but couldn't? Everything I wished I wanted to do I was able to at least attempt. But sometimes things avalanched and did not work as expected.. Listening ministry for example- we tried to get it to work 9 or 10 years ago. Wish I had more energy to put into adult RE. Overall, I am pretty proud of the many things I have done.
- Is there an area of long term challenge? Rich, deep welcome that addresses classism, patriarchy, etc. I feel we are a pretty welcoming congregation but we need to keep working on it.
- Idea that we would break into a 2nd church? We had several blows to that plan. With construction, several members left. Then pandemic hit us. We are never really in danger of becoming a mega church. That does not mean there wouldn't opportunities in the future.
- What do you feel is our greatest strength? Its a joyful church. Its a church where fun can be had. People enjoy each other's company. Music program and program development are strengths
- Anything you would do differently with the Board? Do more of policy governance driven thinking (ends for example) and less of committee reports. We have been lucky to have had great boards over the years.
- How essential is the facility to the mission? I don't think we can advance the mission without a place to gather.
- Words of advice for Interim ministry - Welcome the interim minister with open hearts. Unusual setup with both minsters reporting to the board. If you honor Chris and honor the interim, it will work out. I think the congregation has a lot to learn. Having a different minister might help with learning new things.
- How do we know if the minister is doing a good job? Board does the monitoring - that's how you measure their progress.

Status: Completed

3. Monitoring our Progress

3.1. Monitoring Reports (Ends and/or Executive Limitations)

Board monitoring report for 3.0 Governance Process and 4.0 Board-Executive Relationship

Monitoring reports were approved unanimously as the Board reported compliance.

Status: Completed

Documents

- 3.0-Governance-Process-2021-2022_monitoring report.docx
 - 4.0-Board-Executive Relationship-2021-2022_monitoring report.docx
-

3.2. Linkage Committee

Final report with discussion of the attached

Russell provided a summary of the final report.

Status: Completed

Documents

- Linkage Committee 2022 Report.pdf
-

3.3. Monitoring Committee



Final report

Nesan provided a short summary of the committee efforts this year

Status: Completed

3.4. Board Engagement Committee

Final report

Sadie provided a short summary of the committee efforts.

Status: Completed

4. Learning & Creating the Future

4.1. Transition update

Nesan, Kelly and Nathan provided an update on the interim process. They walked through the candidates who have been shortlisted for interviews. They provided an update on the interview process and reference checks. They also highlighted the timeline of activities and what to expect next.

Status: Completed

5. Adjourn

5.1. Action Items and Announcements

Action items for this month:

- Pre-congregational meeting at 1 PM on April 24; Rob volunteered for Zoom support and to monitor chat room.
- General Assembly is coming up in June to be held in Portland.
- Nesan to send straw poll to determine Board retreat dates.
- Comments on Story Corps due by April 22.
- Comments on Interim App due by April 20.
- Sadie to write the monitoring reports.
- Kelly to write thank you notes.

Action items for next month:

Announcements:

Congregational meeting at 1:00 on May 22nd. Assistance needed:

- Zoom pilot, online vote counts, in person vote counts
- Light and extinguish chalice
- Motion to 8th principle
- Motion for bylaws change
- Motion for minister emerita status - Leo?
- Kelly to write thank you notes
- Toni to follow-up with committees on follow-up items

Congregational meeting toles

- Chalice lighting: Nesan
- 8th principle motion: Russell



- By-laws motion: Suzette
- Zoom pilot: Rob
- Online vote count: Nathan
- Minister Emerita motion: Sadie

Status: Completed

5.2. Assign Roles for Next Meeting

Assign roles for:

- Readings
- Timekeeper
- Process Evaluator
- Book Discussion
- Snacks

June board meeting roles

- Readings: Kelly
- Timekeeper: Russell
- Process Evaluator: Rob
- Snacks: Dave
- Book: TBD

Status: Completed

5.3. Process Evaluation

Russell concluded that the Board performed satisfactorily across all dimensions.

Status: Completed

Documents

- Board process review form.docx
-

5.4. Extinguishing the Chalice and Closing Words

Rev. Chris read the closing words.

Status: Completed

5.5. Send-off for Those Leaving the Board

The Board commemorated Rev. Meg's final meeting by cutting a cake and making a toast in her honor and service to the church.

The Board members also fondly bid farewell to Toni, Leo and Sadie for their service and leadership on the Board.

Status: Completed

Limitations Report 2.8 – Communication and Support of the Board

First UU Church of Austin
June 14, 2022

With respect to providing information and counsel to the Board, the Senior Minister shall not cause or allow the Board to be uninformed or unsupported in its work.

Accordingly, the Senior Minister shall not:

- 2.8.1 Fail to submit the monitoring data required by the Board in a timely, accurate, and understandable fashion, directly addressing provisions of the Board policies being monitored.

