

# The Council for the Development of Ministry

## CONTENTS

|   |     |
|---|-----|
| <b>Members</b> .....  | 183 |
| <b>Report</b>   |     |
| Foreword .....  | 184 |
| Goals and objectives .....  | 185 |
| Structure .....   | 185 |
| Committee Reports   |     |
| Ongoing study of the diaconate ministry .....                       | 186 |
| Second National Consultation on the Use of Title III, Canon 8 ..... | 186 |
| Seminararians intending lay vocations .....                         | 188 |
| Committee on Undersupply .....                                      | 189 |
| Committee on Diversity and Interdependence in Ministry .....        | 190 |
| Accountabilities of nonparochial clergy .....                       | 190 |
| Resources for clergy spouses .....                                  | 192 |
| “Towards a Theology of Priesthood”: Trinity Institute .....         | 193 |
| Institutional chaplains .....                                       | 194 |
| Report and resolutions from Committee on Canons .....               | 194 |
| Provincial and regional conferences .....                           | 199 |
| CDM review .....  | 201 |
| Preparation for new challenges .....                                | 201 |
| Resolution .....  | 202 |

## MEMBERS

### Agency Board Representatives

- The Rt. Rev. Jackson E. Gilliam, *Chairperson*, CDM; House of Bishops Committee on Pastoral Development.\*
- Mrs. Dixie Hutchinson, Standing Committee of Education for Mission and Ministry of the Executive Council representing Lay Ministry.
- The Rev. Charles H. Long, Jr., Board for Theological Education.\*
- The Rev. James L. Lowery, Church Deployment Office.
- The Very Rev. Richard Mansfield, Council of Seminary Deans.
- The Rev. Craig W. Casey, The Church Pension Fund.
- The Rt. Rev. Robert C. Witcher, House of Bishops Committee on Ministry.

### Provincial Representatives

- Mrs. Nancy BonSignor, Province I.
- The Rev. Lloyd Uyeki, Province II.
- The Rev. Lawrence Handwerk, Province III.\*
- The Rev. Canon Robert G. Tharp, Province IV.
- The Very Rev. Roger White, Province V.
- Mrs. Eleanor Robinson, Province VI.
- The Rt. Rev. John Ashby, Province VII.
- The Rev. John Keester, Province VIII.\*
- The Rev. Ashton Jacinto Brooks, Province IX.

### Members-at-Large

The Rev. Susan D. Buell, St. Francis Episcopal Church, Houston.  
The Rt. Rev. Wesley Frensdorff, Diocese of Nevada.  
The Rev. Harold T. Lewis, St. Monica's, Washington, D.C.  
Ms. Flower Ross, R/W Associates, New Orleans.  
Dr. Timothy Sedgwick, Seabury-Western Seminary, Evanston, Illinois.\*  
Dr. Mary Frances Wagley, Episcopal Social Services, Diocese of Maryland.

### Staff

The Rev. Fred Howard, Coordinator, Education for Mission and Ministry.  
Mr. D. Barry Menez, Field Officer, Council for the Development of Ministry.\*  
The Rev. Roddey Reid, Jr., Executive Director, Board for Church Deployment.  
The Rt. Rev. David E. Richards, Director, House of Bishops Committee on Pastoral Development.  
The Rt. Rev. Elliott L. Sorge, Executive, Education for Mission and Ministry.  
Dr. Fredrica H. Thompsett, Executive Director, Board for Theological Education.  
Mr. William Thompson, Associate Director, Board for Church Deployment.

### FOREWORD

As the report of the 1979 General Convention stated, the Council for the Development of Ministry has moved away from its original emphasis, coordinating ministry-serving agencies of the Church, towards assisting and supporting the development of ministry, both lay and ordained. "Perhaps what is most notable to the Council is the shift that is taking place, from maintenance concerns on the part of the Church and in the Council, to recapturing a sense of mission and subsequently the development of Total Ministry to further that mission" (*1979 Journal of the General Convention*, p. 105).

Although much effort is spent in the CDM to develop communication and accountability within the Church, the issue central to the work of the Council itself, and to the eleven provincial meetings sponsored by the CDM since 1979, is that of mission. The development of resources for ministry depends upon a clear understanding of mission. In one sense the Council is the Socratic midwife; we seek to enable the Church in its discovery of mission. The first task, however, necessitates a second. Under the direction of the General Convention and the Executive Council, we identify and address what we believe to be central issues and concerns for the Church today.

Uniting the particular issues raised in this report is the primary concern for the Church's mission in the world. Too often the proclamation of God's reconciling love in and through Christ has been directed within the Church; too often the Church has failed to fulfill its call to be a servant, interpreting the needs, concerns, and hopes of the world and responding in order to witness to Christ and his redemptive love for all people.

The outstanding issue for the CDM that focuses this concern is that of development of ministry. The call to ministry, both lay and ordained, cannot be individualized with the Church acting as imprimatur. Rather the Church needs to discern the needs of the world and the gifts of its people in order for it to enable Christ's ministry to the world. Specifically, the Church must identify and develop for ministry those who can provide leadership and witness, especially in the Asian, Black, Hispanic, native American, "small-church," and urban communities. This raises particular questions about preparation for ministry and the supporting and nonsupporting structures of the Church.

---

\*Executive Committee Members

Only in addressing these questions can the Church enable the ministry, which will be both a prophetic voice and a servant that bears witness to Christ.

### GOALS AND OBJECTIVES

The overall goal of the Council for the Development of Ministry, adopted at the 1976 General Convention, is:

*To create a structure and provide services in order that the Episcopal Church, at all levels of its organization, will better recognize current ministry development needs, and opportunities, and better utilize resources for meeting them.*

In order to work toward this goal, the Council for the Development of Ministry has pursued four primary objectives:

1. Organize and activate a Council for the development of professional ministry to serve in an advisory and supportive capacity in relationship to the Office of the Executive for Ministries.
2. Provide a national instrumentality for serving the Church as a whole in the regular delivery of services, information, and knowledge of resources to the various levels of organization, and to local regional agencies which function in the field of ministry and development.
3. Establish a method for linking ministry-serving agencies in an operative network for the giving and receiving of assistance, encouragement and support.
4. Establish criteria for judging whether or not the above objectives are being realized.

