

Recommendations and Proposal from Ministry & Oversight, Nominating and Finance Committees

Current Situation: Last year (FY 2014-2015) in the general account PYM spent \$20,400 more than we received. Most income for the general account comes from per-member assessments to monthly meetings in the yearly meeting. There are limits to the amount of funds that can be raised from monthly meetings since their contributions are voluntary. (Assessments of monthly meeting approximately doubled when the yearly meeting hired the Youth Program Supervisor.) Most Meetings supported the hiring, but some still report struggles with their budgets.

For Pacific Yearly Meeting, the budget is a spending authority. The treasurer is authorized to spend up to the limit of the budget. When spending exceeds the budget, approval must be obtained for further spending (i.e., budget augmentation). If at the end of the fiscal year, fewer funds were spent than budgeted, the remainder goes into reserves. When more is spent than budgeted, the difference is drawn from reserves. Obviously, if PYM continued to budget less than actual expenses our reserves would be depleted.

PYM has a variety of reserve accounts; most are restricted for a specific purpose. The unrestricted reserves, from which budget shortfalls would be drawn had been relatively stable in recent years:

2015	\$55,890
2014	\$80,626
2013	\$81,856
2012	\$83,201
2011	\$81,216

This year, in the face of fiscal austerity, three committees (Ministry and Oversight, Nominating, and Finance) are proposing that the funding for delegates be limited to two per organization (other than the Friends Bulletin Corp. (*Western Friend*) Board of Directors, which would continue to send three).

Background: Pacific Yearly Meeting presently names (and, with the exception of FCLCa, fully funds travel for) representatives, delegates, and observers to other Quaker organizations:

- four or five representatives to the American Friends Service Committee (AFSC) Corporation;
- one observer to Evangelical Friends Church Southwest;
- three board members to the Friends Bulletin Corp. Board of Directors;
- one representative to Friends Committee on Legislation of California (FCLCa);
- six representatives to the Friends Committee on National Legislation (FCNL);
- one observer to the Friends General Conference (FGC) Central Committee;
- one member to the Friends Peace Team Board of Directors;

- one observer to the Friends United Meeting (FUM);
- five representatives to the Friends World Committee for Consultation (FWCC), Section of the Americas;
- two representatives to Quaker Earthcare Witness;
- one observer to the Reunion General de los Amigos en Mexico; and
- one representative to the William Penn House National Consultative Committee.

For a considerable time, Pacific Yearly Meeting has pondered these representatives, delegates and observers. How many should be named? In some cases the receiving organizations suggested the number (based on the size of our yearly meeting). Did that mean that we were obligated to send this number? Could we send more? Or less? This issue was considered by PYM's M&O committee without resolution.

A further complication was that prior to 2008, the budget supporting travel to meetings did not fully support travel for the number of delegates named. Both the Nominating Committee and Finance Committee had misgivings about naming delegates and expecting *some* of them to pay their own expenses. (Some Friends are affluent and can and do pay their own expenses; however, if we are expecting representatives to pay their own expense less affluent Friends would not be able to serve.)

At the Representative Committee Meeting in 2008, a minute was passed to fully fund travel of all representatives, delegates, and liaisons. This necessarily increased the budget of yearly meeting, but not as much as might have been expected because some Friends did not charge Yearly Meeting for their expenses and in most years not all of the named delegates actually attended their meetings.

Minute: In order to reduce budgeted expenses, Ministry & Oversight, Nominating, and Finance Committees specifically recommends:

- two representatives be funded for travel to the AFSC Corporation
- one observer be funded for travel to Evangelical Friends Church Southwest
- three board members be funded for travel to the Friends Bulletin Board of Directors
- two representatives be funded for travel to the FCNL meeting
- one observer be funded for travel to FGC Central Committee meeting
- one board member be funded for travel for Friends Peace Team Project Board of Directors
- one observer be funded for travel to FUM meeting
- two representatives be funded for travel for FWCC Section of the Americas meetings
- two representatives be funded for travel to Quaker Earthcare Witness
- one observer be funded for travel to Reunion General de los Amigos in Mexico,
- one representative for the William Penn House National Consultative Committee; this representative also attends the FCNL meeting and has no additional expense for the William Penn meeting.

If this minute is approved two more minutes will be introduced for implementation. The first will cover how to distribute the reduced budget funding among the existing

representatives, delegates and observers. The second will offer a revised configuration for the slate of representatives, delegates, and observers.

Ministry & Oversight Committee supports this proposal as a short-term measure to address some of the fiscal concerns before Yearly Meeting. Meanwhile Ministry & Oversight Committee is laboring with a broader spectrum of issues and is not yet able to bring related recommendations to the Yearly Meeting for consideration. These issues will focus on how we as a spiritual body should relate to, support and sustain other Friends' organizations.

Survey: Finance Committee developed a survey questionnaire to be completed by members of Yearly Meeting. Less than one-quarter of members of PYM responded (215 valid responses). Of responses received, 12% were from Southern California Quarterly Meeting with 347 members and 27% of total PYM membership and 78% were from College Park Quarterly Meeting with 835 members and 65% of PYM membership. The survey responses provide some information but we should proceed cautiously because the number who did not respond is greater than the number of those who did. We have no way of knowing if those who responded are representative of all.

Some findings:

- 60% of respondent (129 of 215) supported PYM sending representatives to Quaker organizations
 - 10% were opposed
 - 30% did not answer
- 41% of respondents give *some* priority for PYM paying travel for representatives
 - 22% gave *high* priority
 - 21% gave *low* or *no* priority
 - 16% gave no answer
- Although respondents were supportive of sending representatives, written reports were not regularly read:
 - 8% frequently read
 - 36% rarely read
 - 51% never read
 - 4% gave no answer
- 57% of respondents supported PYM providing subsidy for attendees traveling over 200 mile to attend the Annual Gathering
 - 9% reported such policy would help them attend
 - 8% were opposed
 - 26% gave no answer
- Yearly Meeting presently makes annual contributions to certain Quaker organizations; there was mixed support for this practice from respondents:
 - 35% supported
 - 32% were opposed
 - 33% did not answer

- Priority for budget allocations:

	HIGH OR VERY HIGH	SOME	LOW	NONE	NO ANSWER
Youth Programs	76%	7%	2%	0%	15%
General & Administrative Expenses	48%	27%	3%	1%	21%
Assistance to Attend					
Annual Sessions and Rep Com	47%	28%	7%	2%	17%
Committee expenses	33%	36%	13%	1%	17%
Donations to Quaker Organizations	12%	27%	32%	12%	19%
Conference travel for Reps	21%	41%	17%	0%	16%