

**College for Bishops Board of Directors Meeting
April 13-14, 2011**

The semi-annual meeting of the Board of Directors of the College for Bishops (CfB) was held at the Chicago Marriott O'Hare beginning at 2:00 pm on April 13, 2011.

Directors in attendance: The Rt Rev'd David Alvarez; The Rev'd Canon Patricia M. Coller; Mr. William S. Craddock, Jr.; The Most Rev'd Dr. Katharine Jefferts Schori; The Rt Rev'd Don E. Johnson; The Rt Rev'd F. Clayton Matthews; The Rt Rev'd Henry N. Parsley; Dr. Timothy F. Sedgwick; The Rev'd Dr. Allison St. Louis; The Rt Rev'd Dean E. Wolfe.

Directors not present: The Rt Rev'd J. Neil Alexander; The Rt Rev'd J. Jon Bruno; The Rt Rev'd Duncan M. Gray III; The Rt Rev'd Mary Gray-Reeves; The Most Rev'd Colin R. Johnson; The Rt Rev'd Jeffrey D. Lee; Mr. Donald V. Romanik.

Staff and guests: The Rev'd J. Michael Ehmer; Ms. Ellen R. Rencher; Ms. Kimberly Woodle.

Bishop Jefferts Schori called the meeting to order and welcomed the group to Chicago. After leading the directors in worship, Bishop Matthews introduced Dr. Allison St. Louis, new board member, and Kim Woodle of CCS, the consulting firm leading the sustainability funding campaign.

Update on Sustainability Funding Initiative

CfB contracted with CCS (recommended by Colin Johnson) to lead the sustainability funding campaign. Kim Woodle, campaign director, has been working in the Memphis office since mid-March. CfB pays a modest amount to CREDO Institute, Inc. for the office space that is being used by Ms. Woodle.

Two focus groups with approximately 26 bishops were held at Kanuga in mid-March to introduce the initiative, get feedback on the case statement and also begin working with the bishops who will be asked to contact prospective donors. Conversations after the Kanuga meetings among and between bishops were encouraging.

Ms. Woodle provides Bishop Matthews with weekly progress reports about the research underway on prospective donors. A summary report on each individual is sent to each bishop who will make potential donor visits, Ms. Woodle will script out talking points for phone calls for those making the initial appointment request. She then prepares a personalized proposal for the donor for the bishop to take on the call and leave with the donor. After the meeting, the bishop is debriefed by Ms. Woodle to learn exactly what the prospect said. The hope is to get at least 50 gifts from 100 prospects totaling \$15,500,000. The entire process is a win/win situation because the fundraising skills and techniques can be used by the bishops in their own dioceses in the future.

Ms. Woodle has prepared a case statement to be used as an internal document and as a base for all donor prospects proposals. Why people should give to CfB is perhaps the most important part of the statement (Page 16). CfB is unique: it benefits everyone in the wider Church, prepares

bishops to face new challenges in a changing world and helps maintain a healthy church by preventing problems. Ms. Woodle asked the Board to provide feedback on the text of Page 16. Ms. Woodle noted the suggested changes (available upon request) and prepared a revised page that was reviewed on Day 2 of the meeting. The board reviewed the revisions made to the “Making the Case” page (Page 16) of the case statement. *Motion was made to approve the revisions, duly seconded and approved by the Board of Directors.*

Donor Recognition

Various methods of recognizing donors will be considered and determined on a case-by-case basis by the donor. Possibilities include press releases, notices in diocesan newspapers, special letters announcing the gift, a celebratory reception, website announcement, etc. Ms. Woodle asked the directors how public this campaign should be. Bishop Parsley noted that the more PR we give to CfB, the better.

Bishop Jefferts Schori recommended that other TEC entities be involved in the campaign communications process. Ms. Woodle should contact Neva Rae Fox to discuss PR strategies and the idea of putting a background story about CfB on ENS. Carol Hoidra was also suggested as a resource to assist with writing a story. Bishops outside of TEC should be part of the communications (i.e. Anglican Communion News Service should write an article when the campaign is over) as well. Bishop Parsley added that the campaign should be announced in diocesan newspapers because it might reach a wealthy person in the pew.

