Background

The Ad Hoc Committee to Evaluate the NPYM Structure was charged at the 2013 Annual Session with coming back with a proposal about the Coordinating Committee. In October 2013, the committee reported to Coordinating Committee, we projected three possible options:

1. Participation in CC has not improved and so there does not seem to be adequate progress or interest among Meetings to continue CC in its present form.
2. Participation in CC has improved enough that it should continue as it is for another year to see if improvement continues.
3. CC improved substantially and should continue as is.

The Ad Hoc Committee contacted by phone, Meetings which had not been sending a member to CC and had conversations about why not and how and if they connected to NPYM. We also e-mailed those who did attend the October meeting for their impressions and got only a handful of responses. Our general sense is that there is not energy or interest among many Meetings in sending someone to CC. (See attached numerical analysis of the attendance at the October meeting.) Most Meetings are very busy with their own activities; many are far away and the time and effort to attend a meeting in Seattle or Portland makes it difficult and not adequately worthwhile. Some feel the committee is too big to be effective. It has taken a while for people to understand the difference between Steering Committee (it will have been 7 years this summer) and the Coordinating Committee, where the job is coordination rather than decision-making.

We found the best connections to MMs were made when a Yearly Meeting Committee took the initiative and offered something rather than asked something of MMs. Particularly noted were the outreach made by M&O, P&SC, Youth, Outreach and Visitation and Ad Hoc Communications Committees. The Committee on the Discipline has also reached out to Meetings over many years. When these committees reach out, connections are made and people in MMs are made aware of NPYM. Person to person is still the most effective means of communication, particularly to build community. Care needs to be taken that the different committees are aware of one another and take care to avoid duplication (or contradiction) and coordinate so that they are mutually supportive. (The need for coordination!)

The website NPYM.org can be a useful tool to connect Meetings with one another and to resources in the YM. For example, there could be a digest of Meeting newsletters on the web. There could be material from Standing
Committees. While some people found the website useful now, others found it counter-intuitive and had difficulty finding information they wanted.

Our conclusion is that a primary job of Coordinating Committee is to support and hold accountable the standing committees and to coordinate what is going on in the YM. It is those committees that make the connections with and possibly services to the MMs. This is the group that can coordinate and prioritize what concerns go to MMs and when. MMs are very tired of being consulted on internal NPYM matters and/or having a plethora of consultations come at once in late spring.

While we found that many people consulted were not interested in the YM, we also found that there are individuals who love the YM and are willing to spend their time and energy to participate in YM work and care about the connections to local groups. We value and support those people and believe there should be room for them to contribute to making connections with the YM.
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Analysis of Attendance at October 2013 CC meeting

Meetings & groups with designated CC members attending with no other role
Bellingham
Multnomah
South Mountain
South Seattle
Lopez Preparative Meeting

Meetings with designated CC member who also had another role
Bridge City
Eastside (I think)
Pullman-Moscow

Meetings with someone attending, but not identified as named from their Meeting
Eugene
MGOF
Port Townsend
Salem
Tacoma

Meetings with no one attending
Agate Passage*
Billings
Boise Valley
Corvallis
Missoula
Olympia
Salmon Bay
Sandpoint*
University
Whidbey*

*I think they have told YM they have no member (and won’t).

There are 22 MMs that should send a CC member. There are 2 PMs that can. 10 of the 22 MMs had no one from their MM attending. How many of the 5 people who attended with another hat, report to their respective MMs? It could easily be that more than half the MMs did not get a report about this CC meeting.

Compiled by Ann Stever, 1/6/2014 from 10/2013 CC draft minutes
Proposal to be seasoned by CC at its April 5, 2014 meeting, revised if necessary, and taken to Annual Session in July 2014 by Ad Hoc NPYM Structure Committee

The current structure of Coordinating Committee is not achieving its goals of connecting Meetings and Worship Groups to the Yearly Meeting and making the YM a resource. Some Meetings cannot find people to serve on CC and do not see a value in connecting with the Yearly Meeting. Some people are not feeling it is worth their time; distance and cost are problems for many. **We concluded that it is primarily the responsibility of the Yearly Meeting, through its committees and officers, to take the initiative to reach out to local Meetings and Worship Groups to fulfill the charge “to serve as an ongoing resource to its Meetings, Worship Groups and Isolated Friends”.** (Part of the Mission/Vision approved at Annual Session, July 19, 2008.)

We propose that Coordinating Committee be changed. **Membership:**
Clerks of the 10 Standing Committees and CC Clerk, CC Recording Clerk, CC Associate Clerk, NPYM Presiding Clerk and Treasurer and 2 members chosen by Jr. Friends. We also propose that there be 3 more members, chosen by the Executive Committee, to assure geographic diversity and overall concern for NPYM beyond any specific role or committee.

**Purpose:**
1. Support clerks of standing and ad hoc committees in doing their jobs including especially taking initiative to reach out to Meetings and Worship Groups.
2. Hold standing committees accountable for good order and functioning.
3. Coordinate and collaborate with one another; season ideas.
4. Identify and encourage acting on emerging and converging concerns.
5. Be sure Meetings are not inundated with requests.
6. Provide a collective sense of where the Spirit is moving within NPYM.

The current Executive Committee would continue to make necessary decisions between Annual Sessions.
Questions for Coordinating Committee, April 5, 2014

We would like your feedback, questions and suggestions. We will revise accordingly before sending out the background and proposal. We do NOT intend to ask Meetings to consider this before Annual Session. We do hope it will be distributed in Meetings so that individuals who come to Annual Session can be prepared for discernment.

1. Do you think this is workable? Why? Why not?

2. What do you see as advantages and disadvantages?

3. This is a smaller committee. Would it be useful to meet quarterly (including the meeting at Annual Session) in order to have more chances to get to know one another? Would meeting quarterly be too much of a burden?

4. If you wear 2 hats in CC (member from your MM and a Committee Clerk) do you find you can give full attention to both roles in the CC meeting and reporting back to your committee and your Meeting?

5. With the smaller group might it might be possible to meet in locations other than Seattle and Portland, as originally envisioned. Good idea?