Interpretation:

Using the metrics agreed upon as the interpretations of the policies were approved, the Executive will gather and present that data to the Board seven days before the Board meeting at which that policy will be monitored. Both the metrics and the data gathered by those metrics will match the provisions in the agreed-upon interpretation of that policy, and they will be presented clearly.

Measures:

To be in compliance, the data will be provided seven days before the Board meeting, and the data will give the Board the information it needs to monitor each policy. The data will be understandable and accurate.

Rationale for the Measures:

These measures correspond directly to the concerns expressed in the limitation.

Evidence of Acceptable Progress – The Data

I report compliance, much of the time.

We have presented information that we consider to be thorough, understandable, and accurate. We have posted the reports at least 7 days in advance whenever possible.

- 2.8.2 Fail to report in a timely manner an actual or anticipated non-compliance with any policy of the Board.

Interpretation:

Actual non-compliance with the Board's policies will be reported as the monitoring report for that policy is presented. If anticipated non-compliance will materially affect the budget (by 10 percent of total budget), or if anticipated non-compliance may result in significant loss of value in the church's reputation, or if anticipated non-compliance may

result in legal action of some sort, the Board will be notified with whatever speed the situation requires.

Measures:

1. Self-reporting by the executive.
2. Direct observation by the board of compliance.

Rationale for the Measures:

These measures are easy to track, inexpensive in time and other resources, and provide a high level of accuracy.

Evidence of Acceptable Progress – The Data

I report compliance.

We have reported to the board, in our monitoring reports, all instances of partial and non-compliance. We are unaware of any instances of partial or non-compliance of an emergency nature or that otherwise would have merited a special report outside of the monitoring report.

- 2.8.3 Fail to inform the Board in a timely manner of material external and internal changes, particularly changes in the assumptions upon which any Board policy has previously been established.

Interpretation:

The executive will share with the board, in a timely way, any information that impacts the assumptions inherent in board policy. This might include such things as the abolition of the FDIC (which would impact limitation 2.6.9), information that calls into doubt the UUA's Socially Responsible Investing guidelines (limitation 2.6.11), or that a series of town hall meetings with the congregation revealed that members have no interest in spiritual growth and feel hostility towards the word 'spiritual' (end #2).

Measures:

1. Self-reporting by the executive.
2. Direct observation by the board of compliance.

Rationale for the Measures:

These measures are easy to track, inexpensive in time and other resources, and provide a high level of accuracy.

Evidence of Acceptable Progress – The Data

I report compliance.

We are unaware of any information that impacts the assumptions inherent in board policy. The board created new ends and a new mission in 2018, and those have been interpreted. The congregation seems to be on board and excited about the direction in which the board is steering the church.

Being able to gather again in person is proving very helpful as regards working toward progress on our ends. We are monitoring the Covid epidemic data in our area very closely but do not have reason currently to think that we will have to move to virtual activities anytime in the near future.

2.8.4 Fail to gather sufficient staff and external points of view, issues, and options as needed for fully informed Board decisions.

Interpretation:

Well-informed decision-making requires information from multiple sources. The Executive's reports to the board, whenever possible and appropriate, will draw on sources beyond the senior minister. This may include staff, moral owners, members, and third party professionals.

Measures:

1. Self-reporting by the executive.
2. Direct observation by the board of compliance.

Rationale for the Measures:

These measures are easy to track, inexpensive in time and other resources, and provide a high level of accuracy.

Evidence of Acceptable Progress – The Data

I report compliance.

We are unaware of any situation where the board lacked sufficient information to make fully informed decisions.

Before her retirement, the senior minister met with the minister for program development, RE coordinator, communications coordinator and the director of music on a weekly basis. The acting senior minister meets with the RE coordinator, the communications coordinator, the congregational administrator and the director of music weekly. They in turn meet with their staff. We hold monthly staff meetings to make sure both "big picture" and details are well covered. We have also hold numerous individual and small group meetings with church members and other stakeholders, as well as larger group sessions. This year the board held many "Town Hall" meetings as linkage with the congregation and got lots of information from those.

We have attempted to address the retirement of the senior minister and the emotions the congregation may be feeling directly in worship services and other means of communication, and the board has communicated often on the transition process.

2.8.5 Fail to report to the Board behavior or conditions that are detrimental to the work relationship between Board and the Senior Minister.

Interpretation:

Harm to the Board's working relationship with the Senior minister would be anything that makes it difficult for them to discuss issues reasonably, anything that would cause one to hesitate to meet with the other, or create an impasse whereby hope of a collaborative relationship was diminished.

If there are other conditions harming the working relationship between the Senior Minister and the Board as a whole, such as health matters, resentments, unreasonable expectations, inappropriate behavior, or conflicts of interest, they will first be dealt with according to the covenant of healthy relations. If that does not resolve the matter, the Senior Minister will speak about it to the Board.

Measures:

1. Self-reporting by the executive.
2. Direct observation by the board of compliance.

Rationale for the Measures:

These measures are easy to track, inexpensive in time and other resources, and provide a high level of accuracy.

Evidence of Acceptable Progress – The Data

I report compliance.

We are unaware of board behavior and conditions that are detrimental to the work relationship between the board and senior minister.

2.8.6 Fail to advise the Board if, in the Senior Minister's opinion, the Board is not in compliance with its own policies.

Interpretation:

If the Senior Minister sees that the Board is deciding matters in a manner that takes the congregation farther from its Ends rather than moving it closer, s/he will bring that to the Board's attention. If the Board is making decisions that are counter to the policies it has set for itself, the Senior Minister will bring that to the Board's attention in a timely manner and in an attitude of mutual respect.

Measures:

1. Self-reporting by the executive.
2. Direct observation by the board of compliance.

Rationale for the Measures:

These measures are easy to track, inexpensive in time and other resources, and provide a high level of accuracy.

Evidence of Acceptable Progress – The Data

I report compliance.

We are unaware of any instances wherein the board is not in compliance with its own policies.

- 2.8.7 Fail to recommend changes in Board policies, as the need becomes known to the Senior Minister.

Interpretation:

If it becomes clear to the Senior Minister that any Ends Policy does not, in fact, reflect the spirit and desire of the congregation, she will recommend to the Board that that policy will be modified. If there is an issue upon which the congregation clearly wishes to focus time and money, and that issue is not reflected in the Ends Policies, the Senior Minister will recommend that a policy be created in order to reflect the congregation's forward motion. In addition, if the Senior Minister believes that limitations policies do not reflect the Board's intent or the church's best interests, she will recommend edits, additions, or deletions to correct the situation.

Measures:

1. Self-reporting by the executive.
2. Direct observation by the board of compliance.

Rationale for the Measures:

These measures are easy to track, inexpensive in time and other resources, and provide a high level of accuracy.

Evidence of Acceptable Progress – The Data

I report compliance.

Our recent survey indicates that the ends reflect the spirit of the congregation and our limitations policies continue to serve the church's best interests

- 2.8.8 Deal with the Board in a way that favors or privileges certain Board members over others.

Interpretation:

The Senior Minister will not make alliances with individual trustees.

The Senior Minister may meet regularly with the President or other officers of the Board as regarding their particular roles.

Measures:

1. Self-reporting by the executive.
2. Direct observation by the board of compliance.

Rationale for the Measures:

These measures are easy to track, inexpensive in time and other resources, and provide a high level of accuracy.

Evidence of Acceptable Progress – The Data

I report compliance.

The senior minister has not made alliances with individual trustees.

- 2.8.9 Make public statements about the position of the Church, if the official position is not formally adopted.

Interpretation:

The Senior Minister may take any position as an individual, identifying him/herself as the Senior Minister at First UU Austin.

S/he may not say “The First UU Church takes such-and-such a stand, or believes such-and-such a thing” unless the congregation has gone through a procedure to affirm that stand.

The congregation or the Senior Minister may also publicize positions taken by the UUA. The congregation is considering a process through which it might take a public stand on public issues.

Measures:

1. Self-reporting by the executive.
2. Direct observation by the board of compliance.

Rationale for the Measures:

These measures are easy to track, inexpensive in time and other resources, and provide a high level of accuracy.

Evidence of Acceptable Progress – The Data

I report compliance.

The senior minister has not made any public statements about the position of the church.

[Last updated June 2022.]

Financial Reports – April 20202

We experienced a drop in pledge contributions in April; however, for the year actual pledge contributions are still meeting budget.

We had expenses of over \$10,000 in April for upgrades to the playground and nursery rooms that were not budgeted. We will continue to have some more expenses in these areas. These will be offset with revenue from the Frank's fund that was also not budgeted.

We received two of the payroll retention checks from the federal government in April.