### STRUCTURE

The Council for the Development of Ministry, as constituted by the 1979 General Convention, has three categories of voting membership, totaling 22 persons: 7 agency representatives, 9 provincial representatives, and 6 members-at-large. In addition, the agency representatives are entitled to send to each meeting staff persons who sit with voice but no vote.

There is a five-member Executive Committee, chaired by the President of the Council for the Development of Ministry, which includes representatives from each membership category, and the Field Officer.

During the past triennium, the CDM met twice yearly for three days per meeting. Various committees met at other times as necessary; the reports of those committees are summarized here.

The budget for the Council is part of the Program Budget of the Executive Council, Education for Mission and Ministry Unit.

The Field Officer of CDM also serves as the Deputy to the Executive, Education for Mission and Ministry, and is accountable to that Executive for the responsibilities of both posts.

Agency representatives on the CDM are appointed by the various agencies. Provincial presidents nominate three candidates for each provincial representative vacancy and the CDM elects one for each province. Members-at-large are elected directly by the voting membership of the CDM from nominations submitted by any member of the Episcopal Church. Each year, at the end of their three-year terms, three provincial representatives and two members-at-large leave the Council.

## COMMITTEE REPORTS

Preparation of reports by committees of the CDM is an important part of the work of the Council. The reports, after approval by the Council, are distributed throughout the Church. *Copies of the reports are available through the CDM office.*

### **On-going Study of the Diaconate Ministry**

The 1979 General Convention of the Episcopal Church directed the Council for the Development of Ministry to undertake a serious study of the diaconal nature of the Church as that nature is expressed both in Holy Orders and by the Laity. This directive was in response to a report on the diaconate prepared by CDM and submitted to the House of Bishops and General Convention. The title of that report was "The Church, the Diaconate, the Future."

In May 1980, the first CDM consultation on the diaconate was convened. Clergy and laity from 30 dioceses came together to look at the issues of recruitment, training, supervision, mobility, and relationships involved in developing and supporting ordained diaconal ministry. The reports of the 1979 and the 1980 consultations are available through the CDM office.

As a further step, CDM undertook an evaluation project, to run three to four years; it will work with selected dioceses significantly involved in diaconate training and deployment programs. Findings from this study will be shared with the larger church. Dioceses in the project are: Hawaii, Spokane, Nevada, California, Pittsburgh, Michigan, Albany, Central Florida, and Southwestern Virginia. Southwestern Virginia has a servant ministry training program that is designed to equal the standards of other diaconate training programs, but does not lead to ordination. This diocesan effort is included to provide a contrast and comparison with those programs leading to ordination.

Dr. Adair Lummis, of the Hartford Seminary Foundation, has been contracted by the CDM to provide professional research services for this study. Dr. Lummis works with a liaison person from each participating diocese. These representatives, with Dr. Lummis and the CDM Field Officer, constitute the research committee.

The study will monitor the recruitment, education, training, deployment, and accountability of deacons within the participating dioceses. Data will be collected on deacons now in training but not yet ordained, and on those who have been ordained for varying periods of time. An effort will be made to indicate how the development of support of this form of ministry influences the understanding of total ministry within a diocese, and the relationships between priests, deacons, laity, and bishops.

The final report is to be prepared for presentation to the 1985 General Convention. It is fully expected that this report will enable each diocese to answer the developmental questions it has about diaconate ministry and to assess what place it would have in the total ministry system.

### **Second National Consultation on the Use of Title III, Canon 8**

Title III, Canon 8, entitled "On Admission to Holy Orders in Special Cases," provides an alternative route to ordained ministry in specified situations. The Second National Consultation on its use was held in Tempe, Arizona, on February 18-20, 1982. At the meeting it was learned that presently there are at least 90 priests and deacons who have been ordained under Canon 8, and at least 45 more people who are in training, within a total of 27 dioceses.

Canon 8 is for use in "communities which are small, isolated, remote, or distinct in respect of ethnic composition, language, or culture, and which can be supplied only intermittently with the sacramental and pastoral ministrations of the Church" (Sec. 2(a)). Growing numbers of congregations are finding themselves unable to pay the salary of a full-time priest and are turning to alternative models of ministry. Although the original impetus for the use of Canon 8 in many areas was economic, we have discovered the theological and missiological riches of this Canon, when used within the context of a "total ministry" understanding of the Church.

The priest is not the one who carries out the work of the Church; the entire congregation is engaged in service, both in the Church and in the world. The Church is called to be a ministering community, not a community gathered around a minister. Each member of the congregation has certain gifts and abilities, which need to be recognized, released, and developed. The mission of the Church is carried out by all baptized Christians.

As members of the congregation become aware of their gifts and are encouraged to practice them, it may be recognized that some person or persons among them should be selected to be a priest, so that they might have access to the sacraments on a regular basis. The candidate should be chosen and raised up by the congregation. The bishop is to "seek out" (Sec. 2(a)) such candidates.

We are coming to recognize the significance of Canon 8 as part of a comprehensive diocesan strategy for mission. We are learning, with the aid of the Church in other parts of the world, the importance of indigenous leadership. We are recovering a more holistic and biblical pattern of Church leadership (cf. *Acts 14:23*).

Title III, Canon 8 calls for candidates to be mature, active within the Church, and living lives in the world characterized by Christian values. Since stability is an important factor, the candidate ought to have firm roots in the community and have no intention of moving his or her residence in the foreseeable future. We are just beginning to face the issue of a second generation of Canon 8 clergy.

Training programs vary in the different dioceses and in different situations. We feel that it is important to maintain this flexibility. The educational background of the candidate, and the situation in which the candidate will be ministering, will be determining factors in devising a program of theological education. Academic credentials should not be stressed, but rather competency to perform the sacramental ministry in a particular congregation. Title III, Canon 8 requires that the candidate be able "to read the Holy Scriptures and conduct the services of the Church in an intelligible, seemly, and reverent fashion" and that the candidate have "knowledge of the general outline of the contents of the Old and New Testaments, and of the Church's teaching as set forth in the Creeds and Offices of Instruction" (Sec. 2(b)(4)). Several dioceses require that priests ordained under Canon 8 engage in a program of continuing education.

