

Minutes
College for Bishops Board of Directors Meeting
April 7-8, 2010

The semi-annual meeting of the Board of Directors of the College for Bishops (CfB) was held at the Virginia Theological Seminary in Alexandria, VA beginning at 2:00 pm on April 7, 2010.

Directors in attendance: The Rt Rev'd J. Neil Alexander; The Rev'd Canon Patricia M. Coller; Mr. William S. Craddock, Jr.; The Rev'd Dr. Ian T. Douglas; The Rt Rev'd Duncan M. Gray III; The Rt Rev'd Don E. Johnson; The Rt Rev'd Chilton R. Knudsen; The Rt Rev'd F. Clayton Matthews; The Rt Rev'd Henry N. Parsley, Jr.; The Rt Rev'd Victor A. Scantlebury; Dr. Timothy F. Sedgwick; The Rt Rev'd Dean E. Wolfe.

Directors not present: The Rt Rev'd David Alvarez; The Rt Rev'd J. Jon Bruno; The Rt Rev'd Edwin F. Gulick, Jr.; The Most Rev'd Katharine Jefferts Schori; Mr. Donald Romanik.

Staff members present: The Rev'd J. Michael Ehmer; Ms. Ellen Y. Rolfes, who took minutes.

Bishop Matthews opened the meeting with prayer. Bishop Alexander outlined the meeting agenda which primarily focused on resource development and securing the CfB's financial future. David Beers has researched the legalities and joined the group to share recommendations and answer questions.

STRUCTURE

Currently, CfB is a program of the Domestic and Foreign Missionary Society (DFMS), through the Office of Pastoral Development (OPD), with a strong connection to the House of Bishops (HOB). CfB has a collaborative agreement with CREDO Institute, Inc. (CII) to provide administrative support.

OPD was created by GC at the request of the HOB in the 1970's. The bishop in charge of the OPD is appointed by the Presiding Bishop (PB). Currently, the Bishop of the Office of Pastoral Development also functions as the Managing Director of the College for Bishops.

In order to raise funds for CfB, the organization's structure must be clarified so donors are assured the funds given will be entrusted for CfB specifically. After discussions about structure, the board concluded that a resolution be drafted recommending CfB be restructured as an independent, nonprofit incorporation, under the tax exemption umbrella of DFMS for adoption by the HOB. Members of the reorganized CfB Board of Directors could be nominated by the presiding bishop (PB) and ratified by the HOB. The reorganized CfB could determine the future role of OPD in its structure. Examples of agencies that have gone through a similar process of becoming separate entities from DFMS but still connected to it include Forward Movement Publications, Historical Society of The Episcopal Church, United Thank Offering and Episcopal Relief and Development.

Mr. Douglas mentioned there is a desire by members of the executive council (EC) for more participation in the whole of the Church rather than cleaving off of organizations. The desire is not necessarily centralization, but more of a general connectedness among organizations. Bishops are a significant minority voice within the EC. A move towards a separate nonprofit organization could be perceived as bishops attempting to build a separate kingdom, potentially complicating the relationship between bishops and deputies. Bishop Matthews echoed the concern.

CfB does not have a substantial amount of money and it is a program that is already salutary. It has an office with staff, so this move is only to try to clean up legalities and give CfB future stability. Mr. Douglas added there are several General Convention resolutions affirming CfB and commending its work, so celebrating those resolutions could be a starting point in the conversation. The point was made that CfB is not asking the

EC for anything and there is no need to tell them of CfB's desire to become a separate entity unless the PB wants to share it with them.

Any monies raised for CfB would be put into a trust. Mr. Beers added that these monies would be held by the corporation, which could decide where and how they should be invested. Donors would have the option to list restrictions.

Mr. Beers does not see any potential Sarbanes Oxley conflicts as it has little impact on charitable organizations, especially religious ones. Bishop Alexander noted that there's a sense that Sarbanes Oxley would have an impact because of the ultimate inability for donors to designate where their money is used.

Bishop Alexander asked Mr. Beers to clarify his advice to organize CfB in a similar fashion to ERD: as a separate entity with a separate board. Mr. Beers explained that ERD recommends board members to the PB. The PB nominates members to the EC, which approves (or not) the nominations. EC ultimately controls the makeup of the ERD board. In the proposed setup, the PB, with the advice and recommendations of CfB, would present a slate of CfB board members to the HOB for ratification. Thus, the HOB would ultimately control the board makeup, ensuring ownership of CfB.

