

2/8/55

POTENTIALS AND PITFALLS

dollars and sense in extension

By a vote of the Extension Committee at its October, 1954 meeting, the Extension Department was instructed to prepare a budget for the fiscal years, 1955-56 and 1956-57. To determine the number of Fellowships that (with a little encouragement) could attain church status in 1955-56 and in 1956-57, a memo was sent to the Regional Directors and to the most promising Fellowships. Upon the basis of these replies, one Fellowship has stated it definitely will attain church status by April 30, 1955, and several others indicated that they may do so in the fiscal year. As for 1956-57, ten or a dozen, from the information received, will meet the minimum requirements by April 30, 1957. It is my considered opinion that, beginning with the fiscal year 1956-57, an average of six new churches could grow out of Fellowships each and every year from that date on, if the Fellowship Office were free to encourage them and if the Extension Department could be assured of a budget large enough to provide them financial aid. This is our potential. Yet this would also mean a continuing increase in new money (\$3,000 per church) each and every year. (There would be adjustments from year to year as subsidy is reduced.)

Extension, most will agree, is one of the more dramatic talking points used by the U.U.A., the A.U.A. and its member societies to raise the Appeal goal. Practically every Unitarian is willing to contribute to the founding of new churches, the organizing of new Fellowships, in spreading our liberal gospel wherever we can and off taking advantage of our tremendous opportunities. But this can also lead to a pitfall.

Last year eight new churches were organized, seven from Fellowships. In this the Association took great pride. Yet only two were included in the regular Extension budget. Only two, it appears, can be assisted this year and one is a hold-over from last year. This means one new church in the 1955-56 fiscal year. If Unitarians throughout the continent are urged to contribute for, among other things, Unitarian growth, and yet the Extension Department is unable to take advantage of its opportunities, the Appeal publicity pertaining to Extension will sooner or later backfire. The following figures may interest you:

1954-55 A.U.A. Budget - \$325,604	{	Dividends - \$193,740	or	60%
		U.U.A. - 83,167	or	25%
		Unrestricted		
		Capital - 48,697	or	15%

The A.U.A. share of the total raised by the U.U.A. was 34%

Extension Budget - \$69,780.77 or 21.5% of A.U.A. Budget

Extension Budget from Appeal - \$17,880 or 7 $\frac{1}{2}$ % of total Appeal

To increase Extension Budget by \$10,000 in one year, using the above percentages, the formula would be:

$$\frac{17,880}{246,000} = \frac{10,000}{X} \quad \text{Thus } X = \$137,585$$

It therefore would be necessary for the Appeal to receive \$137,585 more than last year's attained goal of \$246,000 for Extension to receive an additional \$10,000. This would suggest an attained Appeal goal of \$383,585, if the A.U.A. were to receive 34% of the total raised, and if the Extension Department were to receive 21 $\frac{1}{2}$ % of the A.U.A. Total Budget, assuming other income of the A.U.A. remains the same.

\$10,000 would provide subsidy for only three new churches.

Based on the Appeal trend of the past three years, the Appeal will receive \$290,000 this fiscal year or \$79,000 short of the goal and \$114,585 short of the amount necessary to increase the Extension Budget by \$10,000. However, it may well exceed the amount indicated by the trend, but the most optimistic of us doubt if it will exceed its goal.

It appears obvious, regardless as to whether the full Appeal goal is reached this year or not, under the present allocation of funds, the Extension Department cannot expect to have a budget adequate to reach its apparent opportunities. This leaves us with the following alternatives:

1) Limit the number of new churches to two or three each year. This would mean that ambitious Fellowships could not be encouraged to work toward church status with any assurance that the Association would assist financially.

2) Insist that the new church assume all (or a much larger part) of its budgetary expense. This is not impossible; Marin County raised a budget of \$9200 and asked for no subsidy; I am informed that the average church contribution per member in the Southwest Conference exceeds \$100 per contributor. Can we not and should we not expect the same average from new and thus inspired churches? A hundred dollar average contribution is only high when the church members get in the habit of averaging fifty dollars. Unitarians can be educated to the value of church giving. But it is much easier when they start at the beginning of their church life.

3) Further encourage the development of the Greater Washington Metropolitan Area type program, in which the cathedral church organizes and helps support new churches. The Greater Philadelphia program is now helping the Delaware County Fellowship. Could not this be carried further with, as an example, the Southwest churches taking Little Rock under their wing and helping the Fellowship in this important Southwestern city attain churchhood and also cushioning financially the first few years of its existence? (Such a program would of course necessitate consideration by the Appeal Office, and some agreement being reached.)