An effective support system for priests ordained under Canon 8 and for the parishes involved is important. Most dioceses have devised a system where supervision is provided by other qualified clergy. We need to learn how to redeploy our traditionally trained clergy in more effective ways.

The service of a priest ordained under Canon 8 is focused on the worship and sacramental life of the congregation. Depending on the particular situation, his or her ministry may be expanded to include preaching. Usually he or she will not function as sole leader of a congregation; this role is usually shared with the wardens, vestry, and others.

Although the priest ordained under Canon 8 has a specially focused expression of ministry, this priest has been ordained to full priesthood and is in no sense a second-class member of the clergy. There is one priesthood, full and complete, in which all parties

participate, within the context of a new, enriched theological understanding of ministry.

The priest ordained under Canon 8 has been chosen to exercise the office of priest in a specific congregation, or special situation, and ought not to expect to do so in another congregation or situation, unless called to that office because of particular need. He or she will always be a priest, although not always licensed to exercise the office. All priests are subject to call and to be licensed by bishops, or others who hold jurisdiction. In a few cases, priests ordained under this canon and unexpectedly moving to a new location have been asked to exercise their office in the new congregation.

By and large, we have had good experiences with Canon 8. It is a relatively recent Canon, and our experience with it has been limited. We are experimenting with its use as we go along. We have just recently begun to consider its potential for urban ministry. We shall continue to share our experiences as we learn from each other.

We are grateful for the contributions being made to the Church by those priests who have been ordained under Title III, Canon 8. We hope to explore further the possibilities that this Canon presents and expand our use of it. We affirm the value and significance of Canon 8 for the life of the Episcopal Church and we look to its future possibilities with hope and anticipation.

### **Seminarians Intending Lay Vocations**

During the last triennium, the Council for the Development of Ministry, the Office of Lay Ministries, and the Board for Theological Education jointly sponsored a national consultation of Episcopal seminarians who are involved in degree work at one of the seminaries — but do not intend ordination. The first consultation was held in New York City in January 1980. Eighteen students attended, representing five Episcopal seminaries.

The result of the first consultation was the appointment by the students of a steering committee or task force to implement, as much as was practical, the numerous proposals that came out of the consultation. This representative body of five students became the Task Force on Seminarians Intending Lay Vocations. The Task Force has met three times on a twice-a-year basis. Meetings were held in June 1980, January 1981, and June 1981.

Much of the work of the Task Force has centered on gaining recognition at the national level and on developing a system of networking for seminarians not intending ordination. This has been accomplished to a significant degree by the publication of a pamphlet about the Task Force and its work; by a presentation on the Task Force given for the Council for the Development of Ministry at their meeting in March 1980; by securing staff and budget support for the Task Force from the national Church; by securing the recognition and support of the Council of Deans; by the compilation of a nationally based mailing list; by securing support and funding for an alumni/ae research project for two of the seminaries; and by holding a second National Consultation.

In January 1982, the second National Consultation of Seminarians Intending Lay Vocations was held at Seabury House; it was composed of 38 students and 5 faculty and staff people, representing eight Episcopal seminaries. As a result of this second Consultation, the Task Force has been expanded to include a sixth representative; a national newsletter for Seminarians Intending Lay Vocations has been developed; permanent faculty and staff liaisons for the Task Force have been established at eight seminaries; and a long-range agenda of work for the Task Force over the next two years has been proposed.

The long-range agenda focuses on further development of the networking process already in progress and the more extensive involvement of nonordination track students

in the Episcopal seminaries and in the life of the seminary communities. The work of the Task Force will continue to stress the involvement of lay people at every level of seminary life through the education experience, worship, the sharing of pastoral responsibilities and concerns, the development of mutual ministry concepts, and a shared evangelism.

### Committee on Undersupply

In 1980, the Council for the Development of Ministry appointed a committee to consider the question of *undersupply* of ordained clergy raised by O. C. Edwards in his article, "What Is Meant by an 'Oversupply' of Clergy and What Should Be Done About It?" With reference to the Clergy Deployment Office figures for 1974, "which indicate that at any given moment, one-twentieth of our parishes are vacant and that some of these are seldom filled because they are not attractive to clergy. . . . Dr. Edwards observed, 'Stated differently, there is an *undersupply* [italics added] of clergy willing to serve in out-of-the-way places on low incomes.'"

The preliminary report of the Committee, chaired by Dr. Mary Frances Wagley, "indicates that an *undersupply* of ordained clergy exists alongside an *oversupply* of ordained clergy. This apparent anomaly can be understood by reading this report in conjunction with the oversupply report."

The undersupply situation exists in three main areas: "in parishes . . . unable to support a full-time priest"; "in geographically isolated or less desirable areas"; and "in ethnic parishes."

"According to a CDO report, vacancies in U.S. churches are increasing, especially in small parishes under 200 communicants. . . . Only parishes of over 500 communicants showed consistently small vacancy rates" for the years 1971, 1974, and 1978 covered by the report. Inflation and decreasing national Church and diocesan funds to assist marginal parishes compound the problem.

Geographical isolation aggravates the undersupply problem in small parishes because those areas "lack social, cultural, and educational amenities. . . ." The Committee also found that "an undersupply situation clearly exists in ethnic communities . . . aggravated by subgroups within each ethnic minority which may be as unlike one another as they are dissimilar to Anglo congregations."\*

Although the Committee report stated that the undersupply of ordained clergy for small, ethnic, and geographically isolated parishes was due to "the majority of ordained clergy (being) . . . trained for and conditioned to expect to serve in a narrow range of parishes," it did not advocate the training of clergy "specifically for specialized ministries."

Processes presently employed to remedy the undersupply problem include "tent-making ministries, Canon 8 ordinations, and the assembling of lay-clergy team ministries." Ecumenical cooperation was suggested as a possible avenue of exploration.

The Committee concluded that "solutions to the problem must be sought if the current and potential mission of the Church is not to be thwarted."

