

## **Theme: Governance**

### **What We Heard:**

There was a healthy conversation on governance, and we thank the discussion groups for their active engagement with this important issue.

Discussion groups said that governance is about decision making, accountability, transparency, accessibility, and keeping our vision and mission clear. It's how we relate but not how we rule each other. It's conciliatory. It has both organizational and theological implications.

There was concern from some marginalized groups (indigenous and other ethnic ministries) about the impact of the shifts on their communities. There was also concern for the potential of losing our voice for social justice and

representation when it is important (regional, different groups, ordered/lay).

When governance creates burdens, isolation, confusion, governance is no longer serving us.

It's important to know the difference between governance and management: governance sets the framework and management gets it done. It seems these proposals deal with both governance and management.

Strong communication is needed; there is a need for trust in a time of great fear.

# ANW 02 – CONSTITUTION OF A MEETING

## What We Heard:

There was acknowledgment that there are pros and cons:

- Concern that emails could create miscommunication/ineffective communication
- “Prior consent of higher court of the church” can cause confusion and concern
- Some commissioners experience this is already happening in some contexts
- Email is only appropriate for yes/no votes
- Email must be minuted if we move forward
- Requires explicit caution if relates to anything confidential
- Would require rules for implementation
- Concerns about consistency with the theological implications about how/where we say the Spirit moves

- Should be reserved for conversations that don't require deep discussion or conversation & reflection
- Requires accessibility to technology
- Should be the exception not the rule
- General we heard affirmation for using this process in limited circumstances
- There is no consensus from the Discussion Groups about how and when this method of meeting/voting would be used.
- Affirmation that it be used for smaller matters and would not be normative.

### **Suggested Way Forward:**

That the 43rd General Council:

Amend The Manual to allow a meeting by e-mail in exceptional

circumstances, with clear parameters and policies to be developed by the General Secretary.

Moved: B. Sheaves

Seconded: L. Doyle

CARRIED.

Amendment:

Moved: K. James-Cavan

Seconded: W. Sanderson

DEFEATED.

# **ANW 11 – UCW REPRESENTATION ON REGIONAL COUNCILS**

## **What We Heard:**

Most groups questioned the appropriateness of General Council directing the Regional Councils in this matter.

There was recognition by almost all groups of the historical & current importance and value of the UCW.

The importance of women's representation in general was recognized by some groups.

Corresponding membership was suggested as a possible option.

Most groups did not communicate strong support for this proposal and felt that the matter was for Regions to decide.

## **Suggested Way Forward:**

That the 43rd General Council:

Refer Proposal ANW 11 to the Regional Councils for consideration and take no further action.

Moved: B. Kostichuk

Seconded: L. Doyle

CARRIED.

# **GCE 12 - FAITHFUL DECISION MAKING ON SOCIAL JUSTICE ISSUES**

## **What We Heard:**

- Groups noted that the proposal was about hearing from marginalized voices.
- There was support for inclusion, and that it should apply to all levels of the church.
- There was appreciation for the background report.
- Some questioned how do we determine which voices are prioritized when there are so many groups and priorities?
- Timely communication was affirmed as important by several groups.
- One discussion group also noted that timely communication will have implications for staff workloads.

- Formal partnerships (ecumenical and international) were named as important stakeholders in this issue.
- General affirmation for and no opposition to this proposal.
- There were suggestions for consideration in its implementation.

### **Suggested Way Forward:**

That the 43rd General Council:

Adopt the Report **ANW3 Faithful Decision-Making on Social Justice Issues in the United Church of Canada** in its entirety and direct the General Secretary to implement the report and the recommendations of GCE 12.

Moved: B. Kostichuk

Seconded: L. Doyle

CARRIED.

# **M&O 1 – FRANCOPHONE REPRESENTATION ON THE DENOMINATIONAL COUNCIL AND THE DENOMINATIONAL COUNCIL EXECUTIVE**

## **What We Heard:**

The discussion groups provided a diversity of comments on this proposal:

- There is a need to balance inclusion with the nominations process already set out.
- There was pastoral concern for the Francophone constituency and named the historical importance of this constituency.
- Groups believed in inclusion and voice, but not necessarily that there should be designated seats on the

Denominational Council and Denominational Council Executive.