Bishop Matthews said the formal procedure would be for him to discuss the idea of CfB becoming a separate entity with the PB. If approved, then work should begin on crafting a resolution outlining the way the board is to be elected and appointed, calling for CfB to be incorporated, noting where ultimate ownership of assets would lie, etc. After discussing whether or not approval of the resolution could be accomplished by the HOB via email, the board agreed that the resolution should be presented at the September 2010 HOB meeting for discussion and vote by the bishops.

The goal of the fall conversation will be to sell CfB to the HOB, generate energy among the group and help build a sense of ownership. Bishops should have some general information regarding the pending fundraising initiative. Bishop Scantlebury mentioned producing a press release to increase awareness of CfB and make it more normative among the HOB. Questions of control come up, so it will be important to clarify in why the new structure of CfB is desirable.

Mr. Beers recommended incorporating in Delaware or D.C., not in New York. A chancellor could draw up the documents and then give them to Mr. Beers for review. The process itself is simple and could be accomplished in less than a day. If CfB does incorporate, then CfB employees could sign check, contracts, etc. and not have to route them through DFMS.

Mr. Sedgwick asked about what liabilities exist for CfB if someone were to sue. Mr. Beers said that if CfB were to make a mistake, there are assets to be reached. Lawyers can try to protect restricted gifts, but there is no guarantee. Anyone who sues will sue TEC. Principal funds would not back up the claim against CfB, but now it would have to stand behind any fault of CfB. Individual liabilities of board members would be the same.

Default provisions must be made and outlined, especially where funds would go if CfB went out of business and whether or not the HOB would have any decision-making power.

Mr. Beers left the meeting at 3:30 pm.

2010-2013 Financials

Mr. Ehmer reported on the 2010-2013 financial projections. Funds received from CPG through CREDO for the current triennium will decrease and be discontinued in 2013. There was a \$44,000 surplus in 2009, a \$17,000 surplus is projected in 2010 but deficit budgets are forecasted beyond 2010. Reserve funds (totaling approximately \$144,000) are available to help through 2011, but a portion of that money will be used to drive the endowment project.

Living Our Vows tuition was reduced for TEC bishops in 2010 due to GC funding. CfB will need to document clearly how the GC funds are expended. Mr. Ehmer added that the line-item amounts for management fees to CREDO represent educated guesses. They were added indicate the real cost of operating CfB out of the CREDO office. The difference between management fees to CREDO and less-in kind contributions is the actual amount CfB pays to CREDO.

There is no need for immediate panic about the financial situation, but long-term prudence and action are necessary.

FUNDRAISING

Overall Endowment “Campaign” Concept

Bishops Alexander and Matthews and others met in Atlanta in March to draft a concept for this fundraising effort for presentation to the board. The group agreed on \$10 million as a likely goal. They thought the effort should be quiet, lay-led, bishop-guided and target individual donors.

A suggestion was made to call this effort a “sustainable fund” rather than a campaign and that it should emphasize leadership.

This effort will likely include regional chairs (lay and bishop) who will assist with moving the efforts forward and give exposure to the wider Church. The PB’s participation will be crucial. If a deep pocket lay person who really understands systems, leadership, strategic planning, etc. could get on board and contribute a significant amount of money, then he/she could guide the process and help make calls to other donors. Efforts should be made to identify opportunities for planned giving, bequeaths, designated funds, program naming, scholarships, etc.

The board agreed the goal amount should be raised (perhaps to \$15M) since \$10M will give CfB sustainability, but not much room to expand programs, begin new research initiatives, increase scholarships, etc.

A suggestion was made to conduct a feasibility study to research current giving capacities. This information would be important to have as well as the names of potential donors who may be interested in this particular initiative. Bishop Matthews added that the bishops currently enrolled in Living Our Vows endorsed the idea highly.

Bishop Wolfe thought a “selling point” could be comparing the cost of training a bishop for three-years through CfB to the average cost of an episcopal election, the cost for preparing a priest for ordination and the amount of money (property, personnel, etc.) that the HOB oversees. Consider the investment that should be made in church leaders.