Bishop Alvarez asked if the CfB campaign would impact the mission funding, archives and Haiti campaigns. Bishop Jefferts Schori noted that the Church isn't ready to make one big case. This CfB campaign is focused and stands on its own, but CfB can inform the larger church of what it's doing in cooperation with the others campaigns. The CfB campaign should be a very clear, separate issue.

Bishop Wolfe noted that we need to establish a firm timeline for the campaign. Ms. Woodle believes that three months may be unrealistic and at least six months may be necessary. She said there is no reason the “asking period” cannot continue beyond the contract with CCS as she will leave all in order for follow up. There is a sense of urgency with the campaign, but there shouldn't be a sense of anxiety. Bishop Jefferts Schori added that CfB needs to have a funding stream in place before General Convention 2012.

Ms. Woodle proposed having a celebratory reception with the donors (who have given \$250,000+) once the campaign is complete and added that most donors would want recognition. Could this be an Evensong at the National Cathedral? Bishop Jefferts Schori offered to host a dinner at some point as well. Additional forms of recognition should also be considered.

Ms. Collier noted that a press release is a good opportunity to spread the word about CfB. Once the campaign is completed (or perhaps mid-way), a special letter could be sent out to the HOB, Anglican Communion, etc. to announce the status of the campaign. Ms. Woodle confirmed with the Board members that they are comfortable with her moving forward with the press.

Financials for Case Statement

The bishops at the Kanuga focus groups requested a more detailed breakdown of CfB financials over the past few years. Mr. Ehmer reviewed various documents that he prepared in response to this request.

Bishop Wolfe noted that the financials are a piece of communication that will need to be handled with sensitivity. Some in the Church wonder why CfB needs so much money to train so few people. Mr. Ehmer recommended preparing a communication for the HOB to inform them of all that CfB does, the kind of budget it has, etc. It would also be helpful for the HOB to understand the percentage of time that Bishop Matthews spends with CfB. The bishops now own CfB and need to be responsible, informed owners.

Mr. Craddock noted that CfB needs do a certified audit, especially if there will be major donors giving money. Bishop Jefferts Schori added that CfB can use the DFMS audits before this year. Bishop Matthews will consult with Kurt Barnes, but in the meantime, CfB should get an audit.

Bishop Parsley inquired about the Scholarships line. Bishop Matthews noted that non-TEC bishops pay the full tuition of \$3,200 for the LOV program. Scholarship requests from TEC bishops are considered first before requests from non-TEC bishops. Bishop Colin Johnson indicated in an earlier conversation with Bishop Matthews that he might be able to give a donation from his campaign for Canadian scholarships.

Mr. Ehmer reviewed the “Power of a Pledge” handouts that show various income scenarios when differing amounts of gifts are received over time. The challenge is to secure enough funds early on so CfB can continue to operate this year and next year. Ms. Woodle noted that donations “in perpetuity” going into an endowment should draw from proceeds, not principle.

Bishop Matthews wondered if CfB could get a bridge loan to assist with operating costs until the campaign is complete. Bishop Wolfe commented that everything could be in jeopardy if CfB doesn't use all funds for the endowment.

Mr. Craddock noted that CfB needs to get financial advice on how to run an endowment fund and to put systems in place to receive significant funding.

A discussion regarding the management of the investments followed. Ms. Collier noted that the Church Pension Group (CPG) isn't open to managing investment from other entities while DFMS and the Episcopal Church Foundation are.

Naming Opportunities

The term “Managing Director” for Bishop Matthews' position isn't accurate. Using “Dean” is preferred. What are the plans for this position? Will CfB have a full time dean? Bishop Matthews noted that endowing a chair doesn't necessarily mean that it will be a full time position.

Ms. Woodle asked if CfB could also have “schools.” Bishop Johnson suggested that the Short Courses and Small Group Study programs be named a School of *Lifelong Learning*. Exact naming can be determined by the donor.

Bishop Alvarez asked about the relationship between CfB and DFMS. Bishop Jefferts Schori noted that they are partnered organizations. Board members will continue to be elected by the HOB and will have a relationship similar to the ones that UTO and ERD have with DFMS.

Bishop Alvarez noted that the Presiding Bishop is the President of CfB and that won't change.

Curriculum Review

Dr. Sedgwick reported that a process for ongoing review of CfB programs is being proposed. Two purposes of this evaluation are to get instruction feedback and to discover what CfB goals are and the needs to be addressed. This will ensure ongoing quality programs as well as the development of a next generation to provide leadership for the College itself. The process should include those who've been involved in the programs.