- It was noted by many groups that Francophone representation is already taken very seriously by the Nominations Committee.
- A few groups noted that the membership of the incoming Executive of the Denominational Council shows our collective commitment to inclusion of the Francophone community.
- There was some affirmation for *La Table* to be able to propose names to various courts of the Church.

### **Suggested Way Forward:**

That the 43rd General Council:

That La Table des Ministères en français be empowered to propose names to the Nominations Committee for inclusion in the various councils and committees of the church and take no further action on proposal M&O 01.

Moved: B. Kostichuk

Seconded: L. Doyle

CARRIED.

Amendment:

Moved: C. Hamilton

Seconded: N. Beaudry

CARRIED.

# **MTU 1 - A CHANGE TO CURRENT REMIT PROCESS**

## **What We Heard:**

- There were mixed feelings generally across the groups who responded on this proposal.
- There was acknowledgment of the historical reasons for the current system.
- There was suggestion that communities of faith should be encouraged to participate.
- There was concern that small/rural communities of faith might be having issues receiving communication.

## **Suggested Way Forward:**

That the 43rd General Council:

Take no further action on proposal MTU 01

Moved: G. Brownmiller

Seconded: M. Wyatt

CARRIED.

## **MTU 3 - MEMBERSHIP OF THE EXECUTIVE OF THE DENOMINATIONAL COUNCIL**

### **NL 1 – REPRESENTATION AND ACCOUNTABILITY WITHIN THE EXECUTIVE OF THE DENOMINATIONAL COUNCIL**

#### **What We Heard:**

- Some groups felt that the loss of regional representation meant a loss of the conciliar nature of the church.
- Some groups noted there is a difference between representation and conciliar: we are moving away from a geographically representative model, but we are still a conciliar church – we still have councils.
- Some noted the role of the Executive Ministers is important in this new regional model of the Church.
- One group noted regional representation is not a theological requirement of our conciliar structure.

- Some groups felt concern over the implications of losing regional representation but affirmed that corresponding members could play a role in the new model.
- There were a significant number of questions raised about the implications of the new systems in addition to comments noted.
- There is a lack of clarity around representation & accountability of those elected to do the work of the church, as well as what it means to be conciliar.
- There were significant and important questions raised on these proposals.
- There was some affirmation for the proposals
- There were some groups who felt not increasing the size of the denominational council executive was important.

### **Suggested Way Forward:**

That the 43<sup>rd</sup> General Council:

Refer MTU 03 and NL 01 to the General Secretary to study how we define the conciliar nature of the church and the role ~~impact~~ of regional and other forms of representation ~~on~~ within our conciliar system and its decision-making processes, and Direct the General Secretary report to the 44<sup>th</sup> General Council on the experience of living into the new models of the church; and in the interim ensure regional representation through corresponding membership to the Denominational Council Executive.

Moved: L. Shepherd

Seconded: P. Gale

CARRIED.

Amendment:

Moved: E. Morrison

Seconded: G. Bott

CARRIED.

Amendment:

Moved: D. Pollard

Seconded: T. Orlando

DEFEATED.

## **TOR 5 – THE MANUAL ITEM 5.3.3: MANDATORY MEETINGS OF THE PASTORAL CHARGE**

### **What We Heard:**

- There was general affirmation for the proposal, and for taking into account the difference between smaller and larger churches in how they determine the required number for a mandatory meeting.
- One group suggested the matter be referred to the Denominational Council Executive for further study.
- One group suggested that the number required for a mandatory meeting of the pastoral charge be 10 people or 10%, whichever is greater.

### **Suggested Way Forward:**

That the 43<sup>rd</sup> General Council:

Amend The Manual, Item 5.3.3: Mandatory Meetings of the Pastoral Charge, to make the requirement for a mandatory meeting 10 people or 10% of the full membership, whichever is greater.

Moved: C. Wood-Thomas

Seconded: A. MacLennan

CARRIED.

Amendment:

Moved: J. Macdonald

Seconded: B. Fillier

CARRIED.