

June, 2011

## Report of ad hoc Committee to the FAUC Executive Council for the Relationship Review of FAUC and FNC

After reviewing the varied input from:

- FAUC members
- FNC members
- FNC directors
- FAUC office administrator and Minister
- some FAUC Executive Council members,

the ad hoc committee has summarized the most obvious and repeated concerns.

Not to be ignored, along with these concerns, came some accolades for both FAUC and the FNC. We received approximately 25 responses. To mention some of the accolades:

- benefit to the church of the *Welcome desk* ( friendliness factor, building security, less interruptions to FAUC staff, portrays an open and welcoming atmosphere)
- FNC is well run, well supported by volunteers, many FAUC people are active in giving leadership and participating in programmes
- FNC offers relevant/inclusive programmes for children and adults
- both FNC and FAUC office members and respective staff/Board members operate in a friendly, helpful, problem solving way to bring about solutions that work
- crossover promotions in our respective publications are increasingly successful
- the FNC has put the church “ on the map,”...out in the community at large
- meetings that involve church members have priority and the ‘office’ will always attempt to find room for meetings, if given enough notice

### 1. Cost

To begin, the major concern was that of cost of the FNC to FAUC. Specifically, is the church in a position to subsidize the FNC? Clearly not. Should it?

Two analyses of the cost factor have been done by two different individuals. One dealt with the custodial costs and a building schedule study was done. The cost for custodial services related to the FNC was \$8900.00 annually. This was justified by using the 2010/2011 schedule and averaged on a sampling of typical weeks. The FNC pays the church \$1800. a month (\$21,600.00 annually) so the costs of custodial services are met. The other study is very detailed and is available in the church office. The two are very far apart in the custodial cost area. We were not privy to the ‘books’ of the FNC hence it is difficult to ascertain whether the FNC *can* provide the church with additional ‘rent.’

Clearly there are several different cost models, some in spreadsheets, and others in perception only. Detail can be used to create consensus. Without consensus the question is going to hang around for a long time.

- a.) Do we really want to know the answer to the analysis? If it is a foregone conclusion that the costs or subsidy don't matter, (FNC is our community outreach) then really FAUC only cares about the higher level consolidated cost statement. If this is the case, then "some people are going to have to let go of their issues".
- b.) If you really want the analysis, i.e. we are prepared to act on the information to better manage FAUC costs overall, then there is clear value in launching a more thorough analysis of the costs. If we do the right analysis, we can create the consensus that is missing today. In the end the information might aid us in making better or more informed decisions on a go forward basis.

## **2. Rent**

The question of rent. This is the 'muddiest' question of all.

Do we require the FNC to pay the commercial rent rates? If so, how do we establish those? Are we really a marketable location?

- Parking
- Technical hookups
- Power requirements
- Facility upgrades
- Health and safety code issues
- Church's need to modify its schedules
- Separate office spaces
- Summer shutdown for maintenance
- Building code items may need upgrading
- External signage
- Long term impact on rooms

We received some 'models' for market rents that I could share with you but they are long and detailed. If we were to go with "market rent", I believe the FNC would not be able to stay with us. One of the FNC directors clearly stated that the FNC is just making ends meet or to quote: "running on a shoestring."

### Recommendation

What came through clearly, after reading all the input, was that FAUC and the FNC need to sit down and redefine the role of the FNC and revisit the original 'deal' and mission. They need to establish an open financial model where the church understands the organization of the FNC and their financial status. Perhaps the non-denominational aspect and separate incorporation are the real "walls" but these are necessary for liability purposes.

### **3. Governance?**

Who/What governs the FNC? And decides what programmes are offered?

#### Recommendation

After revisiting the FNC Mission, perhaps this should be established.

### **4. Outreach?**

Yes, according to the original “mover and shaker” of the addition to the church, this word was used and the understanding for most was to ‘put more people in the pews.’ Has this happened? Not many to be as significant as we would like. However, the word ‘outreach’ has many meanings. According to the FNC Mission statement to date, outreach is not included. We quote:

“The FNC provides non-denominational, educational opportunities for personal wellness and growth in a caring, dynamic and community-focused way that celebrates and values all members of the community.” 1997

Has the FNC fulfilled its Mission as stated over the years? We believe the answer is ‘yes.’ With changes to personnel in the offices over the year, the thinking, cooperation and philosophies have changed. We are on an upswing with Rev. Christopher and Naomi as a team. They both recognize a need for change, open communication and sharing. Should we celebrate this? For sure. Do we need to make changes? For sure. Will we?

#### Recommendation

It will take more work, investigation, clear communication, respect and fair and reasonable ‘heads’ to work it all out. Perhaps we have not accomplished the ‘outreach’ that was initially envisioned but with a more collaborative approach perhaps some of the programmes could offer support to retirees, people who have been laid off, youth looking for work after graduation, recovering people? These programmes would have a ‘church feel’ to them and offered by church members so that the community gets to know us better.

#### Summary

We didn’t come up with a magical solution to the concerns but this report is respectfully submitted by Sheila Corkill, John Wettlaufer and Katherine Dalziel.