---

\*To help remedy this situation, a Task Force to recruit, train, and deploy black clergy has been created. It is funded by Venture-in-Mission and is composed of both black and white bishops, priests, and laypersons. According to a report from the Rev. Harold T. Lewis of the Task Force, the number of blacks in seminaries in recent years is "not sufficient to offset those black clergy lost through resignation, retirement or death." One of the Task Force's primary goals will be "the re-education of various segments of the Church; it must encourage bishops to actively seek and support *qualified* candidates; it must, above all, seek to present the ordained ministry in the Episcopal Church as an exciting and viable profession for blacks." The Task Force also seeks to prepare more black women and men for service to the whole Church; "to encourage their placement on seminary faculties; diocesan and cathedral staffs, college chaplaincies, and parishes not predominantly black."

### Committee on Diversity and Interdependence in Ministry

This Committee, which was previously known as the Committee on Lay Participation in Theological Education, was chaired by the Rev. Charles H. Long, Jr. It revealed its objectives in definitions of *diversity* and *interdependence*.

*We understand diversity to refer to the variety of ministries needed if the Church is to respond more effectively to its mission in the world. Diversity is expressed in specialized ministries such as military, institutional, and university chaplains; in ethnic and racial ministries; in ministry to persons with physical handicaps, such as the blind and the deaf; in the many ministries of lay Church professionals; and in the diversity of "styles" or employment, training, and skills among clergy. Our task is to seek out up-to-date information about these expressions of ministry, to ask what assumptions they represent about mission, what special needs they may have for recruitment, selection, and training, and what help may be appropriately expected from the CDM and its constituent agencies.*

*We understand interdependence to refer to an emerging new understanding of mutual relationships between bishops, priests, deacons and laypersons in the ministry and mission of the whole Church. Our task is to monitor and review the reports of provincial DCOM conferences and research undertaken by or on behalf of the CDM (e.g., selection, diaconate, priesthood) and to make recommendations to the full CDM.*

The reports of the Provincial DCOM conferences would be studied for "what assumptions or common understandings . . . they reveal about the nature of ministry; . . . about the meaning and direction of mission"; and "about the interdependence of all the Church and ministers." They would also be evaluated in light of "what resources are available (or needed) to support these ministries at the national and provincial level, and at the diocesan or local level."

The Committee asked the Field Officer to report on findings that may come out of the provincial DCOM meetings in the fall of 1981 regarding "issues in the relationships of COM's and the seminaries"; "what they understand by 'lay ministry' and the responsibility, if any, of COM's for its further development"; and what provisions they make for the needs of "ethnic, racial, and other specialized ministries."

### Accountabilities of Nonparochial Clergy

In January 1981, Dr. Adair Lummis prepared a report, "Reflections on the 1980 Study by the Council for the Development of Ministry of Nonparochial Priests," based on data gathered from a questionnaire sent in 1980 to 83 diocesan bishops. Conducted under the auspices of the Subcommittee on Accountabilities of Nonparochial Ministries of the Council for the Development of Ministry, chaired by Dr. Ed Voldseth, the survey contained questions on written policies that describe the system for licensing and receiving regular reports from those clergy who do not serve in parishes; opportunity for the worshipping community, where nonparochial clergy was assigned, to participate in the defining of their ministry in that community; the amount of time and energy the bishop is called upon to expend in responding pastorally to these persons, or in supervising them; integration of nonparochial clergy into diocesan mission and ministry strategy; the advantage of nonparochial clergy and nonstipendiary clergy serving on a parttime basis in parishes in order to meet the economic exigencies of the future; what can be done nationally that would help in dealing with nonparochial clergy (Adair Lummis, "Reflections on the 1980 Study by the Council for the Development of Ministry, p. 1).

One of the most important findings of this survey is that "*many bishops perceive a*

*need for better (clearer, more complete, and common to all dioceses) categories of nonparochial clergy developed and better guidelines for determining what their responsibilities are for these different categories of nonparochial priests*" (Lummis, "Reflections," p. 3).

From comments made to various survey questions, responding bishops distinguished at least three major characteristics of nonparochial clergy that affect the bishops' perceptions of their value. These three characteristics are: "(1) whether the nonparochial clergy's employment is church-related or secular; (2) whether these priests want or need to be paid for supply work in parishes or are nonstipendiary; (3) whether these priests have the time, interest, and competency to work as supply, interim, or assistant priests in parishes, or give their time and expertise in diocesan committees or consulting" (Lummis, "Reflections," p. 3).

Nonparochial priests work in a variety of fields: as hospital, military, or prison chaplains; as diocesan staff members; as seminary faculty and administrators; as pastoral counselors; as secular professionals or business executives. Retired priests are also considered nonparochial clergy. All of these types of nonparochial clergy "differ not only from one another in their integration into the life of the diocese and their availability for supply and other parish work, but also differ substantially from those who are waiting for parishes and in the meantime supporting themselves in part- or full-time secular jobs, who in turn differ from those who are happily working fifty hours a week or more as secular professionals or business executives" (Lummis, "Reflections," pp. 3-4).

On the whole, the bishops responding to the survey were "rather ambivalent about how valuable they presently find and anticipate finding nonparochial priests for the ministry of parishes and other organizations in their dioceses" (Lummis, "Reflections," p. 13).

In partial summary, Dr. Lummis concluded from survey data that bishops felt ambivalent about the value of nonparochial clergy due to "two dilemmas . . . in defining what type of nonparochial priest is being referred to and whether this priest is geographically resident, canonically resident or licensed" (Lummis, "Reflections," p. 14).