Bishop Johnson noted that CfB should not count on continued funding from GC in future years if it restructures and begins to receive significant funding from outside donors.

Bishop Wolfe raised the question of the relationship of this initiative to the Mission Funding Initiative. The two initiatives will remain separate, but the idea of requesting bundled gifts from donors was presented. After discussion, the group decided not to pursue further the idea of bundled gifts as the hope is to begin and complete the CfB initiative before the Mission Funding really begins.

Bishop Matthews proposed to convene a smaller group to further develop the details of this concept.

Investment Management

The board discussed the question of how to manage funds once they are received and if they should be managed by DFMS, Church Pension Fund (CPF) or Episcopal Church Foundation (ECF). Bishop Alexander mentioned an ongoing conversation about the possible development of a body that will allow dioceses, colleges, etc. to aggregate their money for benefit of larger return. The group in conversation is going by the name of Timeas. More about the future of this project will be known in mid-April.

The board agreed that CPF could be a positive option for managing CfB's funds and recommended having a conversation with key principals.

Mr. Craddock asked if CfB should consider looking at the Sewanee or VTS investment portfolios. Mr. Sedgwick agreed that CfB should explore both and look at CfB's relationship to the institutions. Bishop Alexander asked that the board give him or Bishop Matthews the names of any investment people in their dioceses as the details of fund management are considered.

Bishops Alexander and Matthews will inform the PB of this board meeting and will review/inquire about:

1. The desire for CfB to become a separately incorporated entity under the tax exempt status of DFMS with the ability to determine how resources are managed.
 - a. Drafting a resolution for discussion at the September HOB meeting.
 - b. Discussion of the incorporation process and Mr. Beers' possible involvement.
2. The fundraising initiative
 - a. The need for her to be personally involved in this focused, quiet campaign that will be lay-led and bishop-supported.
 - b. The importance of cautious transparency (being open to bishops who have been involved) to keep the momentum going.
 - c. The exact figure has not been determined, but \$10 million is too modest and doesn't allow for new initiatives. CfB will be prepared for the possible loss of financial support from GC.
 - d. How she would feel if previous PBs were approached about helping with the project.
3. The process of the nomination, approval and ratification of CfB board members.

Campaign Coordinator Position

The draft job description for a part-time Endowment Campaign Coordinator was reviewed by the group. The individual in this position will serve to facilitate the campaign process, prepare and maintain records and materials and work directly with the campaign co-chairs and/or other volunteers. A suggestion was made to rename the position "Resource Development Consultant."

Bishop Wolfe mentioned that the coordinator position seems to be more of a project administrator position and that there is still a need for an actual coordinator who will be more in contact with the individuals making calls. Mr. Craddock added that the PB could perhaps have suggestions for the coordinator. Details of this position and structure will need to be outlined more clearly.

Bishop Alexander suggested having a campaign advisory committee consisting of bishop co-chairs (East Coast and West Coast) and several mission critical lay leaders. This "campaign cabinet" should have a maximum of 6-7 people and meet regularly either in person or via conference call.

Fundraising Committee Setup

A listing of names of individuals, bishops, foundations and dioceses that may be considered for serving on a fundraising committee, giving large gifts or using their influence to talk to potential donors includes:

Lay/Bishops East of the Mississippi

Lay: James Baker, Jim Barksdale (MS), Alan Blanchard, Connie Fraser (NC), George Gallup (NJ), Lyle Hall (VT/clergy), Mason/Ann Hawkins (WTN), Martha Ingram (Nashville/TN), Cristoph Keller, Polly Keller Winters (AR), Jim Kennedy (ATL), Dan Matthews, Mac MacFarling (ATL),

Butch & Owen Mills (ETN), Lucy Perry (ATL/Coca Cola), David Pitts (Louisiana), Quinton Premo (Chicago, Capri Capital), Kimberly Tracy (Boston, UNICEF), John Whitehead (Goldman Sachs)

Bishops: Clark Grew, Frank Griswold, Ted Gulick, Peter Lee, Hayes Rockwell, Wayne Wright (DuPont)

Lay/Bishops West of the Mississippi

Lay: M.L. Agnew (clergy), George H.W. Bush (TX), John Danforth (clergy), Mrs. Hoover (Chicago/Bill Persell), Arthur Kusumoto (HI), Tom Luce (Dallas), David Miller (Los Angeles), Nancy Mulford (Dallas), ? Rusack, Dennis Scully (Chicago), Ann Tuohy (Chicago)