Suggested steps are:

1. Creating a Program Review Committee (PRC) to review the College as a whole and establish a system of ongoing review and oversight of programs
2. Charging the PRC to review the Living Our Vows Program (LOV) and identify what additional work needs to be done (committee to meet immediately before the October 2011 Board meeting)
3. Charging the PRC to establish a NBSC Review Sub-Committee to meet in the summer of 2011 to plan for the 2012 conference and report to the Board in October

Living Our Vows Program

Bishop Johnson reviewed the history of the LOV program and how it addresses themes such as life/work/time management, how to deal with a vision for a diocese, how long does it take for a bishop to find his/her voice, staffing issues, what are responsibilities of being a bishop, etc. The coaching element of LOV is important and can be productive. Bishop Jefferts Schori added that LOV has become much more driven by needs of the bishops in their particular stages of ministry. It feeds a need that comes at a normative time for new bishops and provides a sense of support and encouragement from the beginning.

LOV has changed the culture of the HOB. The HOB meetings are now more than a meeting and are a place for bishops to be together in a more organic way and to trust one another enough to think out loud.

Dr. Sedgwick noted that CfB needs to hear what's been the experience of those who've attended the program. Evaluation is the key to keeping the momentum going. It's been 10 years since the original research project was conducted and a new generation is now emerging. Where are we heading now? What are the outcomes they want for the program? What are we doing well? What are we missing? What do we change? What are best practices? We now need more ownership and to get insights.

Bishop Parsley noted that it's one thing to assess/evaluate what we're doing and another to assess what bishops might need. He suggested surveying bishops from the past five years to see what they've needed.

Bishop Alvarez wondered how far CfB can go in accompanying bishops since some longer termed bishops still have not found their way. Could there be refreshment programs for them? How can the model of LOV expand into the curriculum of HOB meetings?

Bishop Wolfe asked how CfB can be more oriented towards specific bishop situations (i.e. NV is different from NY).

Bishop Parsley added that it would be helpful to have lay people involved in this conversation to give bishops a sense of lay expectations, since there are a lot of expectations that many bishops don't understand.

Visioning for the Future

Mr. Craddock and Dr. Sedgwick posed three questions to the group:

1. How can we improve/strengthen the current core programs?
 - Bishop Jefferts Schori noted that there should be intentional coherence between the NBSC, LOV, 90-Day Companion Program and ongoing education of the HOB. Relational resource development. CfB should foster a learning community vs. teaching bishops what they need to know.
 - Bishop Alvarez asked how much do bishops know about the diocese they're entering.
 - Bishop Matthews noted that this needs to be tied to the theological work being done with the Episcopal Elections and Transitions Project. There's a growing sense that one is called to a particular context, not just the order of a bishop. There is a collection of gifts required in the episcopate that fit a particular context.
 - Dr. Sedgwick added that a differentiated resource is needed. The hope is that in the future there will be a resource group for a bishop nominee to contact for help in discerning a call to the episcopacy.
 - Bishop Jefferts Schori pointed out the gender dynamic. There's not a sense of competition among women, rather much resistance. There have been initiatives to equip women to think about these questions, variety of episcopal roles, etc.
 - What are other ways of serving as bishop (as in Western KS, ND)?
 - The average diocesan staff is smaller than a staff of a large parish and the average diocesan size is like that of a small pastoral congregation.
 - Bishop Parsley asked if CfB could offer a course (Short Course or at LOV) on episcopacy
 - What does it mean and what does oversight mean? Could that be taken and broken out into dioceses? Bishops who've been there could talk about their experience.
 - Ms. Collier mentioned a Sustainability Conference in Honduras. There are different ways of being the Church and gaining income for the Church.
 - Dr. Sedgwick added that CfB could offer a course collaboratively with others. Do the research, focus on the larger issues for the church, then identify and address challenges for bishops and identify their role.
 - Dr. Sedgwick asked if CfB could help nurture the vocation of bishops and help bishops think about sabbaticals.