*. . . Bishops tend to value for potential parish and mission work nonparochial clergy more if: (1) they have a number of parishes and missions in the diocese which cannot afford to pay for full-time priests; (2) they perceive their nonparochial clergy as being competent for parish or mission work; (3) they have some evidence that their nonparochial clergy are willing to work as supply, interim, or assistant ministers when and where they are needed in their dioceses (rather than that of some other bishop); (4) they have nonparochial clergy who are willing to work in impoverished churches for a small fee and expenses or for "free."*

*As noted, bishops might be more optimistic generally about the value of nonparochial clergy to their dioceses if the national Church, or other bishops in concert, could develop better methods of reporting the presence of nonparochial clergy to the diocesan in whose area they are living, requiring nonparochial clergy to report their presence and transferring canonical residence if they do not plan to return to their "home" diocese, developing better diocesan plan of relating nonparochial clergy to parishes and to the mission and ministry of the dioceses, improving reporting procedures for nonparochial clergy to inform the dioceses of their ministerial and other activities every year, and providing better guidelines for what the responsibilities of bishops should be for different types of nonparochial clergy.*

*The oversupply of priests for full-time paid parish positions coupled with the unslackening seminary graduation of Episcopal M.Div.'s will increase the ranks of*

*nonparochial clergy for some years to come. Whether individual diocesan bishops are concerned about the future of nonparochial clergy or not, it would nonetheless seem wise for the Church as a whole to take some steps toward assisting diocesan bishops in resolving the two major dilemmas noted of what their relationship to and responsibility for different types of nonparochial clergy should be, and vice versa. Otherwise, expected expansion in the numbers and kinds of nonparochial clergy within every diocese and overall will only exacerbate the extant confusion.* (Lummis, "Reflections," pp. 14-15)

Copies of the document containing the surveyed bishops' responses to the questionnaire as well as copies of Dr. Lummis's study are available through the CDM office.

### **Resources for Clergy Spouses Adapted from a report by Betsy Rodenmayer**

Recognizing that there are currently three definable groups of clergy spouses (lay women married to ordained men; lay men married to ordained women; and ordained women married to ordained men), Ms. Rodenmayer's study, "Research on Resources for Clergy Spouses," limited itself to lay women married to ordained men—moreover, "lay women married to ordained men who are in the active parochial ministry" (Betsy Rodenmayer, "Research on Resources for Clergy Spouses," p. 1).

Research was limited to publications no earlier than 1965, with an emphasis on those of the 1970s and early 1980s, because it became "almost immediately apparent that the attitude and behavior of the society and the church in this country has been strongly affected by the women's movement" (Rodenmayer, "Research," p. 1).

After consulting with official representatives of the denominations with membership in the Department of Ministry of the National Council of Churches, Ms. Rodenmayer found "that these denominations are raising the concern but have done little, if anything, in the way of dealing with it" (Rodenmayer, "Research," pp. 1-2).

Study of the bibliography, which Ms. Rodenmayer annotated, provided the most useful findings.

1. Wives of Episcopal clergy are highly educated in comparison with the national norm. A very high percentage have college degrees, master's degrees, and some have doctor's degrees.
2. They come quite consistently from a good middle-class social background.
3. Less than half come from an Episcopal background.
4. Very few come from a rural area or a small town.
5. A larger percentage of Episcopal clergy wives work than the national percentage of working wives. The most common occupations are teaching, social work, and secretarial. (Rodenmayer, "Research," p. 2)

Among the "pressure points most frequently expressed by wives of clergy" were financial concern ("In comparison with other professions the salaries for the most part are low. There is much concern about retirement income"); housing worries ("A little over 50% of the responses desire and welcome an arrangement to buy their own homes, not only for the present but also for retirement security"); and resentment, both "at the time demands made on the husband" and "at being identified as the rector's wife rather than as a person in her own right" (Rodenmayer, "Research," p. 3).

Ms. Rodenmayer's study suggested that when addressing the needs of clergy spouses, we should consider how we can best serve the different age groups, with their different orientations, needs, and expectations; "how to modify the expectations of congregations

in different parts of the country"; and how we view the ministry (Rodenmayer, "Research," pp. 3-4).

Recommendations included a series of conferences for clergy wives and a series of conferences for clergy "in the same locations"; follow-up conferences for both; and "conferences for selected members of those congregations" (Rodenmayer, "Research," p. 4).

**"Towards a Theology of Priesthood": Trinity Institute  
Adapted from a report by the Rev. Durstan McDonald**

Recognizing that there has been a "significant increase in the numbers of nonstipendiary clergy, of ordinations of 'sacramentalists,' of rectors also working secular jobs, as well as changing relationships between clergy and laity and increase of stress upon clergy personally and upon parishes economically," the Board of Theological Education and the Council for the Development of Ministry commissioned Trinity Institute in 1980 to undertake a consultation to study the implications of these phenomena on Church policy and on our understanding of priesthood. The Rev. Durstan R. McDonald of Trinity Institute authored the resulting report, "Towards a Theology of Priesthood," based upon the expressed views of the consultation's participants. Much of the background material was drawn from studies by Rev. Aidan Kavanagh, O.S.B., and Rev. Richard Norris, Jr.

The report of the consultation responds to questions raised in Bishop Stephen Bayne's 1971 CDM study:

*The problem is not one of too many priests. It is one of too few imaginative and effective ways in which priests and priesthood are being put to work in the Church. The problem is one of too little awareness of mission, of too little resourcefulness in devising new forms of ministry and adapting old ones, of too little understanding of priesthood itself.*

The participants in the consultation responded to this challenge. As Rev. McDonald's report states: "We believe a more adequate understanding of Christian priesthood will lead to a more adequate theology of ordained ministry. Only on such a foundation is it possible to move on to a clearer understanding and theology of the diaconate, presbyterate, and episcopate for our time."

*We found that what is necessary is nothing less than a radical shift in the current ideology of priesthood (and nothing more than acceptance of emerging ecumenical consensus as in the 1973 Canterbury Statement of the Anglican-Roman Catholic International Commission). Our language is misleading. In ordinary usage, to speak about the priesthood is to speak about priests in parishes and other settings.*

*Both our practice and our language suffer under the hegemony of the presbyterate. The eviscerated diaconate, now undergoing renewal, and the virtual isolation of the bishop from the congregation testify to the reduction and collapse of pastoral leadership into the presbyterate. The hegemony of the presbyterate is so strong that it absorbs all the power and focus of ministry into itself, turning the laity into willing clients for ministry rather than ministers of Christ, a priestly people (cf. 1 Peter 2).*

*If anything emerged with startling clarity during this interdisciplinary gathering of scholars, parish clergy and bishops, it was that the terms "priesthood" and "ordained ministry" are not synonymous (contrary to popular use). As Sidan Kavanagh said, "Christians do not ordain to priesthood, they baptize to it."*

The consultation examined the emerging roles of the diaconate, presbyterate, and

episcopate in the early Christian church. This examination determined the consensus achieved on the major issues. One of its significant findings was: "A recovery of the varied possibilities for pastoral leadership and the priesthood of the *laos*, the People of God, will shed light on current trends in the church."

