Background: At Annual Session 2008, NPYM approved the implementation of a new structure, which had been approved the previous year. The plan mandated an evaluation to be brought to the 2013 Annual Session. In the fall of 2012, CC set up an Ad Hoc NPYM Structure Evaluation Committee, co-clerked by Chris Cradler and Ann Stever. Other members of the committee were Margaret Coahran, Ted Etter, ELee Hadley, Lucretia Humphrey and Kate Jaramillo.

The mandate for the evaluation specifically included the following:

1. Quantitative measures from CC reports to Annual Session since 2009.
4. Comparison of estimated and actual costs related to the new structure, adjusted for inflation, cost of living increases and the addition of any staff.
5. Use of NPYM’s mission statement for development of questions for different groups within NPYM.

The evaluation process was intended to answer the basic question: Is the NPYM structure fulfilling the goals of the Vision?

NORTH PACIFIC YEARLY MEETING MISSION AND VISION: The purpose of North Pacific Yearly Meeting of the Religious Society of Friends is to provide a means for Friends to strengthen and support one another in a common search for divine Truth and Light. North Pacific Yearly Meeting, both as an organization and as an annual session, supports and encourages Friends, as individuals, monthly meetings and worship groups, deepening their spiritual center and moving into Spirit-led action. (July 1994)

North Pacific Yearly Meeting will:

• Hold an Annual Session to bring Friends together to worship, attend to business, and build community for all ages.

• Serve as an ongoing resource to its Meetings, Worship Groups and Isolated Friends by:
  o fostering leadership;
  o facilitating communication about and among Friends within NPYM;
- providing **opportunities** for education, service, and spiritual enrichment;
- encouraging **visitation** among Friends;
- **publishing** Faith and Practice and other resources;
- supporting Meetings and Worship Groups to make Quakers a more **visible presence**.

**• Nurture spiritual development** and a sense of community for our **children and young people**, and support their transition to adult participation in the life of Friends.

**• Support discernment and implementation** of traditional and emerging **concerns** arising from Friends’ Testimonies.

**• Foster relationships** with the wider world of Friends. (October 2006)

The three major changes in the new structure were:
1. Do most NPYM business at Annual Session.
2. Create three new Standing Committees: Ministry & Oversight (expanded charge and to operate all year), Peace and Social Concerns, and Youth.
3. Replace Steering Committee by a Coordinating Committee, intended to facilitate networking among Meetings, standing committees, and individuals.

**Process:** The committee met twice in person for daylong meetings in Portland as well as by phone and e-mail exchanges. We developed four questions and a suggested process for CC, Meetings and Worship Groups. All groups were given the NPYM Vision & Mission Statement, on which the questions were based. The suggested process was used at Coordinating Committee. Meetings and Worship Groups addressed the questions in a wide variety of ways.

We heard from 17 of the 22 Monthly Meetings. (This included MGOF as a MM. In this report, numbers of MMs varies, because there were changes during the 5-year period.) We heard from 1 of the 2 Preparative Meetings. We heard from 8 Worship Groups. Chris Cradler met with Jr. Friends at their Ski Trip to get their in-put.

We developed another set of questions for the 10 clerks of Standing Committees and had responses from all 10. We did not address Young Adult Friends as a group. Other required information was gathered.

The committee took the preliminary report to the April 13, 2013 Coordinating Committee for their feedback. CC suggested that the Ad Hoc committee explore the structure of some other Yearly Meetings.
We consulted with Intermountain and Pacific Yearly Meetings (our “sister” unprogrammed Yearly Meetings in the West. Intermountain is just starting a change in structure. Their new Representative Committee will be the place where new ideas and issues for their Annual Session (AS) can start to be seasoned. It will meet once outside of Annual Session (AS). Pacific has a Representative Committee of about 50 people that meets once a year. That committee oversees their annual session and makes other decisions. They have no Executive Committee. Both YMs have other standing committees. The NPYM Ad Hoc Committee has not yet fully considered these responses, but did not see any ideas to recommend at this time.

Following the mandate for evaluation:

1. **Summary of quantitative measures from CC Annual Reports**

   We have quantitative information from 2008 - April 2011. The intent of the new structure was for most decisions to be made either at Annual Session or by Monthly Meetings. There was recognition that this would involve a change and challenge for Nominating Committee. We note that 2008 – 2009 was a transition year from the Steering Committee to Coordinating Committee. The first CC meeting was in April 2009. The statistics below are for CC only. Therefore the numbers for 2008-2009 do not reflect a whole year.