- Could there be an opportunity for more structured sabbatical for bishops seven years out (i.e. a LOVII) to address how they can reengage themselves for another role/way? Bishop Johnson noted that something like this should be held towards the end of a bishop's sabbatical.
 - Bishop Jefferts Schori noted the importance of self-sustainability. It's involved in oversight and is the bishop's primary role. How to insist and ensure that the diocese is looking at those questions all of the time?
 - Bishop Alvarez asked how many bishops (active/resigned) realize the need to open TEC for Hispanic work? To what extent are bishops not aware or linguistically afraid? Could CfB assist with bishops in learning Spanish?
 - Bishop Wolfe noted that many smaller dioceses are creating different models of the episcopate. This is exciting and challenging, but he is concerned about dioceses getting small and smaller and bishops becoming part-time and less "in charge." How do we evaluate the new models that are emerging?
 - Bishop Wolfe asked if CfB could help develop a packet of materials to be sent out by Search Committees for people considering becoming a bishop.
 - Dr. St. Louis asked what new bishops know about where they're going. Who are they supposed to be? If there's ambiguity, then it's important to get a clear sense of things and if the image of what they imagine matches reality. Could there be a day to shadow a bishop?
 - Dr. St. Louis introduced the idea of the new bishops developing personal/professional goals in the 90-day program and then addressing them later at LOV. CfB could then evaluate whether or not bishops are achieving their goals and the information learned would then inform the program, making it cyclical.
 - Bishop Matthews noted that search committees are asked to create an educational component about the office of bishop. He needs to collect all that's been written in episcopal elections in response to that request.
 - Bishop Johnson added that the media training for first-year bishops at LOV is very important. How do bishops frame their response to the issues before them? Could a course on working with media be offered again to other bishops?
2. What areas of research are needed and how can they be developed? (*To be addressed at a future meeting.*)
 3. What are the outstanding needs for education/formation? And how can they be developed and with whom? (*To be addressed at a future meeting.*)

The board adjourned for the evening and resumed conversations and reporting at 8:30 am on Thursday, April 14th. Dr. St. Louis led the group in worship. Bishop Jefferts Schori called the meeting to order immediately afterwards.

Managing Director's Report

Bishop Matthews is pleased with how far CfB has come over the past years. He is glad to be on this new adventure and excited about the possibilities that sustainable funding will allow for CfB. He continues to be pleased with the working relationship with CREDO and is grateful for the support it provides. He is also pleased that Bishop Colin Johnson is a new board member as a representative from the Canadian Church.

Review and Approval of October 2010 Minutes, Goals and Actions

The minutes of the directors' meeting held October 6-7, 2010 were reviewed and approved as written. The 2010 CfB Goals and Actions and 2011 Goals were reviewed as well.

Evaluation

Various evaluation instruments continue to be administered, but the overall evaluation process need to be assessed.

A suggestion was made to administer a self-assessment tool in a bishop's first 90 days or during his/her first LOV Residency, then administer it six years later to see attitudinal positions. The goal will be to measure existential wellbeing, self efficacy, confidence, vocational satisfaction, financial, etc. CREDO is working on a tool like this and could adapt it for bishops. No decision was made.

Research

A book with curriculum from *Around One Table* (AOT) from the Episcopal Identity Project (EIP) has been created through a CPG grant called Strength for the Journey. CfB might be asked by CREDO to assist with distribution of the materials. Reorganizing dioceses have expressed interest in getting information to understand identity as they rebuild. The hope is that other bishops may want to lift up and work with the material. The curriculum's intent is to spark discussions and not be didactic in nature.

The Bishop Spouse/Partner Research Project findings were presented to bishops spouses/partners by Therese Sprinkle and Woodi Sprinkel in September. The methodology can be mirrored to eventually do a study of clergy spouses.

Joe Stewart-Sicking continues to study Clergy wellness and will produce a report later this summer. He will then turn more towards researching clergy families.

A meeting of researchers involved in CREDO and CfB projects, along with other Episcopal, Methodist, Lutheran and Presbyterian researchers, will be held in Memphis in December. Tim Sedgwick will attend this meeting for CfB, and others may attend as well. The CfB is interested in a project that will allow for a study of the needs of Dioceses and Episcopal leadership according to context, especially size.