### **Institutional Chaplains**

The Committee on Episcopal Ministries in Institutions (CEMI) was convened by the Rev. Allan Reed to study the condition of the Episcopal Church's ministry in specialized settings, exercised by approximately 1,000 Episcopal clergy.

CEMI has for the past four years "continued to study our Church's ministry in specialized settings; . . . made contact with several organizations of Episcopal chaplains; . . . [and] fostered interest and initiative among chaplains in order to involve them with issues affecting their ministries."

After carefully considering the results of the study, the members of CEMI ask that the bishops commend to the several dioceses, provinces and seminaries of the Episcopal Church the following:

1. . . . acknowledgment of the place and value of specialized ministries, especially those chaplains or counselors who may not be closely associated with the present Church structure.
2. . . . encouragement of the professional development of chaplains and counselors, in cooperation with certifying agencies already in the field. . . .
3. . . . development of standards of performance and other professional qualifications for Episcopal clergy and lay persons who serve as paid chaplains and counselors, as required, for example, by policies of the U.S. Department of Human Services and other agencies.
4. . . . encouragement, in cooperation with our seminaries, of the development of programs of recruitment, screening, endorsement, placement and continued education for Episcopalians interested in specialized ministries.
5. . . . development of systems of peer and judicial review for chaplains and pastoral counselors.
6. . . . appointment of official representatives to those professional organizations which expect the major denominations to take part in decision-making and planning for educational, health care or custodial affairs.

### **REPORT AND RESOLUTIONS FROM THE COMMITTEE ON CANONS**

As the Committee on Canons of the Council for the Development of Ministry reflected on the expanded understanding within the Church of the character of Christian ministry, we became more and more aware that the existing canon law of the Episcopal Church, as it relates to ministry, reflects the philosophy of an earlier time, when ministry was primarily thought of as the function of the ordained. Several specific areas of concern attracted our immediate attention. In dealing with these, we hope that those who use the Canons will be alive to new and future shapes of ministry. We offer the suggestions in our report toward careful but extensive revision of these Canons because of needs we perceive in the Church today.

Specifically, we recognize that if the Church is to be strong in today's world, many models of ministry will develop outside traditional parochial boundaries. For that reason we have become aware that the Canons relating strictly to the exercise of an ordained ministry within the limits of a cure, as opposed to those being exercised in expanding and

new models, need to be identified and re-expressed. We further recognize that there are at least two kinds of nonstipendiary ministry that are emerging—one of which is already acknowledged as having developed through a growing awareness of vocation on the part of lay people, through which they either expand their ministry as lay persons, or recognize the special call to ordination. In addition to this growing and important body, there are a large number of ordained clergy who have been active within the “professional” institutional life of the Church, and are now moving into nonstipendiary ministries—more specifically, exercising their ministry as they did before, but supporting themselves through nonecclesiastical employment.

We present these suggestions for canonical change to the General Convention in the hope that it will recognize the immediate need for change in present procedures to facilitate ministry, and will also acknowledge the expanding and creative nature of ministry within the life of the Church. We realize that Canons do not exist to make ineffective or disinterested clergy into good clergy, and that they are not in and of themselves moral precepts. However, we do believe that the Canons reflect the moral character of the Church, and to that end we believe that the recommended changes found herein speak to the good that emerges through the life of the Church, as well as to that seemingly order necessary for operation.

The concern of the Committee on Canons of the CDM is that these needed changes come to the attention of the General Convention. We have no pride of ownership with regard to specific words and phrases. We acknowledge that there are those more skilled in the drafting of Canons than we. On the other hand, we do believe that by presenting the materials as we have, we can facilitate their comparison with existing canonical language and thereby contrast present expression with both present and future need.

We invite your comments and hope that this effort will receive your careful attention.

This report was prepared by the following committee members:

|  |                       |
|--|-----------------------|
| The Rev. Henry N. F. Minich, <i>Chairman</i> | Mr. William Thompson  |
| The Rev. J. R. Gundrum                       | The Rev. Craig Casey  |
| Mrs. Dixie Hutchinson                        | Mr. Robert Royce      |
| The Rev. Ivan Partridge                      | The Rev. John Keester |

**Resolution #A—83.**

Amend Title III.11.10(c).

*Resolved, the House of \_\_\_\_\_ concurring, That Title III, Canon 11, Sec. 10(c) be amended as follows:*

(c). When such requirements have been fulfilled, the Bishop, with the advice and consent of the Standing Committee, may proceed to ordain the said Deacon to the Priesthood, *pursuant to Title III, Canon 11, Sec. 9.*

(COMMENT: This amendment is intended to make clear the fact that Canon III.11.9 is also applicable to nonstipendiary deacons ordained under Canon III.10.10.)

**Resolution #A—84.**

Amend Title III.11.9.

*Resolved, the House of \_\_\_\_\_ concurring, That Title III, Canon 11, Sec. 9(c) be amended as follows:*

Sec. 9. No Deacon shall be ordered Priest until he shall have been appointed to serve in some Parochial Cure within the jurisdiction of this Church, or as a Missionary under the Ecclesiastical Authority of some Diocese, or as an officer of

some Missionary Society recognized by the General Convention, or as a Chaplain of the Armed Forces of the United States, or as a Chaplain in some recognized hospital or other welfare institution, or as a Chaplain or Instructor in some college or other seminary of learning, or with *some other* opportunity for the exercise of ~~his Ministry the office of Priest~~ judged ~~sufficient~~ *appropriate* by the Bishop.

(COMMENT: This amendment recognizes that many clergy today, especially in nonstipendiary ministry, may not be being ordained to traditional situations for priests. Further, it avoids the fiction prevalent today of appointing nonstipendiary clergy to parochial cures merely to fulfill the “threshold” provisions of this Canon. It continues to be incumbent upon the bishop to judge whether or not the deacon will have sufficient opportunity for the exercise of the office of presbyter.)

**Resolution #A—85.**

Amend Title III.21.4(a).