   The evaluation document highlighted the question of how often the Executive Committee was used for approval of nominations and other decisions. This is the chart of Executive Committee actions:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Nominations approved</th>
<th>Decisions made</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2008-09</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009-10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010-11</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

   This suggests that it is, indeed, challenging for Nominating Committee to bring a full report to Annual Session. This was also a period of considerable challenge for Nominating Committee.

   The other quantitative information we found in these reports is the chart of attendance at Coordinating Committee. We have information for 7 meetings: 3 in 2009, 3 in 2010 and 1 in 2011. Possible total attendance was 33 - 6 officers, 10 Standing Committee Clerks and 17 from Meetings, since three Meetings opted to name liaisons to CC, rather than members. The average attendance was 24.1 with 1 low of 22 and 1 high of 27. Attendance was quite consistent. The possible attendance of members from Meetings was 20 and the average was 16. The possible attendance of members from the Yearly Meeting (Standing Committee Clerks and officers) was 16 and the average was
10.7. Statistics are somewhat misleading because a number of people wore “2 hats”, i.e. were a committee clerk and their monthly meeting’s member. Given that the attendance usually included the CC Clerk, assistant clerk, the recording clerk and the Presiding Clerk, it would appear that attendance among Standing Committee clerks was somewhat weak. This suggests some lack of understanding of the role of CC –a place for standing committees to share information, network, share challenges and support one another. This is born out by reports from Standing Committee Clerks. On the other hand, at the November 2012 CC meeting, of 30 people present, 7 were YM officers, 2 were Jr. Friends and our 1 staff person. 9 of 10 Standing Committees were represented, but only 9 of 18 Monthly Meetings. When you count people wearing “2 hats”, a total of 13 Meetings were represented. Reports from Meetings and Worship Groups (see #1 in Findings From Mtgs and WGs) and Standing Committee Clerks (see #2 in Findings from Clerks of Standing Committees) suggest that CC is not seen as a resource.

At that time, CC members felt that communication among standing committees had improved quite a lot from the previous structure, but communications with MMs and WGs had not. There was increased use of conference calls and the support of the NPYM Secretary was very useful. The respondents were evenly divided as to whether the structure worked to increase communications and interconnectedness. (Italics added for this report.) M&O and Youth Committees were seen as the most visible (still true in 2013). CC was very clear that it was not doing a good job supporting PMs, WGs and Isolated Friends. They felt standing committees were working well for the most part and identified elements for a successful committee. They noted there is room for improvement in understanding the role of CC and its members (still true in 2013). Some felt the committee met too infrequently. Two-day meetings were too long. A change was made as a result of this evaluation to a one-day meeting, 9 AM – 6 PM. There was a sense that CC was accomplishing a number of its goals. The greatest need for improvement was to clarify the differences between the old Steering Committee and CC. (A longer summary of this Self-Evaluation from ELee Hadley, then Clerk, is available upon request.)

It should be noted that the survey related to attendance at AS 2009-11, when 2 of the 3 Annual Sessions were in Montana.

Survey results - 237 people responding
❖ 54% had not attended AS in the last 3 years, 16.5% had attended
all of the last 3 Annual Sessions.
❖ The number one factor for not attending AS was scheduling conflicts (work, vacation, other); the number two reason was living distance from the AS site or lack of adequate vacation time.
❖ 20% of those in both the “attended” and “not attended” groups cited cost as a factor in attendance; 40% indicated that lower cost or better financial aid would make attendance more likely.
❖ 38% of respondents cited “informal fellowship” as the most important reason to attend AS; 32% cited “conducting business” as the most important function for NPYM carried out at AS.

Conclusion: Most people suggested ways to improve what we are doing at Annual Session. The number of days for annual session was not a major concern for the people who responded. The recommendation approved at Annual Session 2012: "Annual Session remain a five day event so as to provide space for the Business, identified by respondents as important work and the Fellowship, identified as an important draw for Friends' attendance at Annual Session."

4. Comparison of costs.
The Clerk of Finance and Legal Committee developed a chart, comparing costs in the three years 2006 – 2009 when there was Steering Committee with costs in the three years 2010 – 2012 with Coordinating Committee and the increased number of Standing Committees.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Cost Difference</th>
<th>Percentage Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Travel and operations</td>
<td>$2,098 cheaper</td>
<td>(17% decrease)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretary wages &amp; expenses</td>
<td>$2,823 cheaper</td>
<td>(11% decrease) - partly due to shift in staff)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standing Committee expenses</td>
<td>$164 more expensive</td>
<td>(2% increase)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall expenses</td>
<td>$4,757 cheaper</td>
<td>(10.6% decrease)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

During years with the CC total expenses were $39,938 while during years with the SC total expenses were $44,695. It is clear the new structure as it has been operating, is not more expensive. We did not add other staff, which had been suggested as a possibility in the structure implementation report. It also might be questioned whether we have been spending enough to make the new structure work well.

