

1 ASSEMBLY ON MISSION

2 Eighth Meeting

3 July 31, 2002

4

5

## MINUTES

6

7 Brother Jonathan Cord, Moderator, called the eighth meeting of the District of  
8 San Francisco Assembly on Mission to order at 1:16 p.m. The roll was taken by  
9 the Tellers. Brother George, General Secretary, reported the following delegates  
10 absent: James Borrelli, Brother Harry Morgan and Brother Thomas Zoppo.

11 Brother George noted that James Borrelli was also absent from the morning  
12 session.

13

14 The Moderator invited Brother David Brennan to lead the opening prayer.

15

16 The minutes of the fifth meeting of the General Assembly were presented for  
17 approval, as corrected at the seventh meeting.

18

19 There being no further corrections, upon motion made by Brother Dominic  
20 Berardelli, second by Brother Ronald Roggenback, the minutes of the fifth  
21 meeting were unanimously approved as corrected.

22

23 The Moderator opened the floor for questions of clarification on Report # 1 from  
24 the Governance, Leadership and the Structure of Educational Works Committee.

- 25 • Line 8-9. Concern about how the District might be involved in the  
26 formation of individual's spiritual development. Response was that the  
27 leadership on school campuses need ideas and suggestions on ways to  
28 provide prayer opportunities.

29

30 Proposition # 3 from the Service of the Poor Committee was read by the General  
31 Secretary for consideration. The floor was opened for debate.

32

33 A motion was made by Mike Trafecanty to amend the proposition beginning with  
34 line 11-12 by changing the words to read "encourage the Brothers and Partners  
35 to create special local initiatives of direct..." The motion was seconded by  
36 Brother Thomas Jones.

37

38 Debate on the amendment followed. The Moderator called for the vote.

39

40 In favor: 57      Opposed: 51      Abstaining: 9      The amendment passed.

41

42 The Moderator reminded the Delegates that an abstention is not a vote. Only  
43 yes or no are counted.

44

45 The debate was opened on the proposition as amended. The following issues  
46 were brought before the floor:

- 47 • Concern that the proposition contradicts Proposition # 3 of the  
48 Stewardship Committee. If they are in opposition they negate each other.  
49 The Moderator noted that each proposition is taken on its own merits. The  
50 Stewardship Proposition #3 uses the word “priority.” All that this one  
51 states is that current works will not be put at risk by any new works.

52

53 Brother John Montgomery called the question. Brother Norman Cook seconded.  
54 There was no objection. The vote was taken.

55

56 **BE IT RESOLVED** that Brother Visitor, in collaboration with the District  
57 Leadership and District Council, encourage Brothers and Partners to  
58 create special local initiatives of direct educational service to the poor and  
59 marginalized. Such encouragement may include, but are not limited to the  
60 following: a) the awarding of grants and/or matching funds for proposed  
61 programs and projects and b) the providing to Brothers and Partners with  
62 the time and resources to investigate unmet educational needs in the local  
63 community and to determine the viability of proposals to meet those  
64 needs.

65 **BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED** that priority be given to projects which can  
66 demonstrate that they will network with existing Lasallian institutions or  
67 programs.

68

69 In favor: 103    Opposed: 5    Abstaining: 8    The proposition passed.

70

71 Proposition # 1 from the Governance, Leadership and the Structure of  
72 Educational Works Committee was read for consideration. The floor was opened  
73 for debate.

74

75 A motion was made by Rick Sprague to amend the proposition beginning with  
76 line 13 by striking “when appropriate.” The motion was seconded by Brother  
77 John Montgomery.

78

79 Debate on the amendment followed. The Moderator moved to vote. A vote on  
80 the amendment was called for. The amendment carried with a voice vote.

81

82 There was no further discussion on the proposition as amended. The Moderator  
83 called for the vote.

84

85 **BE IT RESOLVED** that the District Leadership Team and the District Council  
86        assess the effectiveness of the current composition and operating  
87        practices of LEC and implement appropriate changes to its composition  
88        and operating practices; and

89

90 **BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED** that the District Leadership Team collaborate with  
91 the Secondary School Administrators' Association and the Association of  
92 Board Chairs to communicate the results of this LEC assessment to  
93 boards, faculties, and school communities.