*Resolved, the House of \_\_\_\_\_ concurring, That Title III, Canon 21, Sec. 4(a) be amended as follows:*

Sec. 4(a). A ~~Minister~~ *Deacon or Presbyter* of this Church desiring to enter other than ecclesiastical employment, *or one ordained pursuant to Title III.10.10 or Title III.11.10 desiring to resign from the exercise of the office to which he was ordained*, without ~~relinquishing his Ministry, renouncing or being released from the exercise of the office~~, shall make his desire known to the Bishop or the Ecclesiastical Authority of the Diocese in which he is canonically resident. The Bishop, with the advice and consent of the Standing Committee, after satisfying himself and them that the applicant will have, and use, opportunities for the exercise of ~~Christian Ministry, the office to which he was ordained~~, may give his approval, on the following condition: the Minister shall report annually, in writing, in a manner prescribed by the Bishop, his occasional services, as provided in Canon I. 5. Sec. 1.

(COMMENT: This amendment adds: (1) nonstipendiary deacons and priests to those who are required to substantiate the opportunities for the exercise of the ordained offices following their entry into other than ecclesiastical employment; (2) deletes a reference to “relinquishing” (which has no canonical significance) and adds the existing concept of renunciation and a new reference to release; (3) establishes as the test for approval the commission conferred at ordination; (4) requires the report mandated by Canon I.5.1 as hereafter revised; and (5) permits the bishop to add such other conditions as may be appropriate.)

**Resolution #A—86.**

Amend Title I.5.

*Resolved, the House of \_\_\_\_\_ concurring, That Title I, Canon 5, Sec. 1 be amended as follows:*

Sec. 1 . . . Every Bishop, Presbyter, or Deacon whose report is not included in a parochial report shall also report ~~his occasional services, on the exercise of his office~~, and if there ~~have~~ *have* been none, the causes or reasons which have prevented the same. And these reports, or such parts of them as the Bishop may deem proper, shall be entered in the Journal.

(COMMENT: The report of those who are not covered by parochial reports, and thus not under the direct pastoral oversight of another member of the clergy, must include,

and thus confirm, the fundamental reasons for ordination in the first instance, and compliance with the stated opportunities relied upon by the bishop and Standing Committee in Title III. 21. 4(a). The present Canon could be met by a report of "one wedding.")

**Resolution #A—87.**

Amend Title III.21.

*Resolved, the House of \_\_\_\_\_ concurring, That Title III, Canon 21, Sec. 4(c) be amended as follows:*

Sec. 4(c) 1. Any such ~~Minister~~, *Presbyter or Deacon*, removing to another jurisdiction, shall present himself to the Bishop of that jurisdiction within two months of his arrival in the jurisdiction.

2. ~~The Minister~~ *Such Presbyter or Deacon* shall fulfill the following conditions:

1. He shall officiate or preach in that jurisdiction only under the terms of Sec. 7 of this Canon.

2. He shall in writing notify the Bishop of the Diocese of his canonical residence, within sixty days of removal.

3. *He shall apply for a licence from the Ecclesiastical Authority into whose jurisdiction he has moved within one hundred twenty days of such removal as required by Sec. 7 of this Canon.*

4. *He shall also forward a copy of the report required by Title I, Canon 5, Sec. 1 to the Ecclesiastical Authority to whose jurisdiction he has removed.*

5. *The Bishop from whose jurisdiction he has removed shall notify in writing the Bishop to whose jurisdiction he has moved, upon receipt of the notice of such removal.*

If the Minister fails to comply with these conditions, the Bishop of the Diocese of his canonical residence may, upon sixty days' written notice, transfer the Minister to the Special List of the Secretary of the House of Bishops.

(COMMENT: The proposed amendments to Sec. 4(c) require a presbyter or deacon to apply for a licence within a reasonable time after his removal to a new diocese. If he is sincere in his intent to continue to reasonably exercise his office, this would be an essential compliance with the Canons. Further, he is required to send a copy of his report to the bishop of this new jurisdiction.

Additionally, his Bishop is required to notify the Ecclesiastical Authority of the new jurisdiction of the movement. No formal pastoral oversight is changed or canonical residence established, but an opportunity is presented for all concerned to establish some appropriate pastoral possibilities.)

**Resolution #A—88.**

Amend Title III.21.4(d).

*Resolved, the House of \_\_\_\_\_ concurring, That Title III, Canon 21, Sec. 4(d) be amended as follows:*

(d). Any such Minister, removing to another jurisdiction, shall notify both the Bishop of the Diocese of his canonical residence and the Bishop of the jurisdiction in which he resides, as to which of the following options he prefers:

1. The Minister may request to remain canonically resident in his present Diocese. In such case, the Bishop of that Diocese shall retain the Minister on his roll of clergy as long as the Minister fulfills the requirements of Sec. 4(a) of this Canon.

2. The Minister may request to have his canonical residence transferred to the jurisdiction of his civil residence. In such case, the Minister shall, before requesting Letters Dimissory, secure a statement, in writing, from the Bishop of such jurisdiction (who may consult with his Council of Advice in the matter) that he is willing to receive such a Minister and to enroll him among the clergy of his Diocese; and note, that the provisions of Sec. 6(d) of this Canon shall not apply in such a case.

~~3. The Minister may request the Bishop of the Diocese of his canonical residence that his name be placed on the Special List maintained by the Secretary of the House of Bishops. If the Minister complies with the requirements of Sec. 4(a) of this Canon by reporting annually to the Presiding Bishop, he shall continue to be held as a Minister in good standing in this Church.~~

*(e) Presbyters or Deacons in other than ecclesiastical employment, whether ordained under Title III, Canon 4 or Title III, Canon 10 or whether entering other than ecclesiastical employment without renouncing or being released from the exercise of their office, shall demonstrate to the Bishop of the Diocese in which they are canonically resident that they have and will continue to use reasonable opportunities for the exercise of the office to which they have been ordained.*

*(f) Any Presbyter or Deacon of this Church not under presentment and who would be permitted under Title IV, Canon 8, Sec. 1 to renounce the exercise of his office, who desires to enter into other than ecclesiastical employment, may declare in writing to the Ecclesiastical Authority of the Diocese in which he is canonically resident his desire to be released from the obligations of the office and that he desires to be relieved of the exercise of the office to which he was ordained.*

*A Bishop receiving such a declaration shall proceed in the same manner as if the declaration were one of renunciation.*

(COMMENT: Sec. 4(d)3, allowing a presbyter or deacon to voluntarily go on the PB's list, essentially allows him to "back out" with no oversight at all and it is suggested that it be deleted.)