**FINDINGS FROM MEETINGS AND WORSHIP GROUPS**
We asked:
1. How have you interacted with NPYM Standing Committees?
2. The Coordinating Committee was developed for networking. How has NPYM served as a resource to your Mtg/WG by facilitating
networking? (Include ways your Mtg/WG served as a resource to others.)

3. Most NPYM Business is done at Annual Session. How have you and your Meeting participated and been affected by this change?

4. What improvements can you suggest for implementing the NPYM Vision?

1. How have you interacted with NPYM Standing Committees?

M&O: Most groups were aware of the YM M&O committee, especially the consultations by conference call, addressing issues of interest to Monthly Meeting M&O (by whatever name) Committees. While few outside the participants knew anything about the topics or what went on, they were still highly valued.

Discipline: Many groups engaged in one way or another in reviewing parts of Faith & Practice and were thus connected to the Discipline Committee. F&P is a valued “go to” resource.

Youth Committee: Many groups knew of and expressed appreciation for the Youth Committee and YM programs for Central and Jr. Friends. The Youth Summit held April 3, 2011 at Eastside Meeting was mentioned. Some recognized there would have been no Children’s Program at the 2012 Annual Session without the intense work of the committee.

Nominating, Outreach and Visitation (O&V) and Annual Session Planning Committees were mentioned by a few Meetings.

Some groups expressed frustration at the lack of interaction or resources from the Peace & Social Concerns and Information Technology Committees, specifically problems with the website and Directory. The Ad Hoc Committee notes there is a new, active clerk of PSSC. His attendance at winter MGOF 2013 was greatly appreciated. IT issues need further examination. That committee’s report expressed a number of concerns.

Finance and Legal and Site Committees do not interact much with Meetings/WGs, although there was a suggestion that it would be good to have 3 or 4 sites that we that with which we can become familiar.

A recent MM Finance Committee clerk mentioned no contact with F&L, but that committee is not charged with relating to MMs. However, two concerns/ideas arose in relation to F&L:
a) When changes in assessments are considered, there probably needs to be consultation with requests for feedback from MMs. While budget decisions are made appropriately at Annual Session, Friends need more background on an issue like changes in assessments. So, perhaps F&L does have some responsibility to be in touch with Meetings.

b) F&L can also be a resource. We heard that a new MM treasurer was looking for help and best practices. F&L might also consider fiduciary trainings, as were done a few years ago. Jill Hoyenga is a resource within NPYM.

It sounded like groups were aware of many YM Standing Committees, but mostly responded to outreach or requests rather than initiated use of these resources. The major exception was P&SC, where some groups wanted information and networking and couldn’t get it. The process of asking Meetings about the Standing Committees certainly raised awareness of these resources.

2. The Coordinating Committee was developed for networking. How has NPYM served as a resource to your Mtg/WG by facilitating networking? (Include ways your Mtg/WG served as a resource to others.)

This question generally drew a blank in most groups. While it is clear that some personal networking has taken place, especially at CC meetings, this major function is not at all clear or well understood by Mtgs/WGs. In fact, it does not seem clear to CC members themselves. A number of Mtgs cannot find anyone to appoint as their CC member. There also seems to be some confusion between the old Steering Committee and Coordinating Committee. The seasoning process is also unclear. Many Mtgs have all they can handle with issues and activities of their own and have not experienced “value-added” by CC. Essentially, CC is not seen as relevant to Mtgs.

3. Most NPYM Business is done at Annual Session. How have you and your Meeting participated and been affected by this change?

There are very wide differences between those who feel they are being asked to season too much, or to respond to surveys and evaluations, and those who liked being asked and feel a part of the process, even if they do not go to Annual Session. Some Mtgs felt overwhelmed, which may have been because many requests came about the same time, in the spring. Other Mtgs appreciated the involvement.

There were mixed opinions about doing business, but some expressed appreciation for doing the budget there. The report from one Meeting summed it up:
“Two of us spoke almost simultaneously about doing the routine business of the Yearly Meeting at the Annual Session – one favoring this change and the other opposing it. Doing routine business either contributes to community building or takes time away from doing so, depending on your point of view.”