The Fellowship Office, though wishing to give the "green light", is in the position where it must delay, discourage or, say, "No" to Fellowships which could achieve church status with A.U.A. subsidy. It may interest you to know that the appropriation for the Fellowship program is today exactly \$2300, or \$50 more than it was in 1949; there were then 22 Fellowships - there are now 152. New Fellowships are being organized and old ones being served, but not as fast nor as well as could be done.

Extension will continue, but at about half-speed ahead. The time is ripe, it seems to me, to consider fully our opportunities and to explore all avenues for realizing them.

M. H.

DEPARTMENT OF UNITARIAN EXTENSION
AND CHURCH MAINTENANCE

MINUTES

February 8, 1955

A meeting of the Extension and Fellowships Committee, together with department staff and Regional Directors, was held at 25 Beacon St., Boston, on Tuesday, February 8, 1955, at 9:30 a.m. There were present: Mr. Jenkins, Chairman; Messrs. Abell, Brill, Cahill, Campbell, DeWitt, Foote, Gartner, Gibbs, Hilton, Husbands, Killam, Johnson, Luther, Miller, Pullman, Ricker, Schramm, Schug, Sinclair and Smith; Mrs. Wudge, Mrs. Pieksen and Miss Chace, Secretary.

The minutes of the last meeting, October 5, 1954, were declared approved as written.

Department Budget. Copies of a proposed budget for 1955-56 were passed out by Mr. Gibbs. This budget totalled \$79,005 - about \$10,000 more than that of the current year. Mr. Gibbs pointed out that aid for two new churches had been included at \$3500 each. Park Forest, Illinois is expected to be one of these new churches and Birmingham, Michigan (already affiliated as a church but not receiving aid), the other. Mr. Gibbs stated that the budget had been approved in principle by the Budget Committee.

After a brief discussion, on motion by Mr. Campbell, duly seconded, it was

VOTED: To approve the proposed Extension Department budget for 1955-56, subject to possible further revision when it is known what funds will be available.

Mr. Gibbs also passed out copies of an estimated budget for 1956-57, totalling \$91,905. In addition to the usual items, this included aid for six new churches at \$3,000 each. During the discussion of this budget the amount listed under "Grants to Churches" was revised upwards by \$5,000.

On motion by Mrs. Pieksen, duly seconded, it was

VOTED: To request a total Extension Department budget for 1956-57 of \$96,905.

Mr. Husbands gave a report on "Potentials and Pitfalls" in Unitarian Extension. He stated that at least six Fellowships could reach church status each year, if the Department were free to encourage them - i.e., to promise financial aid. Based upon the present proportion of Appeal funds allocated to Extension, the Appeal would have to raise \$137,585 more this year than last, in order to provide an additional \$10,000 for three new churches - only half of our potential. If this amount is not forthcoming, Mr. Husbands suggested that the Committee consider one of the following alternatives: (1) limit the number of new churches to two or three a year; (2) urge new churches to assume all or a much larger share of their budgetary expenses; (3) encourage Metropolitan Area Committees to assume greater responsibility for starting new churches.

Mr. Campbell passed out copies of a series of charts showing aid given to new churches organized from Fellowships since 1951 and projected, according to present rate of growth, into 1957. Twelve new churches are now receiving \$29,000 in aid. Mr. Campbell's charts indicated that the number of Fellowships able to

Feb. 8, 1955

- 2 -

reach church status was increasing rapidly - as many as 10 in 1956 and 19 in 1957. The total amount of aid to assist these new churches and those already on the aided list would be \$105,900. Even if the Department should limit aid to three new churches each year, Mr. Campbell stated that a total of \$39,000 would be needed for this purpose by 1957.

A large portion of the meeting was spent in discussing the problems presented by financial limitations. Mr. Jenkins asked whether any of the churches now receiving aid might be able to become self-supporting sooner than was originally planned. Dr. Ricker and Dr. Killam felt that this might be true of some of the societies in their areas. Dr. Ricker suggested that \$3500 be approved as the maximum amount of aid to a new church, but that a lower figure be set whenever it seemed reasonable to do so. Dr. Killam felt that \$3,500 aid, decreased by 20% over a five year period, might be more helpful than a smaller amount reduced over a ten year period.

The question of raising the number of families necessary for church status was also brought up. However, Mr. Husbands replied experience has shown that larger Fellowships tend to fall apart without professional leadership.