New Sec. 4(e) intends to continue the concept of requiring a presbyter or deacon to exercise his office or consider renunciation or release. The present Canons merely have a one time qualification as to these opportunities which is at the time of the application to the bishop. Thereafter, there is no follow-up under present Canons.)

New Sec. 4(f) adds a new concept: that of release from the exercise of the office without a renunciation under Title IV. After the request for release, the bishop would proceed to remove as if a renunciation had been made.)

**Resolution #A—89.**

Amend Title IV.12.1.

**Resolved, the House of \_\_\_\_\_ concurring, That Title IV, Canon 12, Sec. 1 be amended as follows:**

Sec. 1. There shall be three sentences which may be imposed; namely, suspension, removal, or deposition. A sentence of suspension may be imposed (a) after final conviction by a Trial Court, or (b) by the filing of a waiver under Sec. 4(d) of Canon IV.12. A sentence of removal may be imposed when there has been a renunciation under Canon IV. 8 *or a request for release under Canon III. 21* for causes which do not affect the moral character of the ~~Minister~~ *Presbyter or Deacon*. A sentence of deposition may be imposed (a) after final conviction by a Trial Court, (b) after the filing of a waiver under Section 4(d) of Canon IV. 12,

(c) when there has been a renunciation under Canon IV. 8 in cases where there may be a question of a foregoing misconduct or irregularity on the part of the Minister, or (d) abandonment of the communion of this Church as set forth in Canon IV. 10.

(COMMENT: This amendment adds release as a grounds for removal.)

**Resolution #A—90.**

Amend Title IV.13.3.

**Resolved, the House of \_\_\_\_\_ concurring, That Title IV, Canon 13, Sec. 3 be amended as follows:**

Sec. 3. In case such person was deposed for abandoning the communion of this Church, or, having been ~~deposed~~ removed by reason of his renunciation of ~~or release from the Ministry of this Church,~~ exercise of the Office of Presbyter or Deacon, or for other causes, he have also abandoned its communion, the Bishop, before granting such remission, shall be satisfied that such a person has lived in lay communion with this Church for one year next preceding his application for such remission.

(COMMENT: Again, release is added and an erroneous reference to deposition is deleted.)

## PROVINCIAL AND REGIONAL CONFERENCES

Under the leadership of the Provincial Representatives, the provincial meetings of the Commission on Ministry members were instrumental in enabling the Council for the Development of Ministry to serve the Church as a whole during this triennium. These meetings provided opportunities for COM members to share information and resources, to raise concerns, and to receive assistance and training when needed. They were also the arena where the local concerns for ministry were raised and placed in a national perspective and where the Council could inform conference members of findings discovered in other provinces. The cooperative and collegial style of planning for these meetings by the Provincial Representatives and staff persons has avoided duplication of efforts and provided a responsible stewardship of available resources.

Provincial meetings sponsored by CDM are listed by province and include the major concerns addressed.

In preparation for the Fall 1981 series of provincial conferences sponsored by BTE and CDM, the Committee on Diversity and Interdependence in Ministry of the CDM formulated questions for provincial leaders to consider:

1. In the light of your provincial meeting, what are the significant issues between seminaries and COMs?
2. What are the present concerns between lay, diaconate, presbyterate and episcopate orders?
3. What are you doing regarding specialized missions and ministries?

The representatives were asked to respond to these questions during their reports to enable CDM to meet the needs raised in the questions.

### Provinces I, II, and III

The Tri-Provincial (I-III) Commission on Ministry meeting, October 26-27, 1981, focused on the development and support of lay ministry. The keynote speaker was Ms.

Minka Sprague of the General Theological Seminary (copies of her speech are available upon request). The Rev. Lloyd Uyeki (II) and Ms. Nancy BonSignor (I) reported on the meeting; among the report's findings:

- Diocese of New York is struggling with the lay/ordained dichotomy.
- A great number of laity are still seeking ordination because expression of ministry in the lay order is often not recognized either by them or the Church.
- There is a need to identify, uphold and have role models for lay ministry and authenticate ministries already taking place.

### **Province IV**

The Rt. Rev. Robert Estill was the keynote speaker at the Province IV meeting, November 16-18, 1981, to discuss "Excellence in Ministry." In his report, the Rev. Henry N. F. Minich suggested that CDM "prepare a journal of the learnings from these valuable provincial gatherings as a disciplined way of sharing new ideas, keynote speeches, selection methodologies, etc." The CDM staff accepted his recommendation.

### **Provinces V, VI, and VII**

"DCOMs and the Seminary: A Dialogue" was the theme of the Tri-Provincial (V-VII) COM meeting, October 22-24, 1981. A faculty member and/or dean represented each accredited seminary with direct connections with these provinces at the meeting. Ms. Dorothy Britain, consultant, led the participants as they identified important issues for dialogue between DCOM members and seminary representatives. Some of the issues identified were:

#### *Preordination criteria:*

- How to involve COMs, bishops, seminaries.
- How do we share in that criteria, to have the same criteria instead of the present confusion of criteria.

#### *Relationships:*

- Between the intake policy of the Church and the placement needs of the Church.*

#### *Internships:*

- What are the future possibilities?
- What are the needs, problems?

#### *Diaconate:*

- Theology of the diaconate.
- Training for the diaconate.

#### *Professionalism:*

- Professional clergy in the Church.

Three areas of interaction needing closer coordination and collaboration by DCOM and the seminaries were agreed upon: preseminary preparation; seminary training, field work, and evaluation; and postseminary training. It was agreed "that the central need for making all of the above possible was for closer personal communication between COM chairpersons, bishops, and seminaries—for the development of open sharing and trust."

### **Province VIII**

The Rev. John Keester reported on the Province VIII meeting, held on October 27-29, 1981. Its theme was "Total Ministry." