



**Foothills Board of Trustees Meeting  
Approved Monthly Meeting Minutes**

**February 21, 2019**

**Board Members in Attendance:** Ed Beers, Sara Steen, Sue Sullivan, Brendan Mahoney, and Cheryl Hazlitt as process recorder for this meeting, with April Undy and Glenn Pearson calling into the meeting via Zoom and phone respectively, and Rev. Sean Neil-Barron.

**Other Guests:** Governance Committee members Brian Woodruff and Jody Anderson from 7:26 to 8 pm.

6:00 pm Open with chalice lighting and check-in

Action Items:

**Motion to approve consent agenda**, minus the minutes from the Congregational Meeting of Feb. 10, 2019, **by Cheryl Hazlitt. Brendan Mahoney seconded. Motion passed.**

**Motion to approve the Feb. 10 2019 Congregational Meeting Minutes as amended** in revision #3 of the Feb. 21 2019 Board Meeting Packet, with the following final vote count numbers: 179 total votes (176 yes, 3 no), including 147 in-person votes and 32 online verified membership votes. **Sara Steen motioned. Brendan Mahoney seconded. Motion passed.**

**Motion to replace the previous charge to the Restoring Wholeness Task Force with the following charge by Cheryl Hazlitt, seconded by Glenn Pearson. Motion passed.**

PROPOSED CHARGE FROM BOARD OF TRUSTEES  
TO RESTORING WHOLENESS TASK FORCE  
Revised February 4, 2019 by Sara Steen

*Background:*

Past misconduct in our church, as in many congregations, has often been kept hidden or secret or undiscussed. Congregations with rumored or proven misconduct often share characteristics including lack of trust, ongoing dysfunction, and a failure to thrive or fulfill their potential.

We desire to create and maintain a healthy culture at Foothills where each person's integrity is respected and expectations for healthy boundaries between religious professionals and congregants, and between congregants, are clear; people understand why these boundaries exist; and there is a clear path toward accountability and healing if violations do occur.

We aspire to a culture that seeks the truth about its own history and does so with an openness and a commitment to compassion and justice, one in which we live in accordance with the values dear to our UU heritage and essential to a healthy and vital spiritual community.

*Intended outcomes:*

Assess Foothills' current system and culture to identify healthy and unhealthy/maladaptive aspects that impact the safety and integrity of our church as a whole.

Assess the current situation at Foothills to identify the healing work that still needs to happen in the wake of our recent misconduct disclosures.

Assemble recommendations for the board and ministry of ways to enhance our church's culture to prevent future misconduct and promote healthy relationships between religious professionals and congregants.

Review existing policies about misconduct and make any recommended changes to the board. This should include, but not necessarily be limited to, a recommendation for a restorative process for staff or volunteers who have engaged in misconduct to come back into relationship with the church.

In consultation with the history project (see below), assess the need for a public narrative regarding misconduct. If necessary, work in collaboration with the history project to create a public narrative that will go through board approval.

*Relationship to ongoing history project work:*

Originally the task force was conceived of as a tool for compiling narrative histories of the relationships between religious professionals and staff and the people they served at Foothills, including but not limited to professional misconduct. Because of the ongoing, in-depth work of the history project, we are not currently asking the task force to do this work.

The task force should be in dialogue with the history project about the best way to produce a public narrative that includes an acknowledgment of past misconduct.

*Task force composition:*

A task force will be formed that operates under the joint direction of the Board and ministry. The task force will include one board member and two or three non-board members.

*Duration and reporting:*

Task team duration is expected to be two years (May 2019-May 2021).

The board member of the task force will work in conjunction with the Senior Minister to generate quarterly reports to the board.

*Limitations:*

The work of the task force is limited to past employees and past lay leaders. Any information that arises about current employees or lay leaders should be directed through existing policies. If the task team hears any stories that may involve illegal behaviors, the task force will immediately notify the senior minister and board president, who jointly will determine the appropriate next steps.

The Board will conduct any necessary disclosures that may arise during the process.

**Discussion Items:**

Ed asked what information we need to capture from board meetings to do the ongoing work of the board between meetings:

-Sara suggested a table-of-contents type structure for the Google Team Drive, that we draft the workflows we've been talking about creating to help us do our board work, and that we need a place for filing task force charges within the team drive structure.

-April suggested that the new norms and standing rules proposed for board meetings could have been previewed/discussed on Slack prior to the meeting. Ed notes that these norms and standing rules were presented in both the draft and final meeting packets for this meeting.

-Sue suggested a channel for noting problems finding files or information, to help us ID structural organizational issues. Sara suggested that the technology channel be used for that.

-Ed reported having trouble finding things on Slack and Sean offered to share an article about Slack functionality updates that might be helpful.

-Ed indicated he would like to change the way the board keeps minutes and will meet with Sue before the March board meeting about this.

### Visioning Schedule:

- Ed said we will have a Zoom call with Laura Park to clarify the aspects of the board's role in our new governance structure, including the concept of Linkage and the difference between it and monitoring.
- Sean reiterated the Ministry's next steps, including a draft interpretation of how to manifest the visioning statements by May and a final interpretation by September, which the board will indicate whether we find it to be a "reasonable interpretation" of the vision statements that we approved in January. April suggested that we invite the Governance Committee to the interpretation presentations.

### Monitoring Board Performance:

- Ed presented some material on the Board's self-monitoring role and incorporated elements of the board's monitoring plan into the Board Work Plan Calendar he created to track the responsibilities of the board month-to-month.
- Sean indicated that each board meeting could have a section for board performance monitoring and executive performance monitoring, and that policy review should be on a separate cycle but also addressed in segments at each board meeting. He suggested taking the monitoring portion of the Senior Minister's report out of that report and including it in the monitoring section of the board's agenda.
- Sara indicated that we need a segment of the board meeting where we look ahead a month or three to assign upcoming monitoring tasks.
- Eventually we will have a monitoring calendar that completes in one year and a policy review calendar that completes over three years.

After a break, Brian Woodruff and Jody Anderson from the Governance Committee joined the meeting for the policy review section of the meeting.

A discussion of the new governance structure, the role of the governance committee in writing and reviewing board policies and the differences/overlaps between the Hotchkiss model the previous board policy was based on and the Unity Consulting model we are currently following ensued. Brian and Jody asked for a narrative description of how we want the board policies to be rewritten and supporting material from Unity consulting so that the governance committee can do the crafting of the policies for our review.

It was determined that we should ask Laura Park for resources to use in rewriting our board policies to be congruent with the Unity Consulting model, to ask her if she could work with governance committee members, and if she can she help us to understand the role of linkage.

Brian suggested that the governance committee tackle the rewriting of policy sections 1 and 4 to start.

Brian and Jody left the meeting and April signed off of her Zoom call.

Sean presented the monitoring report of executive performance.

Cheryl presented a process observer report of the meeting.

Sara reminded all board members to revisit the Board Action Items spreadsheet to update and close out any completed assignments.

Meeting adjourned at 8:43 pm.

Minutes written and presented by  
Sue Sullivan  
Board Secretary