Bishops: Fred Borsch, Dick Chang, Carolyn Irish, Jeff Lee, Jim Mathes, Claude Payne, Wayne Smith, Bill Swing, Don Wimberly

Foundations

Crystal - Chattanooga, TN (St. Paul's Church), Hunter Huckabee
Lilly Foundation (Cate Waynick)
Luce – Michael Gilligan, Neil Alexander

Dioceses

Alabama, Atlanta, California, Colorado, Connecticut, Dallas, Delaware, Ft Worth (Ted & Wally), Idaho, Indianapolis, Long Island, Los Angeles, Massachusetts, Missouri, New York, Rochester, Southeast Florida, Southern Ohio, Texas, Utah, Virginia, West Missouri, Wyoming

Parishes

All Saint's Pasadena
Christ Church, Alexandria
Christ Church, Charlotte
Christ Church, Chattanooga
Christ Church, Greenwich

Christ Church, Indianapolis
Christ Church, Short Hills, NJ
St. Michael & St. George – St. Louis
Trinity New York

In order to increase awareness of this CfB initiative, each bishop should be involved in some way, perhaps by being called and asked for 2-3 names of people they would approach to support this fundraising effort. Even if all suggested potential donors weren't contacted, this would be part of the informal conversation to happen prior to the September 2010 HOB meeting.

Research should be conducted to look for funds that have money no one has requested. Children of bishops are another demographic that could be targeted. This initiative will ideally not evolve (in order to avoid sticky politics) into a larger "campaign" of requesting support from the wider Church.

The meeting adjourned for the day at 8:30 pm.

Thursday, April 8

Bishop Alexander began the morning with prayer and reconvened the meeting at 8:50 am.

GOVERNANCE

Update on Governance

Bishop Matthews reviewed the draft guidelines of CfB governance that were outlined at the October 2009 meeting. The only change made since October was to delay the beginning of new classes of directors. New board members will now begin serving at fall meetings. Those members rotating off will serve through the

summer up until the fall meeting. The PB supports having a Canadian bishop serve on the board. Bishop Matthews will move forward with extending an invitation to Colin Johnson.

Bishops who will rotate off of the board in the Fall 2010 are: Ian Douglas, Ted Gulick, Chilton Knudsen and Victor Scantlebury. Their service over the years has been greatly appreciated and will be more formally recognized at a later date. Mary Gray-Reeves will begin serving in the Fall 2010. Bishop Matthews asked the board for suggestions of a bishop and a non-bishop “other” to be added in the fall as well. The group agreed the “other” should continue to be a seminary faculty member if possible. Suggested individuals included: Cynthia Kittredge (SSW), Sathi Clark (Wesley, HOB Theology Committee), Kwok Pui Lan (EDS), Fredricka Harris Thompson (retired). Additional suggestions of “others” included a deep-pocketed lay person, a researcher or a consultant for diocesan processes or academics currently serving on Church committees. These “others” could attend a few board meetings as a guest and then be considered to become part of the board at a later date. Maintaining a diverse board and having a stronger representation of women was requested.

Bishop Alexander asked for suggestions of bishops to approach about serving on the board. The following were named: Tom Breidenthal (Theology Committee), Joe Burnett (Theology Committee, former professor), Jeff Lee, Alan Scarfe and Cate Waynick.

The following revisions/clarifications to the by laws were suggested:

1. Ex officio board members should be appointed annually by the chair and board. The question was raised as to whether or not an organization could continue to have board representation if they stop contributing to CfB.
2. The PB will nominate board members (suggested by the board of directors) and the HOB will ratify the decision.
3. The board chair should appoint the Nominating Committee. Whether or not this committee will consist of the entire board or only several members will need to be determined.

Details of the CfB governance and nominating committee will need to be more clearly defined by an Executive Committee. Once draft bylaws and a resolution are created and approved by the PB, they will be submitted to the board for ratification either by conference call or email prior to the September HOB meeting.

REPORTS

Managing Director’s Report

Bishop Matthews expressed his thanks to the directors and CREDO staff members for their continued work and support. The 2009 Annual Report speaks to a very successful year. Bishop Matthews sees 2010 as a time of transition, not just in terms of where CfB fits in the organizational structure of the Church, but in terms of obtaining clarity of that fit, clarifying the structure of governance and moving forward with seeking sustainable, ongoing funding.

Projects in 2010 include training a new class of peer coaches and 90-day companions, continuing research projects and changing the faculty and several components of the Living Our Vows Residency.

Communications

The 2009 Annual Report was well received at the March HOB meeting. Bishop Matthews reported that the report has been effective in increasing awareness of CfB and several retired bishops who have been at HOB meetings and seen the reports have made pledges. He added that the report serves as a pleasant reminder of past meetings that CfB has facilitated and helps encourage a sense of pride in and ownership of CfB by the HOB.

Mr. Craddock noted that Herb Gunn has recently begun work as the Director of Communications for CREDO. He will be available to help CfB create a communications strategy. A suggestion was made to create a CfB Communications Committee and also have a formal communications strategy prepared for the board to review in October.

2009 and 2010 Goals and Objectives

Bishop Matthews reviewed the 2009 Goals, Objective and Actions and 2010 Goals and Objectives. Programs continue to go well. The *Around One Table* (AOT) session at the March HOB meeting was well received. Bishops Breidenthal and Waynick reflected on two AOT themes and helped bishops engage in theological conversation and consider implications for use of AOT in their dioceses. Mr. Ehmer reported that CREDO is creating a curriculum for use by reorganizing dioceses (in CREDO's Strength for the Journey program) using AOT information. The curriculum will be replicable and available for use by the wider Church in the early fall. Mr. Craddock added that this curriculum will not be solely driven by CREDO and will be a collaborative offering of CfB, CREDO and Fresh Start to the Church. The information is owned by the Church and will be available on multiple websites (including TEC's) for widespread use.

The Episcopal Elections and Transitions Project survey has been completed and theologians are at work. A summary report is already being used in dioceses in election processes. Mr. Craddock added that findings from this project may tie in nicely with CREDO's Vocational Profile initiative currently being developed.

The following were suggested as additions to the list of 2010 goals and objectives:

1. Goal: Obtain clarity regarding CfB's organizational placement in the structure of TEC.
Objective: Prepare a resolution for the HOB asking for CfB to become a nonprofit entity with the PB nominating board members and the HOB ratifying them. *A motion was made to add the above goal to the 2010 listing, duly seconded and approved by the Board of Directors.*
2. Goal: Explore opportunities and new areas of development that are aligned with CfB's mission.
Areas to explore include research, Episcopal discernment, continuing education, vocational profiles for bishops, staffs, dioceses, etc.
3. Goal: Explore opportunities for analyzing and working with the data gathered from research projects.

Bishop Parsley suggested offering stand-alone professional development courses that focus on particular aspects of episcopal ministry (i.e. bishop as teacher, overseer, public person, etc.) This intensive piece with focused content should be opened up to all in the Anglican Communion and other ecumenical partners (Lutherans, Moravians, Methodists) to encourage relationship building.

Mr. Douglas noted that CfB programs are far superior to the program for new bishops offered in Canterbury. CfB could help better serve the Communion by being more deliberate about inviting others to participate in its offerings. Ed Condry at Canterbury Cathedral was recommended as a contact. Robin Eames and Johnson Tom were suggested as leaders of courses dealing with conflict and ethnic diversity.

Bishop Wolfe sees this as an opportunity to collaborate. Programs could be offered in typically "slow" weeks (Last week of Nov/first of Dec/early Jan/early Sept.) in an enticing location. Bishop Alexander added that CfB should explore offering programming for bishops who are already retired. Even though individuals are retired or resigned, they still have a need for care, fellowship, study, etc. How can these individual still give gifts to the Church even without having an active office in TEC.

Mr. Sedgwick added that exploring new program ideas will need to be considered so that it can be advanced as a focused conversation at the fall board meeting. What are the goals of expanding program offerings? Small courses are expensive and labor intensive. CfB should not be the place for just offering workshops, there should be a development of learning with a range of critical perspective. Someone needs to think through the ideas and exploration of choices and direction.

