Matthews United Methodist Church Administrative Council Meeting-05/28/2024

Attendees:		
Pastor Chuck Wilson	Beth Merchant	Sam Hatcher
Pastor Paul Craig	Ben Freeman	Terry Efird
Pastor Corey Milliet	Christa Tyson	Mike Murphy
Amy Devore	Jon Pollack	Amanda McGrath
Lee Goldstein	Tyleta Morgan	Hugh Clark
Katrina Larrison	Becky Yates	Heath Gilbert
Suzanne Pugh	Susie Verrill	Kaitlin Klotz
Craig Estep	Margaret Todd	
Margaret Todd	Gene Monago	

I. Welcome and check-in (Suzanne Pugh)

- a. 3 words to describe your feelings about the outcomes of General Conference
- II. Finance-Mike Murphy
 - a. Period 4
 - i. Tithes are +\$6,600 and we are exceeding our goals
 - ii. Other income is down about \$10,000 to budget
 - 1. The discrepancy is due to changes to the daycare program we were supposed to contract with but did not.
 - 2. The current tenant, Legacy, will be taking the spaces beginning in August.
 - b. Expenses
 - i. YTD we are doing better than budget by \$90,000
 - 1. A lot of this drives from wages and advance money collection (which will be used later).
 - ii. Staffing: \$48,000 difference
 - iii. Holdback money for eventualities: +\$8,300.
 - c. Evaluation
 - i. Unrestricted cash available = 2.92 months of expenses
- III. Feasibility Study Feedback-Terry Efird
 - a. Generosity Development was hired.
 - b. In March, a feasibility study committee was established to investigate how ready/willing the MUMC congregation is to pursue a capital campaign.
 - c. 23 focus groups were presented STP, Methodist Men, Friday Men's Group, Ladies Circles, Sunday School classes, and open sessions.
 - i. 435 individuals participated in a focus group.
 - d. As of May 22nd, 263 surveys were returned with upwards of 110 comments.
 - i. General reaction to plans as presented:
 - 1. Very Positive: 52.5%
 - 2. Positive: 33.5%
 - 3. Mixed: 14.1%
 - 4. Negative: N/A
 - ii. Confidence in congregational ability to raise \$2 million over 3 years:

- 1. Very confident: 28.3%
- 2. Confident: 49.2%
- 3. Mixed: 22.0%
- 4. Not confident: 0.5%
- iii. Willingness to financially support the plan with a 3-year financial commitment in additional to current annual giving
 - 1. Very willing: 41.1%
 - 2. Willing: 45.8%
 - 3. Mixed: 10.5%
 - 4. Unwilling: 2.6%
- iv. Willingness to share time to advance the initiative
 - 1. Very willing: 26.0%
 - 2. Willing: 38.4%
 - 3. Mixed: 26.0%
 - 4. Unwilling: 9.6%
- v. Potential range of 3-year financial commitment:
 - 1. \$1-2,500:83
 - 2. \$2,500-5,000:45
 - 3. \$5,001-10,000:26
 - 4. \$10,001-25,000:14
 - 5. \$25,001-50,000:7
 - 6. \$50,001-\$100,000:3
- vi. Consultant Recommendations
 - 1. The consultants recommend proceeding with a capital campaign.
 - a. Major and lead gifts account for \$1-1.2 million of the \$2 million goal.
 - b. The congregation has an 83% very positive or positive view of the proposed plan.
 - 2. The consultants were confident in the capacity of congregation to raise \$1,000,000.
- vii. Questions:
 - 1. How was information from the focus groups shared with people who could not attend?
 - a. On 5/20, a link to a recording was sent out along with a link to the survey
 - b. Just These Lines
 - c. Zoom focus group
 - 2. Is the challenge gift contingent on something else?
 - a. Yes
 - 3. How will the people who are not on Administrative Council have access to the information presented in tonight's meeting?
 - a. That plan is under development

- b. PowerPoint detailing the information shared in tonight's meeting will be shared next week.
- 4. Can Generosity Development do some categorization of themes?
 - a. Potentially-we don't know if it's exactly in their wheelhouse.
 - b. Additionally, the Building Committee and Trustees could work together to categorize the themes and provide their categorized data to the architect.
- 5. Can the comments be provided to the architect?
 - a. This is a possibility.
- viii. Feasibility Study Committee Recommendation
 - 1. The Feasibility Study Committee recommends moving forward with a capital campaign and is confident in the congregational ability to raise \$2-2.2 million.
 - 2. Once \$1.5 million (pledged and donated) has been reached, a challenge gift of \$500,000 from the Stuart and Eulene Murray Foundation in Atlanta, GA will be donated.
 - a. The \$428,000 that has already been committed to the HVAC unit replacement counts toward the \$1.5 million.
 - 3. The feasibility study committee recommends that the Administrative Council and Trustees assist with reviewing participant comments and response development to be shared with the congregation on or before 07/31/2024.
 - a. Not all comments/questions will be addressed.
 - b. Potentially, a few questions/comments will be addressed in Just These Lines each week.
 - c. A case statement will be made by the beginning of August.
 - d. Key donor meetings will be held in September.
 - e. The campaign communication will be launched congregation-wide in October to coincide with the annual stewardship campaign in November.
 - 4. There is some concern regarding the congregational understanding of why the building changes/improvements are being made.
 - a. There was a sense of the updates being made only to enhance accessibility when other improvements outside of accessibility would be made.
- ix. Vote to move the recommendations forward to a Virtual Charge Conference on June 10th.
 - a. Sentiment is that the recommendations will be advanced to the June 10th Virtual Charge Conference.
- IV. Clergy Updates-Pastor Chuck Wilson

- a. Building Committee
 - i. Currently small, several people have been lost to life circumstances.
 - ii. Administrative Council is charged with expanding the building committee to include the following individuals:
 - 1. Carol Goulsby (Servant leader)
 - 2. Joe Culpepper
 - 3. Robert Larrison & Katrina Larrison (1 vote)
 - 4. John Ross
 - 5. Grace Trumpower
 - a. Call for a vote: Suzanne Pugh
 - i. Motioned Becky Yates
 - ii. Seconded by Margaret Todd
 - 1. 17 affirmative
 - 2. 0 opposed
 - 3. 0 abstentions
- V. Closing Prayer-Pastor Paul Craig