FIRST UNITARIAN UNIVERSALIST CHURCH OF AUSTIN Budget vs. Actual

	Apr 2022			Total YTD		
	Actual	Budget	Budget	Actual	Budget	over Budget
Income						
4100 Earned Revenue			0	0	0	0
4110 Event Revenue		5,000	-5,000	0	5,000	-5,000
4130 Rentals Revenue	9,012	11,500	-2,489	37,776	46,000	-8,224
4199 Discounts/Refunds Given			0	-1,675	0	-1,675
Total 4100 Earned Revenue	\$ 9,012	\$ 16,500	-\$ 7,489	\$ 36,101	\$ 51,000	-\$ 14,899
4200 Contributed Revenue			0	0	0	0
4210 Unrestricted Contributions			0	0	0	0
4211 Pledge	36,538	55,000	-18,462	227,849	227,000	849
4212 Sunday Plate	1,378	2,500	-1,122	3,608	10,000	-6,392
4213 Other Gifts	5,172	3,333	1,839	58,638	13,332	45,306
Total 4210 Unrestricted Contributions	\$ 43,088	\$ 60,833	-\$ 17,745	\$ 290,095	\$ 250,332	\$ 39,763
4220 Restricted Contributions	2,022		2,022	12,764	0	12,764
4221 Special Plate	662	833	-171	5,476	3,332	2,144
Total 4220 Restricted Contributions	\$ 2,684	\$ 833	\$ 1,851	\$ 18,239	\$ 3,332	\$ 14,907
4230 Grants	115,309	50,000	65,309	140,414	134,349	6,065
4290 Other Contributed Revenue	1,400	1,000	400	1,254	7,000	-5,746
Total 4200 Contributed Revenue	\$ 162,481	\$ 112,666	\$ 49,815	\$ 450,003	\$ 395,013	\$ 54,990
Total Income	\$ 171,493	\$ 129,166	\$ 42,327	\$ 486,104	\$ 446,013	\$ 40,091
Expenses						
Total 6100 Payroll Expenses	\$ 58,399	\$ 58,675	-\$ 276	\$ 215,908	\$ 234,710	-\$ 18,802
Total 6210 Charitable Giving	\$ 4,429	\$ 3,465	\$ 964	\$ 30,267	\$ 13,862	\$ 16,405
Total 6220 Program Expenses	\$ 6,814	\$ 11,197	-\$ 4,383	\$ 19,667	\$ 41,188	-\$ 21,521
Total 6600 Software and Dues	\$ 1,114	\$ 1,253	\$ (139)	\$ 7,568	\$ 5,031	\$ 2,537
Total 6700 Fees and Insurance	\$ 5,763	\$ 3,928	\$ 1,835	\$ 24,653	\$ 29,725	\$ (5,072)
6820 Depreciation Expense	\$ 10,671	\$ 10,671	\$ (0)	\$ 42,684	\$ 42,687	\$ (3)
6830 Interest Expense	\$ 4,813	\$ 5,746	\$ (933)	\$ 18,888	\$ 22,993	\$ (4,105)
Total Expenses	\$ 114,930	\$ 102,843	\$ 12,087	\$ 409,198	\$ 422,095	-\$ 12,897
Net Operating Income	\$ 56,563	\$ 26,323	\$ 30,240	\$ 76,906	\$ 23,918	\$ 52,988
Total Other Income	\$ 1,427	\$ 0	\$ 1,427	\$ 4,743	\$ 0	\$ 4,743
Net Income	\$ 57,990	\$ 26,323	\$ 31,667	\$ 81,649	\$ 23,918	\$ 57,731
Non-Operational Expenses	\$ 15,484	\$ 16,417	\$ (933)	\$ 61,571	\$ 65,680	\$ (4,109)
Net Operational Cash Flow	\$ 73,474	\$ 42,740	\$ 30,734	\$ 143,221	\$ 89,598	\$ 53,623

Note: \$59,224 in employee retention funds budgeted for this year came in last year. Carrying that forward would increase cash flow by that amount.

FIRST UNITARIAN UNIVERSALIST CHURCH OF AUSTIN

Balance Sheet
As of April 30, 2022

	FEB 2022	MAR 2022	APR 2022
ASSETS			
Current Assets			
Bank Accounts			
1072 Bill.com Money Out Clearing	2,117	1,983	0
1110 8009-THCU Checking	491,247	511,065	584,408
1120 RBank Debt Service 676	59,159	59,161	59,164
1130 RBank Construction 668	195,144	186,245	178,237
1140 THCU Money Market	0	0	0
1150 THCU Savings	38	38	38
1160 UFCU Savings	0	0	0
1170 THCU CDs	0	0	0
1189 Petty Cash	200	200	200
1710 UUCEF Permanent Endowment Acct.	291,634	291,757	274,389
1720 UUCEF Mixed Investment Account	277,931	362,185	340,624
1730 UUCEF Murr Music Account	82,238	82,273	77,375
1740 UUCEF Education	880,208	779,445	733,046
Total Bank Accounts	\$2,279,917	\$2,274,352	\$2,247,480
Accounts Receivable			
1210 Accounts Receivable	0	0	0
Total Accounts Receivable	\$0	\$0	\$0
Other Current Assets			
1199 Undeposited Funds	0	0	0
1220 VANCO - Payment Reconciliation	0	0	0
1230 Cash/Checks	715	-1,081	-1,091
1240 VANCO - ACH/MS	0	0	0
1250 VANCO - ACH	0	0	0
1260 Stripe	1,843	2,055	1,757
1310 Prepaid Expenses	11,982	18,700	25,418
1490 Other Current Assets	0	0	0
Total Other Current Assets	\$14,540	\$19,674	\$26,085
Total Current Assets	\$2,294,456	\$2,294,026	\$2,273,565
Fixed Assets			
1500 Fixed Assets			
1510 Building	3,810,162	3,810,162	3,810,162
1520 Land	3,772,325	3,772,325	3,772,325
1530 Furniture & Equipment	132,994	132,994	132,994
1590 Accumulated Depreciation	-628,678	-639,349	-650,020
Total 1500 Fixed Assets	7,086,802	7,076,132	7,065,461
Total Fixed Assets	\$7,086,802	\$7,076,132	\$7,065,461
TOTAL ASSETS	\$9,381,259	\$9,370,158	\$9,339,025

