Board teleconference meeting (draft)

3:15-4:30, June 11, 2014

Present: Adele Halliday, Andrea Mann, Aruna Alexander, Bob Faris, Glynis Williams, Maureen Scott Kabwe, Peter Noteboom, Jonathan Schmidt (staff)

Regrets: Ray Whitehead, Damian MacPherson

Bob Faris gave a summary of the May 21, 2014 Board Meeting conversation (which is recorded in the Board meeting minutes)

Looked at 3 options

Option 1: same as usual, decided needed to look at other options

Option 2: similar to Project ploughshares

Option 3: Consensus of the group present to look at moving forward on option 3:—a commission of the CCC: something like commission on Mission, intercultural ministry, evangelism (understood in broad way evangelism used in WCC)

Would carry on with the programming we are doing now

Involve a larger membership of churches, work would have to reflect that

Question—what would this mean for grants and staff support

Glynis- likely would see same support from PCC, would want to see the work of Forum continue (just as there is a grant that goes directly to project ploughshares)

Andrea—would maintain a grant as long as it was apparent that the work of the Forum would continue, and not diminished by internal relationships

Andrea—would have chosen option of project ploughshares model. Curious why there was unanimous decision for other option

Replies:

Would have same issues as present not being able to meet functions of board

Would allow other denominations to connect and be part of the work

Maureen- concern about autonomy, sense that commission would be more internal conversation and less able to do program work

Adele—denominations not all participating as fully. Not truly ecumenical if 90% of participants of programs are from one denomination. How address this?

Would keep same programmatic direction for next 3 years and then move to people around the table shaping direction. Concerned about capacity of present members to do the work.

Question—why not project ploughshare model but invite others? We could do this under our present form, but haven’t been able to.

Around CCC all member churches are welcome to participate

Peter- Invitation to participate—every triennium an invitation goes to all denominations to participate and send representatives to commissions. There also is work done at commissions to get others to the table. There is no formula for a way a commission works. No imposition from above, other than commitment to Christian unity and consensus. Each commission works differently and those around the table have complete authority to shape the commission. The program emphasis of the Canadian Churches Forum would be an asset that the Forum, would bring to CCC. CCC would want culture of Canadian Churches Forum to be maintained and enhanced.

Aruna – possibility of deeper diversity and complexity, which would challenge us to look at some of the questions we are contemplating. Likes the work CCC is doing on religious pluralism, which would enhance our deliberations. Board is struggling with energy and attendance. Not good, because to have a diverse table we need input from all.

Andrea—diversity question—what happened to interest in moving the Canadian Churches Forum and the board beyond the churches/denominations, widen the circle. Bring in other faith groups or civil society, to make it a more inclusive table.

Response- Not much has happened – staff have networks with civil society. Those networks have not expressed interest in being part of us.

Comment: Reflects on the capacity question—would rely on staff to make those connections. Board does not have capacity to help with this.

Andrea-- Concern that the educational and program work of the Canadian Churches Forum continue…have put a great deal of effort into this. Would like to see it tested for a longer period of time. Not sure how commission would bring more capacity? Need the right people around the table (people with capacity and interest), not just numbers.

Won’t stand in the way of consensus.

Bob- Capacity for other than the current work—commission could be a table for broader conversation around mission and culture. Including looking at mission and evangelism document from Bussan could have a broader engagement. TRC—could be a table that includes conversation for all the Canadian churches to look at implications of the TRC (for the whole Christian church in Canada).

Maureen- new possibilities exciting, but don’t want to lose our current work on intercultural ministry. Not sure hear intercultural ministry when hear mission and evangelism

Peter—encourage us as a Board as we work through the details have criteria to be met in the process. For example a focus on intercultural ministry in a specific way can be written into the mandate.

Would we need to develop a whole new set of bylaws? Too early to say…likely instead would be CCC changing its bylaws. Put a moratorium on changes for three years then people around the table may decide on a new mandate. So long as you are around the table you would be able to advocate for current program.

Question to chair—are we speaking from a position of strength to continue current direction? (Chair and then others answered) Some strength—not other “games in town” other than Tyndale that has a different theological perspective. We have financial resources to continue the current program direction. Bring strength in terms of current program, but also bring strength in terms of our long history of global cross cultural mission. Come with financial assets that you would want to connect, qualified staff, strong and innovative programming efforts, 90 years of history, history of collaboration. Can’t imagine coming more strongly!

Have we looked at the strengths and weaknesses of the 90 years of history? Yes, on web page and part of mission history component of programs.

Noted that that the board meeting we did not have quorum for most of the last board meeting. Staff urged that some sort of change needs to be made.

If move forward with commission model—need to develop plan of next steps, consider implications.

On the council side there would also need to be work.

Aruna- Need to get together to share conversation on various issues. Would CEO model of staff be assumed? Reply: Time to look at issues around this shift in fall. Looking at staffing would be part of process

Maureen—as a board need to look next steps…diversifying and broadening appeals to her.

CCC November – could be time for conversation of board

Perhaps September executive draft next steps. Maybe find some time in July or August, followed by a conference call in September of the full board.

Nov 18th first and 19th are when working groups and groups working with the council will meet.

Executive committee of the council meets in September 29th.

It would be good to have a way to test the interest from the other denominations around the CCC table. Might be good to meet before Sept 29th (9-4) and bring a draft to present to the CCC executive.

**Wed July 30—9-12 executive meets**, and Peter will invite another CCC person. Peter and Jonathan will suggest a process for the executive’s meeting.

Draft proposal to be circulated to board for conversation before September29. Representatives of Board to meet with CCC executive Sept 29.