94

95 In favor: 109    Opposed: 5    Abstaining: 4    The proposition passed.

96

97 Proposition # 1 from the Stewardship Committee was read for consideration. The  
98 floor was opened for debate. The following issues were brought forward:

- 99     • Clarification was requested regarding how the District Leadership Team  
100        would assist with fundraising.
- 101     • Concern was voiced regarding the word "young" because we are also  
102        serving adult learners.
- 103     • Concern was voiced regarding the use of "priority". It should be the  
104        responsibility of each institution's President to generate funds.
- 105     • The schools need to be able to generate dollars to fulfill the mission.  
106        There needs to be the same amount of emphasis on fundraising in order  
107        to fulfill the mission.
- 108     • We need to raise money but are constrained by the lack of expertise. The  
109        intent is to make the schools more self-reliant in their fundraising efforts  
110        and establishing endowments.

111

112

113 A motion was made by Rick Sprague to amend the proposition beginning with  
114 line 13 to read "...to become more skilled in the art and science of fundraising  
115 and development to generate the substantial funds..." The motion was seconded  
116 by Mike Trafecanty.

117

118 There was no debate on the amendment. The Moderator moved to the vote.

119 The amendment carried with a voice vote.

120

121 The debate was opened on the proposition in full as amended. The following  
122 issues were brought before the floor:

- 123 • With the 5% program that currently exists some institutions are struggling.  
124 If they had assistance to be more skilled in fundraising they would be  
125 more successful.
- 126 • The intent of the proposition is not to take pressure off the Presidents'  
127 fundraising responsibility.

128

129 Mr. Richard Gray called the question. Brother Lawrence Haley seconded. There  
130 was no objection. The vote was taken.

131

132 **BE IT RESOLVED** that greater priority be given by the District Leadership Team  
133 to assist local educational institutions to become more skilled in the art  
134 and science of fund raising and development to generate the substantial

135 funds necessary to further the mission of providing a “human and  
136 Christian education to the young, especially the poor.”

137

138 In favor: 82    Opposed: 27    Abstaining: 6    The proposition passed.

139

140 Proposition # 4 from the Stewardship Committee was read for consideration. The  
141 floor was opened for debate. The following issues were brought forward:

- 142     • Chapter Act 187 does apply to Saint Mary’s College and Saint Mary’s  
143       College meets and exceeds the 5%. Appendix 6 of the Response to the  
144       Context for Action/Action Plan lists the percentage of students from Saint  
145       Mary’s College below the federal poverty level as being at 12.8%.
- 146     • The proposition gives the local schools the freedom to not offer all the  
147       students in the 5% category full tuition so that they could help other  
148       students who may require financial aid, as long as the school  
149       accomplishes the 5% policy.
- 150     • There is value in that the proposition gives schools more flexibility with  
151       regard to gratuity.
- 152     • It is not healthy to grant full tuition, however small a family’s contribution  
153       may be. By paying something it brings family involvement into the school  
154       and helps raise funds.
- 155     • No one should interpret the first part of the resolution as freeing the money  
156       to be used for other purposes. Any monies not being used for the 5%  
157       program would still go to financial aid.

158       • Concern with the Be It Further Resolved that if there is not enough money  
159           for both the 5% program and financial aid how could we continue both?  
160           The 5% program is to get students at or below the poverty level into the  
161           schools. If these students can contribute, then there will be financial aid  
162           available for other students. Schools could choose to have families in the  
163           5% program pay or not.

164       • Gratuity is a value of the De La Salle Christian Brothers. This appears to  
165           move away from that.

166

167 Mr. Gary Cannon called the question. Brother Ronald Roggenback seconded.

168 There was no objection. The vote was taken.

169

170 **BE IT RESOLVED** that the schools maintain or exceed 5% enrollment of  
171           students at the federal poverty level, with minor adjustment, while allowing  
172           the schools to determine the level of allocation of funds necessary to meet  
173           the varying student needs; and

174

175 **BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED** that the schools continue to maintain or exceed  
176           their current financial aid funding.