Mr. Sedgwick added that research findings and data are being collected and not being used. These need to be put together and used. How do we explore it? Who will bear that initiative? Mr. Craddock cautioned that CFB not begin development of this area this year as the primary focus right now is fundraising and some exploration also. Mr. Sedgwick feels that there needs to be a larger plan and discussion before too long. He suggested having a Lutheran bishop on the board as an ecumenical representative to provide input and provide transferrable information to the Lutherans.

2009 and 2010 Financials

Mr. Ehmer reviewed the 2009 financials and noted the \$44,000 surplus due to lower than anticipated expenses. The 2010 budget was approved via email by the Board of Directors in early January. The first quarter 2010 report shows a surplus, but not many expenses have been incurred at this point. The numbers are expected to balance out in upcoming months.

Living Our Vows annual tuition fees for TEC bishops was lowered to \$2,100 due to the GC funding to be received. Non-TEC bishops will pay \$3,200 which is the estimated actual direct cost of the training program per year.

A scholarship line was added to the budget to assist participants with LOV tuitions and other program fees.

Bishop Matthews requested that an income line be added to highlight the HOB continuing education expenses even though they are completely reimbursed by DFMS. Having this expense line in the budget (without any funds budgeted for it) will show potential donors an area that could possibly be supported by outside funding.

Budget items related to Bishop Matthews' compensation, social security, etc. were rolled into one line in order to make the budget cleaner. A new line item was added to show the true costs of CREDO's in-kind contribution of administrative assistance. By the end of the year, the managements fees paid to CREDO less the in-kind contribution will equal the actual amount of funds paid to CREDO by CFB.

Programs and Evaluation

The board reviewed the end-of-conference evaluations from the January New Bishops' and Spouses' Conference (NBSC) and the results of the March Peer Coaching Evaluation (PCE) survey. The NBSC program scored well overall and there will be a few items in the conference to tweak. Dean and Ellen Wolfe were new faculty members this year.

The peer coaching program is gaining momentum, and David Rynick continues to do well as a coach trainer. New bishops tend to rate the coaching experience higher than the coaches do, which is likely a result of the coaches being hard on themselves in terms of expectations.

Bishop Johnson made the observation that there is a need to be more intentional towards the end of the coaching relationship in terms of setting transitional goals and how to redefine the relationship after the three-year coaching relationship has concluded. Bishop Gray added that being a coach and not a mentor remains a challenge for many and should be built into the relationships.

Mr. Sedgwick believes that having a meeting of coaches about the learnings, findings, etc. from the relationship would be beneficial in order to get feedback over time. Bishop Matthews added that the idea of having a former bishop coach as a regional check-in person (coach for the coaches) to get immediate feedback is under consideration. These individuals could also help with making future coach/new bishop assignments.

A number of coaches have noted that when they are utilizing coaching skills they have learned not only with their new bishops, but in their dioceses as well. The coaching program has a mutual benefit and is helping

build a new culture among CfB, the HOB and even dioceses as several clergy peer coaching programs have been established as a result of this program.

Research

Results of the interviews conducted for the Bishop Spouse Project were presented at the New Bishops' and Spouses' Conference. Additional findings and analysis of the data from surveys administered in 2009 will be released later this year and possibly presented to the spouse community at the September HOB meeting. Bishop Gray mentioned that the spouse conversation could be somewhat tilted as not all spouses will be at the HOB meeting for various reasons. Woodi Sprinkel will likely assist researcher Therese Sprinkle in making the language of the survey findings less academic and more easily understood and presentable.

Initial findings outlined five roles that spouses typically play, decisions they must make regarding the level of involvement in the bishop's role and how they handle the expectations of the Church. The bishop's role in helping the spouse deal with those roles is also an area of discovery. Bishop Matthews feels that the survey data will show something different from that of the interviews. Mr. Craddock noted that this is a wellness issue that is not normally unpacked. The data from this project has great potential for use by clergy spouses, families and children.

Bishop Alexander noted that research and other materials should use the term "ordination" instead of "consecration."

Mr. Sedgwick added that the findings from this project should be an archived and accessible resource for use by the wider Church over time. Bishop Matthews added that it should be posted within the public area of the CfB website and communicated to the wider Church that it's available.

A discussion regarding archiving material followed. Mr. Douglas suggested opening an account with TEC's Archives department with the assistance of Mark Duffy. It will be important to determine what materials in the history of CfB should be copied and kept.