Mr. Jenkins suggested that the various conferences should be encouraged to appoint Associate Regional Directors to work with Fellowships, as has been done in the Southwest. Mr. Husbands agreed that this might prove better than securing a full-time field worker on the A.U.A. staff.

On motion by Mr. Luther, duly seconded, it was

VOTED: That a small committee be appointed to work with the department staff in evaluating the experience of the past with new churches and studying the whole policy of aid.

Mr. DeWitt suggested that this committee study the nature of communities in which new churches have been located, as compared with their rate of growth. Dr. Miller urged that a correlation between the amount of subsidy received and the success of a church be undertaken.

Appreciation was expressed to Mr. Campbell for his graphic presentation of Extension needs. On motion by Mrs. Pieksen, duly seconded, it was

VOTED: To request the United Unitarian Appeal, in consultation with Francis Campbell, to dramatize this situation in the best possible means.

St. Joseph, Mo. Fund. Mrs. Pieksen reaffirmed the desire of the St. Louis Church to receive the income from the St. Joseph Fund during the next fiscal year. As she had reported at the October Committee meeting, the church would like to use this income (approximately \$900) for a series of newspaper ads in the state of Missouri. She also mentioned that St. Louis is considering a capital fund drive in order to start a new church within the county; these plans are still uncertain, however.

Mr. Husbands asked whether St. Louis could not raise the amount necessary for advertising from its own resources; in his opinion the St. Joseph Fund was needed and would be more appropriately used for the organization of new churches. On motion by Mrs. Pieksen, duly seconded, it was

VOTED: That this matter be deferred for action until the department meeting in May, at which time the need for funds will be better known.

On motion by Mr. Abell, duly seconded, it was

VOTED: That a statement of other opportunities for extension within the state of Missouri be prepared for consideration at the May Meeting.

Springfield, Mass. Mr. Smith stated that Unity Church in Springfield (Unitarian-Universalist) is enthusiastic about starting a new congregation in "Sixteen Acres." This is a rapidly growing, largely unchurched section in the southeastern part of the city. According to present policy, the Extension Department suggests that administrative relationships of any new church or Fellowship be centered in either the Unitarian or Universalist continental body, but not in both. However, Mr. Smith felt that an exception might be warranted in this instance. Since he did not believe that a decision must be made immediately, on motion by Mr. Abell, duly seconded, it was

VOTED: To encourage Unity Church of Springfield and Frank Smith to continue to explore this matter and bring in further suggestions.

Stoneham, Mass. Mr. Smith stated that he had three requests for aid resulting from emergencies within New England churches. The first of these was at Stoneham. The minister has resigned, but the church has agreed to pay his salary through March 1st, in addition to providing fees for guest speakers. Thus the society is under a financial handicap. It was Mr. Smith's recommendation that subsidy for Stoneham continue at the same rate for one more year, without the scheduled reduction.

Woburn, Mass. The Woburn church has operated with a part-time minister for about 15 years and is now anxious to have a full-time man. New developments within the town of Woburn seem to indicate additional church growth. The society could take care of all operating expenses plus \$3500 towards the minister's salary. Therefore, Mr. Smith recommended that \$2,000 in aid be granted to Woburn for one year, and that if satisfactory progress is made, that this support be continued for two years thereafter.

New Haven, Conn. This church has lost a number of members, following the resignation of its first minister. Mr. Smith felt that there was an excellent opportunity for Unitarianism in New Haven, but that a salary of \$6,500 or \$7,000 would be necessary to secure the right man. In order to make this possible, he recommended an increase in aid of \$2,075 to the New Haven church. Mr. Smith also suggested that income from the Holyoke Fund be considered for this purpose.

On motion by Mr. Abell, duly seconded, it was

VOTED: That the Department investigate income from special funds as a means of finding an additional \$4,625 for extension purposes: \$550 for Stoneham, \$2,000 for Woburn, and \$2,075 for New Haven.

Lisle, Illinois. Mr. Hilton reported that the Unitarian minister who has been serving the Congregational church in Lisle recently resigned, while many of the members of the church withdrew at the same time. Together they hope to start a Unitarian Fellowship. This is a rapidly growing area with a population close to 100,000, and Mr. Hilton felt that within two years a strong church could result. He recommended that \$4,100 in aid be granted to Lisle and applied towards the salary of the minister, Rev. Eugene Kreves. Mr. Kreves would then serve in the same manner as a Minister-at-Large, making every effort to help the group reach church status.