

Peterborough Covenant Church Commission

All Saints | Christ Lutheran | St. John the Evangelist | St. Barnabas | St. Luke's

Meeting at St. Luke's on Wednesday October 12 at 6:00 pm

MINUTES FOR APPROVAL

Commission Members: Raymond Yip Choy, David Watton, Mary Anne Hammond, Lois McVichie, Amy Milburn, Marion Edwards, Geoff Mathews, Ralph Tippet, Lucinda Hage, Johanna Coombs

Welcome: Kevin Whitehorn (Co-Chair of the Covenant Council) and
The Rt. Rev. Dr. Patrick White (Diocese of Toronto)

- 1) Meeting opened with prayer and introductions -Minutes of last meeting acknowledged
- 2) Context for our discussions
 - Kevin Whitehorn is attending on behalf of Covenant Council
 - Raymond shared intent to use a short video to help bring us back to where our focus needs to be – ‘bridge’ reminder -whatever we do we have to keep in mind “WWJD” and apart from our worldly needs think about “What Would Jesus Do” -new Mission/Vision statement -we need to think of new expressions of ‘church’ what does Psalm 23 evoke for you? -film clip of Ugandan choir singing Psalm 23 where Psalm is an expression of joy not sadness and death, are we ready to follow Jesus?
 - Dave reviewed our terms of reference – have we done our job? – yes – timeline review -we need to have thick skins when we get feedback, but we have done our job -there have been some ‘let’s get on with it’ statements recently – we need to remember that our parishes may not be at the same place as we (as a Commission) are
 - opening remarks from Bishop White -last here when he was about 16 yrs. old -still seems a contemporary building -met with clergy this past pm (and Brad has Sept 24th info to share soon) -it was a very positive meeting and the clergy know it is time for hard decisions and they do want to help move the process forward (more thoughts to share after Commission members share parish feedback about the report)
- 3) Comments received from each Parish’s review of the June 30 **“Draft Report of Options”**
 - each rep shared a paper summary of their parishes feedback (electronic copy to be forwarded to Johanna for combining into an electronic document for sharing and posting to websites)
 - SJ presented by Lucinda -renewal of the church is what we really need to do not just move buildings around -suggestion that SL join SJ and AS with CL joining SB -feeling that it may be an easing into change -if two leaders you have more choice -need to look at some phrasing -overall feeling was ‘ready to change’ and no ‘let’s stay as we are’
 - SB presented by Mary Anne -option 1 did not appeal -feeling of ‘let’s move forward’ -another strong point to keep the ‘suburban’ parish for positive new programs that are being supported by the Diocese -a lot of good feeling about the Covenant -people not buildings that are important -stewardship is healthy -Raymond said mood was ‘wariness but had a lot of people stay for the presentation’ and people were passionate and some felt the report was a little wishy/washy -we need to look at our terminology ie. our groupings -maybe we should say ‘here are two possible parishes and describe them without the church names’ to minimize some of the setting up for winners and losers -we should talk about the possible next step of recommending all assets are compiled and then go to where the need is -these are implementation needs – we need to remember why we got together in the 1st place

-SL presented by Amy -she reminded us that the implementation group would be the ones to decide - SL has always been welcoming and are quite willing to change -not a lot of negative comments from their feedback – a small group would like to just continue until closing -agreement that people not building are important and SL is very open to change and let's get on with it

-side note – we have been very clear that the parish can opt out or choose to live with a recommendation -we have had good direction from the diocese re: implication of opting out -again remember the options are sustainable but each parish may not be sustainable on their own - Commission members are unanimous in letting another group take over the implementation phase

-SL is in favour of the options and are keen to get on with it

-CL – presented by Johanna – shared letter from Christ Lutheran Church Council and all the individual responses from the circle session held on September 18 -agreement from Council and church members that Option 2 appeared to give more of a chance for the Lutheran voice to be heard - at present there is an overwhelming sense of stress and fear regarding being swallowed up and losing 'Lutheran' identity but there is also a willingness to change and move ahead -some discussion regarding stepping out of the process for now and becoming involved again when nuts and bolts of the process are ironed out

-AS – Dave previously sent an electronic copy of the summary – they met on September 25th and had additional comment pages available to members -feedback broken into 3 categories on 9 pages – Option 1 was favourable but many positive vs. negative comments -some favoured SJ and there were concerns about SJ and AS as presented in Option 2 -one speaker about structure vs worship issues, how can you decide which of the 3 to keep? Put them all on the market and see which isn't sold -a lot of 'get on with it' comments – do we need all the staff that is suggested in the option -1 church 1 name ie. Anglican /Lutheran church of Peterborough -big changes no matter what

-discussion followed about how do we share all this feedback? -agreement that we will put these on websites and into binders (they can be attached to minutes as a single document) -the feedback summaries are ours for advice

7:30 Hydration Break

4. Confirmation/Re-visitation of Options

-now that we have heard feedback what do we think? -discussion followed – keep both Option 1 & 2 downtown and suburban churches and refine them – we have been presenting these options – we need to present something more refined or we will continue needing more discussion and feedback - Mary Anne shared a refinement of Option 2 where the decision is made re: the location of the 2 parishes – discussion followed – we still don't want to make the hard decision -can we take Option 1 out and keep Option 2 and bring in someone who can do an unbiased recommendation and take that to the parishes for discussion/approval?

-Bishop White suggested that we could send the refined Option to the Bishop who might send it back to us and then present it to the parishes as the choice. It is the implementation stage where consultants might be needed

-further discussion about the need for someone outside the process to do the technical stuff in the implementation stage -agreement that we would recommend one urban (downtown) and one suburban (uptown) parish with the understanding that technical experts be involved in the implementation stage

-Kevin stated that the Covenant Council is hoping to help the “Commission with the rest of this process (Council has proposed a joint Carol service before Christmas and a joint worship service at another time)

-noted that we should put the supporting date with the recommendation and next steps

-clarification -consensus to go with Option 2 and include the case which supports this, include suggestion to the Bishop that the recommendation be presented to congregations for approval in principle -including the case for why 1 uptown and 1 downtown parish – and that external technical expertise be involved in the implementation phase and then the consultant report goes to the “Bishop and then parishes and then the decision is made

-we need to write this final recommendation

-Bishop White shared the results of his meeting with the clergy -they were open to looking at things and agreed that Option 2 made sense -by end of October clergy appointments/changes need to happen -they are glad to have an episcopal presence again -during the process the clergy also want to be involved in the renewal and changes in the church -they need to be re-integrated into the process

5. Next Steps, Timetable and Final Product

-Raymond and Dave will do the re-write and that will be the topic of our next meeting and that will be ‘the report’ that gets sent to the Bishop -let’s include a timeline in the recommendations so we can bring it to vestry by February for sure, perhaps sooner

6. Closing –“Send us Out...” and ‘Glory to God’ sung and recited at 8:40

Next Meeting on Wednesday October 19 at St. John’s at 6:00 pm.