FIRST UNITARIAN UNIVERSALIST CHURCH OF AUSTIN

Balance Sheet
As of April 30, 2022

	FEB 2022	MAR 2022	APR 2022
LIABILITIES AND EQUITY			
Liabilities			
Current Liabilities			
Accounts Payable			
2110 Accounts Payable	1,005	-12,867	7,157
Total Accounts Payable	\$1,005	\$ -12,867	\$7,157
Credit Cards			
2150 Chase Credit Card 3081	5,291	5,658	1,002
Total Credit Cards	\$5,291	\$5,658	\$1,002
Other Current Liabilities			
2320 Security Deposits	0	0	0
2410 Payroll Liabilities	0	0	0
2450 Sales Tax Payable	0	0	0
2500 Accrued Interest	0	0	0
2610 PPP Loan	0	0	0
Sales Tax Agency Payable	0	0	0
Total Other Current Liabilities	\$0	\$0	\$0
Total Current Liabilities	\$6,296	\$ -7,209	\$8,159
Long-Term Liabilities			
2620 Construction Loan	1,247,642	1,243,583	1,229,488
Total Long-Term Liabilities	\$1,247,642	\$1,243,583	\$1,229,488
Total Liabilities	\$1,253,938	\$1,236,374	\$1,237,647
Equity			
3110 Unrestricted Net Assets	784,140	784,140	784,140
3120 Restricted Funds	7,429,514	7,429,514	7,429,514
3130 Unrealized Gain/Loss on Investments	-78,755	-78,424	-168,820
Opening Balance Equity	0	0	0
Net Income	-7,579	-1,446	56,544
Total Equity	\$8,127,320	\$8,133,784	\$8,101,379
TOTAL LIABILITIES AND EQUITY	\$9,381,259	\$9,370,158	\$9,339,025

SPECIAL CARE CONGREGATIONS
(The Necessities of Two Year Interims)

By: Robert T. Latham
Interim Minister
Unitarian Universalist Association

SPECIAL CARE CONGREGATIONS

Following is a reflection on the needs of what I will refer to as Special Care Congregations. Such congregations have gone through experiences that warrant not only a special kind of attention during the Interim Period but also a longer span of time for applying this attention.

In brief, these congregations need to be approached with an eye toward their peculiar needs and the time necessary to address these needs. My assumption is that anything less than a two year interim will leave the new impending professional relationship vulnerable to unresolved issues of consequence. Further, that having to deal with these issues will eventuate in serious harm to this new relationship. Thus, a recognition that a congregation is of the special care type should, ipso facto, be approached as a two-year interim.

I perceive there to be four types of Special Care Congregations. Please note that the word minister is used in the singular as a convenience. Read it as plural if applicable.

The Betrayed

One type is a congregation essentially characterized by a sense of being Betrayed. Whatever the length of the professional relationship, something has happened between the minister and the congregation so that one or both feel betrayed by the other and the congregation has been left in a state of dramatic trauma.

This sense of betrayal could have been induced by unethical behavior on the part of the minister. It could have been initiated by issues rising from an inner psychosis in congregational life. It could have been generated by a small conflict that was allowed to escalate beyond the capacity to manage. Whatever the source, an

irresolvable sense of betrayal ensued that led to an unpleasant, and possibly recriminating, relationship ending. An accurate metaphor is a battlefield where issues of perceived importance are seeking resolution through the strategies of combat. Such a mentality produced a no-win situation. Thus, both congregation and minister lost.

The normal means by which leadership seeks a maximum amicable parting under such circumstance is called a Negotiated Settlement. However, whatever the style of ending, the drama of it all has endowed the congregation with a variety of possible feelings: anger, distrust, victory, failure, disgust, revenge, depression and woundedness. And these feelings will relate to both themselves and the minister. They are the feelings generated by warfare.

It is obvious that all of these feelings must be worked through, forgiveness must happen, wounds healed, trust restored, and unity instilled. In addition, the professional ministerial relationship with the congregation must again be made inviting and the congregation's energies must be redirected toward nobility. To achieve this goal will require both gentleness and wisdom. It will also require the ability to help the congregation lift its vision beyond its wounds.

It is common wisdom that this cannot be done in less than a two-year period. The formula is: a year for healing and a year for turning.

The Bereft

Another type is a congregation essentially characterized by bereftness. The congregation has had a long-term relationship of loving admiration with a professional minister and the relationship has ended. This loss could have been initiated by the minister's choice, by death or by some other circumstance of life. Whatever

the reason, the beloved has been snatched from the congregation's bosom and it is experiencing great trauma.

An apt metaphor is The Promised Land. Together, the congregation and minister had entered the Promised Land and experienced its glories. But when the minister left the Promised Land vanished because the Promised Land was not the place but the relationship.