Other

The minutes of the directors' meeting held October 22, 2009 were reviewed and approved as written.

HOB Meetings

The Theology Committee, *Around One Table* and Emergent Church sessions of the March HOB meeting that CfB coordinated went well.

The HOB Planning Committee (PC) decided to begin using the term "Community Learning" instead of "Continuing Education" for these sessions. The overall Theme of this Triennium is "The Church in the Third Millennium" which will have three repeating or sequential streams of content: Identity, Mission, and Evangelism. Evangelism has emerged as the primary topic for the September 2010 meeting in Phoenix, AZ. Hispanic evangelism and immigration will also be topics and the intention seems to "showcase" The Diocese of Arizona as well. Bishop Matthews indicated he will ask Mr. Douglas to consider presenting an opening discussion on the theology of evangelism."

CfB's role in the HOB meeting is not completely clear at this point. The PC will likely want to post various videos on the CfB website from people who want to report to the HOB but not asked to present in-person at the meeting.

Bishop Parsley noted that the HOB gets into numerous topics and doesn't spend enough time going into depth on the subjects that are covered. There is a great desire among the HOB for practical implications of topics covered. It will be important to make sure there are inputs, but to also have the HOB reflect on what a

particular topic means for them in different settings. There should be a larger conversation for the whole and the overall educational process from meeting to meeting should be conveyed.

Bishop Scantlebury noted that the PC should consider how much of the HOB has heard particular speakers before inviting them. What are the next steps for topics, i.e. how to sustain Emergent communities? So what, now what?

Mr. Sedgwick suggested bringing together 3-4 people with different perspectives to present a topic along with a few practitioners to help bishops have a conversation and create an iterative process. Bishop Gray added that CfB should give programming recommendations to the PC and follow up on them.

Bishop Johnson asked if the AOT information could be used again to help continue to address the theme of identity and provide continuity among meetings. What would that look like in a bishop's diocese relative to the mission of the church where he/she is planted? Could the evangelism piece from AOT be used?

Mr. Sedgwick noted that Tom Breidenthal has written a theological paper for ARCUSA on immigration. Eugene Sutton is also working on the subject in his diocese along with others writing theological papers.

Conclusion

The next meeting of the directors will be held October 6-7, 2010 at the Desmond Tutu Center in New York. April 13-14, 2011 and October 4-5, 2011 were set as future meeting dates. Locations will be determined, but CfB will continue to look at VTS as an option. The Fall 2011 meeting dates are tentative as this meeting may be held as a conference call rather than as in-person.

The directors met in Executive Session. There being no further business, upon motion duly made and seconded, the meeting was adjourned at 11:45 am.

College for Bishops Directors' Meeting – April 7-8, 2010
Appendix A

1. Clay and/or Neil to meet with ++ Katharine to review this meeting and discuss draft resolution for HOB
2. Begin draft of resolution to be approved by Directors in summer and presented to HOB in fall.
3. Create campaign advisory committee (4-5 people) and create timeline for summer/fall
4. Review names of potential donors and continue to add to list
5. List key growth areas and new horizon projects.
6. Link ETEP (Episcopal Transitions and Election Project) with current work on CREDO's Vocational Leadership initiative.
7. Initiate conversations with Lutheran bishops
8. Anticipate next steps with Bishops/Spouse research
9. Governance
 - a. Move Gulick to Fall 2010 class to replace Parsley.
 - b. Page 1 will change based upon the resolution...PB to nominate and HOB to elect. We will come up with nominations still.
 - c. Ex officio members will be appointed annually and will have vote.
10. Consider Cynthia Kittredge for Curriculum Committee?
11. Outline the goals and reasoning of creating a new structure and how it will support CfB's goal and mission (transparency, continuity, sign own checks, etc.)
12. Revise 2010 Goals and Objectives
13. Create a Communications Committee to build a communications strategy for review in October.
14. Fresh Start (Ehmer, Kolb) to connect with Henry Parsley, Kee Sloan and Pat Wingo about the use of AOT materials in the Diocese of AL?
15. Add a line to budget to highlight HOB continuing education expenses even though they are reimbursed by DFMS.
16. Revise research and other materials to use the term "ordination" instead of "consecration."
17. Open an account with the TEC's Archives department with the assistance of Mark Duffy.