

## 2015-09-01 Shepherding Team Meeting Minutes

6pm in Prayer Chapel of 4MS.

The purpose of the Shepherding Team is both the spiritual leadership and the legal Board of Directors of All Souls Church.

**Shepherds present:** Marie Alcorn, Mary Baldrige, Doug Banister, Jill Branson, Danny Bullington, Dan Holbrook, Daniel Odle, Jesse Watkins, Bruce Charles as non-voting member stayed until 8pm

**Shepherds absent:** Kate Brimer, Ginger Kielarowski

Ministry, worship, and operations reports were circulated to team members prior to the meeting. Any additional discussion of these reports is presented in the minutes.

I. Mary Baldrige opened with a devotion from *Entempling: Baptist Wisdom for Contemplative Prayer*.

### II. Business Meeting

- A. Approval of minutes from 8/4/15 minutes. Motion. Passed.
- B. Budget amendment: October birthday picnic will cost more than planned; more than \$1,900 remaining in current budget. We will need up to \$3,000 more. Motion to spend more than budgeted. Discussion of possible special offering. Passed.
- C. Discussion of Pastoral Prayer guidelines (aka Congregational Prayer guidelines) in Worship Planning Handbook, finishing discussion from last month.
  - 1. Dan sent his edit notes by email before Shepherding Team.
    - a) Discussion of these edits.
    - b) Discussion on for whom the prayer is prayed.
    - c) A modified version of Dan's suggestions were written into the document, and seemed acceptable to the team.

### III. Work Plan Development

- A. Two proposals on applying consensual orthodoxy and disagreeing well series.
  - 1. Doug explains history and context of both proposals, the Collaborative Communication proposal and the Colossians Forum proposal.
  - 2. Pre-motion discussion: Danny asks: what's the end goal?
    - a) Doug: spiritual formation, that people might grow closer to one another and God.
    - b) Dan: I would rephrase that to grow to "love the Lord your God with all your heart and soul and mind." Colossians Forum seems like a great way to move toward that.
    - c) Daniel: we are a diverse community, though we tend to congregate with those who see things as we do. I love our diversity, don't want to give it up, and want

to work to sustain and grow it. I like both of these proposals. We need a forum to practice, for our members to learn how to disagree and still worship next to each other. This is ethnic, socio-economic, and in doctrine and spirituality outside of the core of the faith.

- d) Danny, answering “why ask what’s the end goal?”: Would it be bad if the church came to one view of homosexuality?
- e) Daniel: that would be a success, but I would still keep it out of the church structure because of consensual orthodoxy.
- f) Mary: every Christian is at a different place on their walk. If we codify something like homosexuality into the bylaws, then it may alienate those not at that point on their walk.
- g) Doug: time out. Let’s get back to the proposals. What would you, Danny, like the goal to be?
- h) Danny: short term: learn to talk to each other in understanding ways. My question is, “what is our long-term goal?”
- i) Jesse: can this work as a both/and proposal, where we do both?
- j) Mary: I like both, too. Collaborative Communication would be great right now, learning to communicate better. It doesn’t lead as directly to diving into the difficult issues as the Colossians Forum. Both seem good.
- k) Doug: let’s all check in. What do you like the goal to be, and what would be the best way to get there?
  - (1) Jesse: to understand each other better; CC first.
  - (2) Daniel: embrace diversity of our body and create a structure to do that well; both, though with additional thoughts on how we carry out CC.
  - (3) Mary: disagreeing well and relating well; two proposals together give us strongest combination for two goals.
  - (4) Bruce: I don’t know the goal. If you’re happy with the process, let it happen. I like that you’re talking, but I can’t say what the end result of the talking will be.
  - (5) Marie: none of us live and breathe consensual orthodoxy, so we need training, both in learning and unlearning. Colossians Forum offers that training. Colossians Forum is more concrete; Collaborative Communication is a helpful practice.
  - (6) Danny: that All Souls would become known as a church where everyone is welcome and there is unity in seeking God’s truth so that each person is willing to put on the table what they believe and examine it; not sure, but Colossians Forum seems more rooted in this goal.

- (a) Bruce notes: stay very concerned about the two people selected for the Colossians Forum. That decision could stack the deck in a negative way.
- (7) Jill: a deepening of relationships, a deepening of community, spiritual formation; both/and.
- (8) Doug: from proposals—“To help the All Souls family learn how to disagree over doctrine in a manner that deepens our knowledge of scripture, builds authentic relationships, awakens love for God, and witnesses to the world;” both/and, but probably Colossians Forum. Is Collaborative Communication worth \$10,000? Feels strongly toward Colossians Forum, ambivalent about Collaborative Communication though can see its effectiveness.
- (9) Dan: freedom in Christ, free to be different from others in Christ but all based on truth; both/and, but accomplishing different things. More interested in Colossians Forum for its directness to the issues. Enjoys worldview-focused discussions. We also must have the language to relate well. Collaborative Communication lets us grow in this area, and it would be great. If we did both, it would cover two different fronts.
- l) Mary: clarification questions about how Colossians Forum works.
- m) Bruce notes as before: be careful about the process for getting the people into the courses and forums involved. We have been accused of stacking the deck in the past. This is a concern for me. Bruce adds, “Do not hand-pick people.”
- n) Daniel: \$10,000 gives me heartburn. Could we work with Lisa and Ferlin on a smaller contract? Who shaped the job description? [they did, with modifications from Doug] I don’t like the feeling of agreeing to a contract where we pay and wouldn’t get what we paid for.
  - (1) Bruce: how do we know if the deliverables of the contract have been fulfilled and the time they took to complete? If something takes half the time, does the payout reflect that?
  - (2) Daniel: we’re talking about the same thing. This is my concern. Could we re-write the job description to reflect more specifics?
  - (3) Bruce: yes, like if they don’t do onboarding, what happens?
  - (4) Bruce: I can check with Lisa and work on this contract.
- 3. Dan: move to send two people to Colossians Forum if we can find two people to go to October 22–23 retreat.
  - a) Discussion
    - (1) Jill: “Dan, who should we send?”
    - (2) Dan: it really needs to be the sense that these are the right two people. I would like it to be a unanimous choice of the Shepherding Team about the two that go.