It is the loss of the relationship and not the reason for the loss which is of consequence because the end result will be the same: denial, anger, guilt, bereftness, depression, defensiveness and anxiety. What is required in this circumstance is to deal in straightforward fashion with all of these feelings. Beyond helping the congregation restore itself to a state of spiritual health, the whole issue of identity apart from the lost minister and the experience of the lost Promised Land must be confronted and an identity that incorporates the minister, yet, which is paradoxically apart from the minister, must be constructed. An anticipation of a new Promised Land must be envisioned.

Without doubt, this requires a two-year interim period. The formula is: a year for grieving and a year for turning.

The Benumbed

A third type of congregation can be called the Benumbed. Again, the congregation has had a long-term relationship with a professional minister but it was characterized by benignity. This benignity eventuated in a form of numbing brought about by sitting on the status quo too long without movement. This numbing is the spiritual apathy produced by lack of vision and the spiritual slumber that lies beneath layers of boredom. There may have been temporary moments of restored feeling brought about by flirtation with conflict but these were usually smothered by a fomentation of civility. This congregation is experiencing great trauma, although

it is likely to go unrecognized because of the placidity of its surface life. Numbness makes for placidity and placidity is often confused for peace and satisfaction.

A descriptive metaphor for the benumbed congregation is Rip Van Winkle. Having drunk too deeply of that elixir blended of benignity and comfort, the institution has fallen into a slumber that has permitted time and all its progress to pass it by. Whatever energy has been expended was toward keeping the community's pulse beating. Its visible expression is outmoded and in a state of minimal maintenance. This congregation cannot be awakened by a gentle nudging. Only the trumpet blare will stir its slumber.

While helping the more dramatic Betrayed and Beloved type congregations toward spiritual health might appear to require more time and energy, this is not the case. The benumbed congregation's sense of mission is at low ebb and perceptions of possibility must come from without. Resurrecting motivation out of numbness and introducing the currency of history to the bypassed demands a high output of energy and a long period of time. In actuality, it may require a year of interim ministry to simply arouse the sleeper. When this is the case then all of the negative reactions to change will occur the second year rather than the first year when it would normally happen. The reason is that negative reactions can only be made by an awake membership.

But this delayed reaction may create a special problem. Normally, the changes that need to be made during the interim period are initiated the first year and people have the following year to absorb and see their benefit. However, if, as experience seems to dictate, it requires a year to awaken the Rip Van Winkle congregation, then a vital year for processing change is lost to this arousing activity. Thus, it is possible that, even though the interim period is two years in duration, people will still be processing change issues the first year of the newly settled minister. Therefore, this year could be fraught with danger to the settlement. Congregants with

unresolved issues around these changes may pressure the new minister to reverse the changes and, through this pressuring, sabotage the relationship before it has a chance to become grounded.

Other consequential problems confront the Interim Period. One is that as a result of its lack of spiritual growth over an extended period, the level of institutional wisdom is as low as the congregation's slumbering blood pressure. This means that, upon awakening, the tendency will be to make decisions commensurate with pre-slumber time wisdoms.

Although it may seem impractical at first thought, such congregations may actually need three years of interim in order to become healthy enough for a new settlement to have a good chance of succeeding. And perchance such a lengthy interim period were to actually become a part of the game plan, it would be inadvisable for one of these to be longer than two years. Indeed, it would be beneficial to have a second Interim Minister who could, as a new ministerial leader, affirm the changes made by her/his predecessor.

Another problem attendant to the Benumbed Congregation stems from the synonymy of its hibernation with that of a minimized maintenance mode. A maintenance mode is characterized by low vision, low energy, low commitment and low giving.

Consequently, anyone willing to step into key positions of leadership over long periods is not only appreciated but normally applauded. The longer the congregation is in slumber the longer the possibility that the same member will inhabit the same position. And the longer the person resides in a position the greater the tendency to accrue unwarranted powers. Members in service positions may even assume policy making powers that are in conflict with the normal functions of their role.

The deep emotional attachment of individual members to the power they have accrued and a consequent identification of this power with self-worth may well create the possibilities of serious conflicts and dramas that drain vital energy away from transition needs. Moreover, the congregation may have elevated the status of such persons to a form of maintenance sainthood and be very reluctant to address the issues inherent in this power aberration scenario. Those involved in the Interim Period should take care that this scenario is fraught with explosive and damaging possibility.

Given all of the issues of loss and power inherent in helping the Benumbed Congregation to awaken and begin dealing with necessary changes, if it can be done successfully at all, it will require a minimum of two years. The formula is: a year for awakening and a year for turning.

The Bequeathed

The forth type of Special Care Congregation can be called the Bequeathed. Some quip has suggested that after a minister has been in a congregation for seven years, she/he owns it. What this rather arrogant sounding notion really means is that people who join a congregation during a minister's tenure do so because of that minister's appeal or, at the least, because the minister does not turn them off. Given time, enough members join who like the minister and enough leave who do not as to convert the congregation into a pro-minister community. This transforms into a kind of ownership, which announces that the majority of the congregation can be persuaded by the minister's vision.