4. **What improvements can you suggest for implementing the NPYM Vision?**

Most suggestions we received have been included in our recommendations. Some have been incorporated into the previous findings. Some were contradictory and cancelled each other out. At this point we would like to highlight what we heard from Jr. Friends.

-JF request a conversation between Jr. Friends and adults (and YF and adults) about membership in Monthly Meetings. This might lessen the difficulty in transitioning from JF/YF participation to becoming active in the adult Meetings. Some fear taking responsibility in Meetings, others aren’t sure adults desire their involvement. They want their opinions to be respected and valued.

-JF suggest that NPYM renew its contacts continually with JFs, taking care to keep JFs in the loop on issues before NPYM

-JF hope some of their members could serve on NPYM committees to help them learn Quaker process.

-Youth Committee asked to publicize the Youth Opportunity Fund and how to use it.

We were delighted with this report and impressed that Jr. Friends were aware of the responsibilities they might asked to take on and while not every individual wished to do that, those who did were clear.

**FINDINGS FROM CLERKS OF STANDING COMMITTEES**

We heard from Clerks or Co-Clerk of all 10 Standing Committees. We asked:

1. How has your committee interacted with Meetings and Worship Groups? a) by serving as a resource, b) by facilitating networking among Friends, c) other?
2. How has Coordinating Committee worked for you – as a support for your committee, as a place to network?
3. What has been the impact on your committee of the change of having more business at Annual Session?
4. What challenges/problems has your committee encountered in relation to the above questions?
5. What improvements can you suggest for your committee to better fulfill the NPYM Mission and Vision?
6. Anything else you want to share with us?

1. Connection with Meetings and Worship Groups
The amount of connection varied with the job of the committee. Those with most connection were M&O, Youth and Discipline Committees. All of these committees made their own direct connections with Meetings and did not depend on Coordinating Committee for contacts or networking. Nominating Committee also reached out to the Meetings directly. Discipline Committee has been consulting Meetings since before this new structure. In some other cases, clerks have responded to questions from Meetings or reached out to a few groups. A few committees have not connected with Meetings, in some cases it not being relevant to their charge, e.g. Site Committee, or have not been successful.

M&O, Outreach & Visitation (O&V) and Discipline Committees are ones that specifically mentioned networking among Mtgs, WGs and Isolated Friends. The Youth Committee brought Friends together in a “Youth Summit” and has visited Meetings. M&O has hosted 3 phone consultations with clerks or reps from Mtgs and sent summaries of such to all the Mtgs and WGs. O&V has connected with 3 WGS and 1 MM, but has focused primarily on Isolated Friends. They supported the travel to small groups by the Friend in Residence before Annual Session in 2012. O&V collected a list of electronic resources to help individuals and small groups connect to the wider Quaker community. Discipline has traveled among some Meetings as a resource and to spark discussion about Faith & Practice. They post responses to their questions and drafts on the web and convene interest groups at Annual Session to discuss them.

For CC to fulfill its function of sharing emerging issues and activities among meetings, members need to be active between meetings, gathering and sharing information with their Meetings and with CC members. Are 3 meetings a year enough to fulfill this function?

2. Coordinating Committee
Almost all clerks responded that CC was not a resource or useful place to network, although there was mention that CC was a useful sounding board or provided helpful counsel. One Clerk found more support in the Executive Committee than in CC. Another appreciated the formation of an ad hoc committee to address an issue. A CC meeting in which committee clerks met separately by themselves to share and talk was particularly appreciated by a committee clerk, there was also a problem for folks wearing 2 hats (being a committee clerk and member from their Meeting). Respondents did not think to mention
the informal networking that takes place at CC meetings, but the Ad Hoc Evaluation Committee is aware that this is perceived as useful.

3. ** Longer Annual Session impact/doing more business**
   
   For most committees, the length of the AS had little or no impact. One Clerk felt it challenging to bring items to AS; Youth and M&O noted that their roles in AS meant that the additional day did mean more work. There is increased work for the Annual Session Planning Committee – for the Presiding Clerk, figuring out how to distribute the business and for the Program Coordinator and Volunteer Coordinator.

4. **Challenges/problems**
   
   Few Clerks addressed this question. M&O reported that at first they felt overwhelmed by all the functions they were supposed to carry out. They resolved this by having an annual retreat right before Annual Session and setting priorities, testing carefully where they were led by the Spirit. Information Technology questioned what place their committee had in the overall structure. They believe they are seen as “tech support” and have done that with varying degrees of success. There are many forms of electronic communication (e.g.Facebook pages), with a sense that there are no overall policies or coordination or even knowledge of who is doing what. The Committee on the Discipline is challenged to know if they have received enough responses from local groups to move forward. Peace & Social Concerns Committee (PSCC) has tried a number of ways to get contact information for Clerks of Meeting PSCC and has not been able to get what it needs. It cannot network among Meetings without this information.

