

SYNOD EXECUTIVE REPORT

The Synod Executive meets three times between Synod meetings (November, May and September) to attend to Synod business as directed by the Standing Orders. Motions are required at this meeting regarding Kintail's *Space to Grow* Campaign and also the proposal to move to a commissioned Synod.

A. Kintail Camp's *Space to Grow* Campaign

Last year's Synod heard Director the Rev. Theresa McDonald-Lee speak to the Camp's three year capital campaign and viewed a short informative video. Updated information can be found in the Camp Kintail report to this years Synod.

At the May 2017 meeting of the Synod Executive we made the following motions in order to get the application to the PCBC moving. These motions need the approval of this Synod.

Income and Cost estimate for the campaign

Income

Camp Kintail Capital (earned) - \$600,000

Space to Grow Capital Campaign (fund raised) - \$600,000

Total Income - \$1,200,000

Expenses

Foundation - \$42,100.00

Steel Beams - \$4,000.00

Lumber Package - \$285,000.00

Eaves trough - \$5,000.00

Electrical - \$140,000.00

Blow in insulation - \$10,000.00

Flooring - \$51,000.00

Accessible washroom - \$10,000.00

Stairs - \$7,000.00

Railings - \$9,000.00

Plumbing - \$105,000

Heating - \$150,000

Excavation - \$40,000.00

Framing - \$90,000.00

Roofing - \$20,000.00

Drywalling and Taping - \$80,000.00

Gravel - \$10,000

Septic Tank & Pump - \$15,000

Contractor - \$30,000

Sub-Total - \$1,100,000.00

Allowance for overages & unforeseen costs - \$100,000

Total Cost - \$1,200,000

*note-all prices are estimates based on quote from suppliers

Moved by Todd and Clark that the Board of Directors report be approved. CARRIED.

- 1. Motion required to approve the Synod Executive's decision to approve the statement of income and expenses for the campaign.**

The following motions were moved by McLennan and Van den Berg and will have to be approved by Synod in October. They are made by the Executive because of the necessity of getting things moving. Each motion was CARRIED.

1. That the Synod sanction a building project to be undertaken by the Camp Kintail.
2. That the Synod sanction a contract of debt with security on camp property and the negotiations of a loan from The Lending Fund of The Presbyterian Church in Canada, for capital purposes, by Camp Kintail.
3. That the Synod authorize the Directors of Camp Kintail to provide security required for a loan from The Lending Fund of The Presbyterian Church in Canada, including a mortgage over lands and buildings of the camp.
4. That the Synod sanction a loan from The Lending Fund of The Presbyterian Church in Canada and the required payments of interest and repayments of a loan as a second charge, after the salaries of the staff, on income, receipts and revenues with the payments of interest and repayments of the loan included in the budgets of Camp Kintail.
5. That the Synod agree that no additional debt is to be contracted by Camp Kintail until the loan from The Lending Fund of The Presbyterian Church in Canada is repaid in full.
6. That the Synod Of Southwestern Ontario agrees and undertakes to monitor and to ensure the loan from The Lending Fund of The Presbyterian Church in Canada to Camp Kintail is repaid and to cure defaults.
7. That the Synod grant permission to Camp Kintail to make application to The Presbyterian Church Building Corporation of The Presbyterian Church in Canada for a loan, on terms as arranged with the said Corporation, in an amount which is not more than sixty per centum (60%) of the total completed value of the congregation's real property (including land and buildings) for the construction of a new Leader in Training Building (South Field Building). which it is estimated will cost \$1,200,000, and sanction the mortgaging of its real property as security therefor.
8. That Synod authorizes Camp Kintail to borrow from or through The Presbyterian Church Building Corporation of The Presbyterian Church in Canada, on such terms as may be arranged, the sum of \$600,000 and to execute a grant or mortgage of the camp's real property securing repayment of the loans and any further assurance required.
9. That the Synod examined the plans of the proposed building to be constructed by Camp Kintail and found them to be adequate and proper.

2. Motion required to approve the Synod Executive's decisions 1 through 9

At the September 2017 meeting of the Synod Executive the following motions regarding the application to the Lending Fund were made. These too need the approval of the Synod.

On the recommendation of the Lending Fund it was moved by Farris and Bablitz that we increase the application to \$100,000 for the *Space to Grow* campaign. CARRIED.

3. Motion required to approve the Synod Executive’s decision to increase the application to the Lending Fund to 100,000

B. Proposal to move to a Commissioned Synod

The Synod Executive meeting Tues May 9th 2017 named Mark McLennan (past Moderator), John Henderson(Clerk), Theresa McDonald-Lee and Robt Adams (Moderator) to explore and present a proposal to transition to a Commissioned Synod to the September meeting of the Synod Executive. An initial meeting was held at Camp Kintail Wed June 28th at 4:30 to explore steps to be taken. Suggested steps were outlined by Deputy Clerk Don Muir.

. Rationale for the transition

We have seen a decline in attendance at Synod reflecting diminished interest and belief in the importance of Synod. (Rural Ministry committee disbanded for lack of interest) Recently, considerable effort was put into rejuvenating Synod meetings by restructuring Synod – shortening the business to one day and enhancing the educational component by offering 5 or 6 workshops similar to the APCE model, in addition to the ‘keynote’ speaker. Also, a major revision of the Standing Orders was done to streamline our work. The first Synod meeting under the new model was held in 2015. In recent years, at least 3 Presbyteries have had difficulty meeting their Synod assessments.