Financials

Mr. Ehmer reported on the 2010 financials. CfB had a surplus of \$42,000 rather than \$17,000 that was budgeted. Mr. Ehmer then reported on the First Quarter 2011 financials. He noted that the temporarily restricted funds have not been moved into the general operating expenses because it would need to be approved by the Board. *Motion was made to move the restricted funds to the general operating expenses, duly seconded and approved by the Board of Directors.*

The following suggested changes to the budget were made:

- Rename "Other Income" to "Formerly Restricted Funds."
- Remove the "less an in-kind contribution" line and show only the actual dollar transactions.

- Rename “Other Travel and Entertainment” to “Other Travel”

Ms. Woodle recommended not showing a deficit in the budget when fundraising. Dr. Sedgwick suggested breaking out sustainability campaign expenses from the annual operating budget. Bishop Jefferts Schori added that these are not part of CfB’s regular operating expenses and removing them from the budget gives a clearer picture. These expenses and formerly restricted funds could be recorded separately from the primary budget lines.

Motion was made to approve the amended budget, duly seconded and approved by the Board of Directors.

Summary Discussions and Actions

1. **Conduct an Audit of CfB Financials.** *Motion was made to conduct an audit of CfB financials as soon as possible. It was duly seconded and approved by the Board of Directors.*
 - The audit should be shown as an annual expense.
2. **Draft Rules for Endowment**
 - Where should funds be invested?
 - Mr. Craddock suggested that CfB default to DFMS for the immediate future. Bishop Parsley agreed that this is the place to put the funds for now.
 - *Motion was made to ask DFMS to manage the funds and revisit at a later date, duly seconded and approved by the Board of Directors.*
 - i. Dr. Sedgwick recommended talking to David Charlton about the fund that draws on small investments from Episcopal schools.
 - ii. Bishop Alexander also has information about another fund management group.
 - *Motion was made for the Board to establish a withdrawn policy, duly seconded and approved by the Board of Directors.*
 - *Motion was made to empower the executive officers (led by Bishop Matthews) to propose an investment guideline, duly seconded and approved by the Board of Directors.*
 - i. This committee will develop an investment and withdrawal policy following best practices standards (DFMS already has this set up) to be emailed to the Board for vote.
 - ii. This group should also investigate what to do with the funds in the first three years and make allowances for using some of the funds as they become available and not waiting for the rolling average.
3. **Determine New Board Members.** Bishop Matthews will convene a Nominating/ Executive committee to meet and report back in the fall. The terms for Bishops Alvarez, Bruno, Parsley and Wolfe are scheduled to conclude prior to the October 2011 meeting, but all are eligible to serve another term. The committee will consider whether or not a board position should be created for a CfB donor.
4. **Draft CfB Bylaws.** Bishop Matthews will convene the Executive Committee and work with David Beers. The Board should have a telephone meeting in September to review the bylaws and then send them to the HOB for review in September.
5. **Review CfB Curriculum.**

- *Motion was made to create a Program Review Committee (PRC) and its charge, duly seconded and approved by the Board of Directors.*
 - i. The Executive Committee will determine membership of this body.
 - ii. The PRC will be responsible for ongoing review and oversight of CfB programs
 - iii. The PRC will establish a New Bishops and Spouses' Conference (NBSC) Review Committee.
 - iv. The PRC will establish a Living Our Vows (LOV) Review Committee.
6. **Decide who will be CfB Chancellor.**
- David Beers is the default because he helped CfB incorporate and his fee schedule is friendly. Bishop Jefferts Schori does not object to Mr. Beers being the chancellor.
 - Bishop Alvarez suggested listing the legal counsel as David Beers in the CfB bylaws and that CfB officers and positions should be added to the bylaws as well.
 - Bishop Parsley recommended specifying that the CfB chancellor will be selected in a certain way.
7. **Develop Communications/Public Relations Strategy.** Make CfB as visible to bishops and others as possible to show that it is well-known and perceived as a solid organization. Bishop Jefferts Schori noted that it will be good to strengthen the relationship with the TEC communications department and she is willing to be part of that process as well.
8. **Formalize Relationship with CREDO.** Bishop Matthews will discuss details of this with the Executive Committee.

Future Meetings

The next meeting of the Board will be October 3-4, 2011, possibly at the Maritime Institute in Maryland. The Program Review Committee will meet on October 2.

The 2012 meetings will be held April 23-24 (likely in Chicago) and September 26-27 (likely at VTS).

The directors met in Executive Session. There being no further business, upon motion duly made and seconded, the meeting was adjourned at 12:00 pm.