- (3) Bruce: advertise that the Shepherding Team needs to be unanimous on this selection or else it will be tabled.
  - (4) Doug: should we have nominations, like we have for Shepherding Team?
  - (5) Danny: both that and coming forward if you feel led are good options.
  - (6) Jill: this will take a while, though.
  - (7) Bruce clarification: individuals from the Shepherding Team suggest people, and then they choose two from that pool.
  - (8) Discussion of timing for this and Collaborative Communication, start date scheduling.
  - (9) Jesse: are we saying no to something else by saying yes to this? Others say no. Jesse maintains yes.
- b) Vote
  - c) Passed
4. Bruce will discuss the contract with Lisa and Ferlin, continuing contract negotiations and come back to the Shepherding Team.
  5. Who will we send to the Colossians Forum?
    - a) Daniel: I am interested, but Shepherding Team time commitment is too much.
    - b) Doug: I have thought about it. Would Jesse go?
    - c) Jesse: I don't know.
    - d) Marie: it needs to be someone respected within the community.
    - e) Dan reads past Shepherding Team members to begin thinking about heavy hitters.
    - f) Doug: there are reasons why it might not be good for me to do it.
    - g) Dan: it is co-leading. I would encourage you to do it, Doug. It would be a good solution or the pastor to do it.
    - h) Bruce: could it be three instead of two? That seems better for whatever reason.
    - i) Daniel: talks about how it balances input better for those two that would lead the discussions.
    - j) Danny: I would move to see Doug go, as well.
    - k) Dan: let's set up quickly an email forum so we have time to think and pray and come to some agreement there.
    - l) Danny: I would rather do it in person.
    - m) Doug: we could meet after a church service in the next couple weeks. [10 to the city after church next week; discussion moves to consider this upcoming Sunday]
    - n) Daniel: set up a fast-moving committee that works from a clear job description.
    - o) Daniel: I would serve as a hub for names. We write a job description, I go and talk to the names you send to me, and I talk to those people and I'll share where the energy is going.

- p) Doug: assume there is a high likelihood only two people will go. If I go, then we're only choosing one other. Correct?
  - q) Daniel: yes. But if you don't go, we still need two.
  - r) Doug: I'll know if I can do this by Sunday.
  - s) Daniel on process for person selection:
    - (1) We need to know by Sunday if Doug can go
    - (2) Shepherds send other people's names to Daniel
    - (3) He'll discuss the specific job description with them and see if they're willing and available
6. Jill mentions feeling defensive toward Lisa and Ferlin. They put a lot of effort into this proposal. The pressure for immediate action comes from us, not them. Shepherding Team discusses.

#### IV. Ministry Areas

- A. Doug's writing.
  - 1. Doug mentions: because of time, we can discuss this later. [it was 8:50pm]
  - 2. Others: encouragement for Doug to keep writing, even if other people don't like what he's writing.

#### V. Other business

- A. Doug discusses unity in our Shepherding Team. How do we handle our differences?
  - 1. Mary: unity is not uniformity. I have to remind myself about that.
  - 2. Others share input.
- B. Dan, general business:
  - 1. Revisiting 10 Hotspots from last month.
    - a) Doug: I didn't see this as an action item.
    - b) Dan: these are more for information. If it doesn't get put on the agenda, then it gets forgotten. Security considerations are already in motion. Revisits other areas from last month: forced arbitration clauses, traditional marriage clarification in bylaws.
    - c) Marie: let's bring up the arbitration business on the next agenda.
  - 2. Should we have a fall retreat for Shepherding Team as discussed at beginning of year? What would be its purpose?
    - a) Marie: having had the extra meeting in June, I haven't thought about it.
  - 3. Nominating Committee for future Shepherds: working on gathering the team together. Dan has four people committed already to the committee and is seeking at least three and up to four people in addition.
    - a) Marie: I'm the only one rolling off the Shepherding Team this year.

- b) Dan: how many more do we want on the Shepherding Team, then?
- c) Marie: possibly up to three.

VI. Adjourned at 9:09pm.

VII. Amendment on 2015-10-06: by email communication, there was unanimous consent that there could be up to three new Shepherds on the nomination slate. This clarifies the way section V.B.3 ends above. This would allow our current non-staff-member shepherds to increase from seven to up to nine. Final decisions have not been set.

Submitted by Jesse Watkins.