Attendance Comparison (Ministers, Elders and total) Out of a potential 564 attendees**
 (**source 2016 A&P p 690 listing 284 ministers on the roll)

2012			2013			2014			2015			2016		
32	6	(38)	47	13	(60)	46	15	(61)	25	17	(42)	28	8	(36)**

** a concern that on the 2016 Saturday sitting there was not a quorum – there was, barely

What would be the responsibilities of the Commissioned Synod?

- . oversight and support of Camp Kintail
 (Kintail is owned by the national church but they do not wish to have oversight - of any camps they own -, that is given to Synod
- . oversight and support of PYPS
- . dealing with appeals (appeals go direct to Assembly if Assembly meets before the annual Synod Meeting..
- . dealing with sexual abuse and harassment complaints emanating from Camp Kintail, also can act resource for Presbyteries.
- . oversight and support of creative, resourceful, experimental ministries
- . a Synod Executive comprised of Moderator, Clerk, Treasurer, chair of Creative Ministries and chair of Camp Bd. Chair of sexual abuse and harassment committee.
- . Standing Orders would need to be revised

What would a commissioned Synod look like?

The Gen Assembly ratio is 1/6 of ministers and diaconal ministers on the constituent roll + and equal number of representative elders. However, Synod could be different. The ratio proposed must be adopted by 75% of those at the Synod meeting (BofF 260). Each Presbytery would commission a minimum of 4 (2 ministers, 2 elders) = 32 commissioners plus Moderator, Clerk, Treasurer.

Commission Comparison

Synod of Central NO&B

Synod of Manitoba & NW ON

<ul style="list-style-type: none">. been doing this for 15 years . is going well, no sentiment to change back. have 4 commissioners from each Presbytery (East Toronto now sends more Presbyters than prior to commissioned Synod). commissioners named by June. commissioners report to their Presbyteries as they do for Gen Assembly. challenge – on significant issues (like \$\$) commissioners reluctant to bind their Presbytery meaning such issues need advance notice and discussion at Presbytery level.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">. been doing this for 5 years . To understand the answer you need to understand that the Synod of MNWO has no camp and no Synod staff. So we have no people that need day to day or even month to month managing, paying, etc. Since we have no staff, the Regional Resourcing funds provided by the LMA are available to fund projects across the Synod. We have developed a way of sharing those funds equitably. But since we are a commissioned Synod with 6 commissioners -- the Synod meets by e-mail meeting -- and occasionally by conference call to manage the distribution of the grants. Since it is meeting as Synod in these times it is a very transparent process. This has been an unexpected advantage. The Synod of MNWO will meet tomorrow for its regular meeting -- it will meet by conference call and it will do its business in about 90 minutes - -maybe a touch less. We have lost the collegiality of meeting together. We have tried to compensate for that loss by every 2 years holding a Synod Conference. Last years conference went quite well, drew reasonably well. The 2015 conference was a disaster with terrible attendance. This has been a loss that we regret -- but we are not going back to the old model. . The BoF says that the formula has to be a percentage -- so it can't be each Presbytery gets 2 minister and 2 elders. It has to be 1 of every 8 (as an example.) So we set the ratio as 1 in 20 which means every Presbytery gets one minister and one elder . It has further centralized the power of the Synod and the work of the Synod in the hands of the clerk. I have become in many ways the Synod -- in a larger context like SWO that might not happen.
--	---

Would be the cost of a commissioned Synod be lower? Yes

- . costs would be lower and thus Presbytery Synod dues would be less
- . travel for "x" commissioners and only one noon meal instead of 2, (evening and noon)
- . all the business could be done in one morning
- . no hotel accommodation costs

Steps to be taken

- . Synod Executive agrees that the Synod of Southwestern Ontario become a commissioned Court. (Synod can make this transition at its own initiative Bof F 260).
- . Notice of proposal, with recommendations, to move to commissioned Synod sent to Presbyteries early September for discussion at the September meetings of Presbytery. The proposal will recommend a ratio of ministers and diaconal ministers on the constituent roll + equal number of elders. The ratio must be adopted by 75% of those at the Synod meeting (BofF 260)
- . Report with recommendations brought to Synod in the first sitting by notice of motion recommending the Synod transition to a commissioned Synod.
- . At a later sitting the notice of motion is then made, discussed and voted on
- . If the recommendation is adopted a letter announcing the transition is sent to the General Assembly office for information. (This transition does not require the approval of General Assembly. Assembly only approves, the name, bounds and constituent presbyteries of each Synod. The Assembly also has the power to dissolve a Synod upon request of the Synod (BofF 259ff)

Moved by McLennan and Bablitz that the proposal be approved and presented to Synod for adoption. CARRIED. It was agreed to send it to Presbyteries ahead of time for their perusal.

- 4. Motion (Notice of motion first) to adopt the proposal to move to a commissioned Synod for the 2018 meeting and that each of the Synod's eight Presbyteries commission 2 ministers and 2 elders to attend.**
- 5. Motion that the Synod Executive present a revised Standing Orders to the 2018 meeting of Synod to reflect this change.**