It might be possible to argue with the quip's notion that it only takes seven years for all this to happen. However, if the ministry relationship is a normal one, then that transformation will take place sometime on a time-line between seven and ten years. Thus, when the minister leaves a legacy is bequeathed....that of a

congregation that basically reflects the minister's theology and institutional perspectives. And sufficient time has passed for this legacy to become subtly sanctified in numerous ways. It is this sanctification that is the key issue.

An adequate metaphor for this bequeathment is ghosts. Ghosts are dangerous because they appear at unexpected times and, often, critical moments in life inducing fear and diverting attention from the main business of living. Moreover, ghosts claim to have ownership of what they appear to represent and threaten harm to anyone seeking to contend this ownership. Any new minister immediately following this bequeathment will spend a great deal of time during the first several years of ministry discovering and dealing with this ghostly legacy. And it is likely that this minister's relationship with the congregation will be victimized in some serious way by any attempts at exorcising these ghosts. Ghosts resent being made homeless and will seek to rid their haunts of the intruder.

The negative possibilities of the bequeathed circumstance argue for a two-year interim period. The mistake, I believe, is assuming that two years is not needed because there are no visible symptoms of trauma present in congregational life. The reason such is not apparent is because another minister has not challenged the ghosts of the legacy. Once challenged, the trauma will emerge. Thus, harm lays waiting beneath the placid surface of congregational life.

This kind of bequeathed ministry warrants, in my judgment, an application of the historical wisdom embodied in the notion that it is better to be safe than sorry. The formula is: a year for exorcising and a year for turning.

Turning

As I envision it, the goal of the interim process is to empower the congregation to arrive at a maximum state of spiritual health. If

this happens, then, the new ministerial relationship that follows will also have a maximum possibility of success.

For Special Care Congregations this means dealing with the peculiar issues of their kind in as adequate a fashion as possible for the first year of the interim process. The second year is then available to empower the congregation to turn its attention to the other issues of ministry that have to do with preparing for a new future. While it might be possible to deal with the visible symptoms of the Special Care Congregation in a year's time, that is not the end of their need. Equally important is a re-visioning of identity, mission and ministry that takes the congregation's focus away from their self pre-occupation and permits the healing process to conclude.

So another way of stating the formula is that the first year is spent dealing with the congregation's special care needs and the second year is spent moving their focus outward toward mission nobility. These two foci cannot be done simultaneously with an expectation of success. They, each, need their own measure of time and attention. And they, each, require a different model of professional ministry for the provocation required to pull it all off in just two years.

Category Symptoms

It should be kept in mind that these four categories of special need are not exclusive to each other. It is possible that a congregation might exhibit the symptoms of more than a single category.

One Interim Minister exposed the basic leadership of a congregation to this schematic and all four categories found strong affirmation. However, this was a congregation that had been deeply traumatized by a long history of bad choices and dysfunctional relationships.

It is most likely that one category will dominate any given congregation's symptoms with a possible secondary set of symptoms that indicate additional institutional needs.

While the symptoms of the dominating category are useful in determining the needs of the interim period, the base-line conclusion to keep in mind is that a congregation exhibiting such symptoms needs a full two year interim period to address these needs.

Interim Minister Stint

A question that may arise for the Special Care Congregation is: "If a congregation needs a two year interim period, should the same Interim Minister serve the entire period?" The answer to this question is grounded in a number of considerations:

- What abilities and leadership skills needs are called for by the congregation's peculiar circumstance and dominating category of special care? Congregations will exhibit distinctive interim period needs.
- To what extent do the available Interim Minister's individual professional capacities correspond to this needs assessment? While all Interim Ministers go through certification training they still have varied and distinctive sets of professional capacities.
- What are the preferences of individual Interim Ministers as to the scope of time they wish to commit to an interim process? Interim Ministers, assessing their own needs and capacities, express different preferences as to the length of their interim period service.

Just as acquiring the right settled minister is a matter of matching needs and availability, so is acquiring the right Interim Minister.

This is particularly true of congregations that fall under two year special care needs. In brief, whether an Interim Minister is engaged for only one or both years of the interim period is dictated by the peculiarities and choices of the existing circumstance.

In making such determinations, the lay leadership of Special Care Congregations may wish to consult with the UUA Settlement Director under whose auspices the training and placement of Interim Ministers falls.

The In-House Interim Minister

One of the more spurious assumptions a congregation can make is that an in-house minister could effectively lead it through an interim period. This is the case irrespective of how qualified such a minister might be. There are critical reasons as to why this is an unwise assumption. These reasons traffic on the in-house minister being overly familiar with and too heavily invested in the congregation's history and circumstance. Some of these reasons are that:

- it is nearly impossible for an in-house minister to bring any real objectivity to bear on assessing congregational need and to asserting a corresponding professional leadership.
- the power of new out-of-house professional leadership cannot be exerted as leverage toward needed change and direction movement.
- creative visions of the future, so vitally needed during this decisive historical moment, are unlikely to be generated.
- in-house ministerial leadership cannot extract itself from the burden of old alliances and the negativities of old conflicts

and provide the sharp-edged inspiration required to unify congregational commitments.