**RECOMMENDATIONS SENT DIRECTLY TO COMMITTEES AS SUGGESTED BY COORDINATING COMMITTEE MEETING AT ITS APRIL 13, 2013**

1. **Teleconferencing should be considered by more committees.** This is different from conference calls for committee meetings, but is based on the experience of M&O. For example, P&SC might find a number of groups dealing with homelessness. Connect those folks with a call involving them. Outreach and Visitation might invite a call involving small WGs and/or isolated Friends to consider some common issue or just make connections. Use the experience of M&O for advice. Sent to P&SC, Discipline, Youth, O&V, and F&L.

2. **Greater use of and encouragement of visitation among Meetings.** These experiences are rich for visitors and those visited. The Brinton Visitor program was missed. The travel by the 2012 Friend in Residence was greatly appreciated. Sent to O&V.
3. Organization of gatherings or consultations outside of Annual Session. While we recognize there may already be more events and consultations than can be attended, we have heard enthusiasm from people for gatherings where people from different Mtgs get together. Whidbey Island Meeting invited Friends from near-by Meetings (as far away as Tacoma) to the clerking workshop at their Meeting, and connections were made that were later used. It is clear that face-to-face connections are vital. Ideas for such gatherings: spiritual retreats, family camp, conferences on fiduciary responsibilities, another Youth summit, a gathering to address how small Quaker communities operate and maintain their vitality, Quaker business process as spiritual enrichment. Such gatherings should be in response to expressed needs and interests, which could be solicited through CC. Sent to M&O, Youth, F&L and CC.

4. In our process we recognized many groups, both Meetings and WGs, are struggling and have little or no time or energy for anything outside of their group. In some cases, groups are happy to be relatively unconnected to the wider Quaker world. Others feel overextended and/or are confronting particular challenges. Outreach from the YM in some form might be appreciated - visitation, listening and being present, knowledge of possible resources available. It appears there is a need for consultation and communications between these M&O and O&V committees. Initially, CC was the place where this would take place, but it does not seem to be working that way. Sent to M&O and O&V.

5. The suggestions and comments from Jr. Friends were forwarded to Youth, Annual Session Planning, M&O Nom, Exec Com, CC, and Presiding Clerk.

RECOMMENDATIONS TO ANNUAL SESSION, July 2013

1. The Ad Com Committee heard strong support from Meetings for a paid youth staff and recommends approval of the proposal from the Ad Hoc Committee on Children’s Program Staff.

2. The Ad Hoc Committee found a need for greater communications across the Yearly Meeting. We heard suggestions for some kind of communication (generally a variety of electronic ones) that would share information about what is happening throughout the YM, in committees, Mtgs/WGs and from our reps to Quaker organizations. Many expressed the need for a current NPYM Directory. The Information Technology Committee felt this was a bigger job than it could oversee, but suggested a member of their committee might be involved in any effort to address this issue.
The Ad Hoc committee recommends that NPYM form another Ad Hoc Committee to explore better ways of communicating within the YM. Suggested questions for consideration:

- What communications do we want/need, among whom, for what purpose(s)?
- In what forms would communications take place?
- Who would oversee this?
- What would this cost and how would it be funded?

3. There was widespread lack of understanding about the role and purposes of Coordinating Committee. Attendance at committee meetings varied. Many CC members were unclear about their role. Neither Mtgs/WGs nor Standing Committee clerks experienced Coordinating Committee as a resource or a place to network, although it was clear that informal networking took place at those meetings. Some Standing Committees have used CC for seasoning purposes. CC was the place where NPYM could identify committees that were struggling. Emerging common concerns were not identified in CC. Some CC members question the purpose of the committee, wondering if networking justifies its existence. Some Meetings found CC irrelevant.

The Ad Hoc Committee recommends that it continue for another year to develop recommendations for improvements in structure, role, and composition of Coordinating Committee. After appropriate seasoning with Meetings through the year, recommendations would come to 2014 Annual Session.

Actions requested at Annual Session 2013

1. Limited sharing of ideas about the above questions in recommendation #2 above and approval of proposal for an Ad Hoc Committee to explore communications needs and solutions.

2. Approval for the Ad Hoc NPYM Structure Evaluation Committee to continue for another year to develop recommendations for improvements to Coordinating Committee. See above recommendation #3.