177

178 In favor: 96    Opposed: 17    Abstaining: 4    The proposition passed.

179

180

181 In response to the Orders of the Day, Richard Gray noted that Proposition #1 of  
182 the Religious Studies, Campus Ministry and Vocations Committee had been  
183 withdrawn and had been submitted as a report for endorsement.

184

185 Proposition # 1 from the Education of Students from Diverse Economic and  
186 Social Backgrounds Committee was read for consideration. The floor was  
187 opened for debate. The following issues were brought forward:

- 188 • Line 18 – Delete the word “on”.
- 189 • Line 13 –The intent of the language regarding “ ongoing communications”  
190 was that structure is important as it will be different from place to place.
- 191 • In the three Be It Resolves there seems to be no consideration of Policy  
192 Governance. Boards usually set the policy but they are not considered.  
193 Response: It was difficult to craft language that was all-encompassing  
194 since all schools are not covered by the Policy Governance model.
- 195 • Question: How do we resolve the call for diversity when we give  
196 preference to Catholics? Response: The fundamental mission is a call to  
197 service of the poor.
- 198 • The two parts that the committee was trying to emphasize were: 1)  
199 Promote ongoing communication at various levels and; 2) Be sure  
200 decisions made are assessed against a standard of diversity and that  
201 diversity is looked at in all decisions that are made and the impact it has  
202 on the schools.

203

204 • The proposition mandates a process or way of looking at diversity. It sets  
205 up a condition whereby the Principal of Subsidiarity with regard to the  
206 Boards is violated. Boards take responsibility to discuss the issue as it  
207 applies to itself and hold the president accountable for its policy.

208

209 Mr. Richard Gray moved to recommit the proposition. Brother Dan Morgan  
210 seconded. Debate followed.

211 Mr. Greg Kopra called the question. Brother Lawrence Haley seconded. A vote  
212 was taken.

213

214 In favor: 41    Opposed: 75    Abstaining: 1    The motion failed.

215

216 Debate was reopened on the Proposition in full.

217 • Lines 20-22 add another level of reporting that is not necessary. Did the  
218 committee talk about how the CEOs would assess this? Response: The  
219 committee is trying to establish the role and responsibility of boards for  
220 mission and encourage presidents and boards to work together. It was  
221 not the intent of the committee to create another assessment.

222 • How have these issues been covered elsewhere? Response: It is simply  
223 continued study and dialogue. In light of Gery Short's presentation it is  
224 our mission to educate the poor and the poor are pushing us to address  
225 questions of diversity.

226

- 227 • There are two boards who have addressed diversity. One has a definitive  
228 policy for diversity and another has done an inclusivity study in order to  
229 help build the school.
- 230 • The proposition is more than a continuing dialogue. It tells the Boards of  
231 Trustees what to do. It is important to respect the authority of the boards  
232 at the local level to make their own policy and to make CEOs accountable.

233

234 Mr. Gery Short called the question. Brother Ronald Roggenback seconded.

235 There was no objection. The vote was taken.

236

237 **BE IT RESOLVED** that administrators in the educational works of the District  
238 continue and advance efforts that result in increased accessibility to the  
239 poor; and

240

241 **BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED** that administrators in the educational works of the  
242 District structure opportunities for ongoing communication to raise  
243 awareness at all levels of the school community of the implications of  
244 growing diversity; and

245

246 **BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED** that administrators in the educational works of the  
247 District consider and assess the impact of their decisions on diversity and  
248 the impact of diversity on their decisions in the areas of administrative  
249 policy, teacher formation and the conduct of activities; and

250 **BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED** that the chief executive officer present to the  
251 board an annual report that assesses how the above resolutions have been  
252 implemented.

253

254 In favor: 54    Opposed: 54    Abstaining: 10    The proposition failed.

255

256 The Moderator proposed to adjourn earlier than the Orders of the Day stipulate  
257 so that the next proposition could be discussed without a break. The next  
258 meeting was scheduled for 3:25 p.m.

259

260 The meeting adjourned at 2:55 p.m.