- the special training and insights of Interim Ministers will not be available to the congregation at a moment when it is most needed to help attain that spiritual health that will be required to assure the maximum success of a new settled ministerial relationship.
- The in-house minister could actually become an impediment to the ministerial settlement process by covertly or overtly aspiring for this settled position.

What is needed in the Special Care Congregation is that kind of skilled outside leadership that can empower the congregation, in its present, to break the patterns that bind it to the past and develop the visions that will bond it to the future. Any in-house minister who can make this happen would be an extraordinary exception to the leadership needs that govern interim period dynamics. The congregation's destiny is too important to gamble on this slim margin of possibility.

Diagram

Following is a diagram of some of the basic differences between the Special Care Congregations I have mentioned. The attempt is to be informative rather than exhaustive. In resorting to the chart for insight it should be kept in mind that no relationship or institution is as simple or clear as a diagram. Every congregation is a living organism with symptomatic peculiarities. In addition, professional ministers have their own individual stylistic ways of perceiving the realities of congregational life. Thus, the value of diagramming is precisely its distortion of reality. Caricature provokes clarity.

ISSUE	BETRAYED	BEREFT	BENUMBED	BEQUEATHED
Metaphor	Battlefield	Promised Land	Rip Van Winkle	Ghosts
Description	Conflict between Minister / Congregation: all feel betrayed	The beloved Minister has left: congregation feels bereft	Congregation has been numbed by sitting too long on the status quo	Long term minister has left: her / his ghosts have yet to be challenged
Tone	Failure, victory, hostility, relief, anger, guilt, blame, confusion, woundedness	Abandonment, anger, depression, anxiety, fear, defensiveness, loss, pride	Grogginess, boredom, blah, relief, jadedness, comfortableness, openness, anticipation	A sense of loss commensurate with the nature of the relationship
Change	Stability, please!	No Changes!	If it brings vitality and direction or “We have always done it this way.”	Things are just fine
Landmine	Taking sides	Anything sanctified by a past two-year existence	Whatever the Old-Timers enacted	Be careful or you will find out
Trust	General distrust of ministers and each other	Trust of all who uphold that which has been sanctified	Trust in caution, conservatism and maintenance	To be earned
Power	Polarized: struggle for dominance	Protectiveness of all empowerment conferred by the Beloved	Fractionalized and disconnected units vie for resources and attention	Present structures empowered as sufficient
Value	Stability, unity, peace, restoration of community	All things past	Approved processes	Solidity
Attitude Toward Past Minister	Ambivalent: love or hate, loss or relief	Irreplaceable loss	Ambivalent: perceived as ineffective but a good person	Respected, Appreciated
Attitude Toward Interim Minister	Peace-Maker	Usurper	Ambivalence	Interloper
What Needs Addressing?	Forgiveness, healing, trust, causes, unity, identity, mission, integrity of the professional ministry	Grief, loss, anxiety, change, the past, identity, mission, new model of professional ministry, new Promised Land	Awakening, potential, structures, lost years, power issues, staffing, leadership, identity, mission	Identifying ghosts, exorcisms, excitement, different tomorrow, new ministerial model, identity, mission
Leadership	Divided	United	Sleepwalking	Blasé
A Basic Institutional Need	A unifying new vision	Successful alternative professional model	Whatever promotes resurrection	New vision of possibility
A Basic Need	Gentle and unifying coaxing	Firm, directing non-anxious	Great excitement and a hint of	Inspiring push from a solid

From The Interim Minister		presence	glory	presence
------------------------------	--	----------	-------	----------

**First UU Austin Board of Trustees
Meeting Process Review**

Date: _____

Name of Evaluator: _____

Ratings: S indicates Satisfactory; NI indicates Needs Improvement; UNS indicates Unsatisfactory

1. Preparation

The board was prepared for this meeting.	S	NI	UNS
--	---	----	-----

2. Action Items - Previous

Last month's action items were completed.	S	NI	UNS
---	---	----	-----

3. Timing

Appropriate time was allocated and spent on agenda items.	S	NI	UNA
---	---	----	-----

4. Policy Governance

Policy governance was observed.	S	NI	UNS
---------------------------------	---	----	-----

5. Covenant

The board covenant was observed.	S	NI	UNS
----------------------------------	---	----	-----

6. Participation

All board members had the opportunity to participate in discussions and decision-making.	S	NI	UNS
--	---	----	-----

7. Action Items - Current

Clear action items were identified from this meeting.	S	NI	UNS
---	---	----	-----

8. Overall

	S	NI	UNS
--	---	----	-----

Comments: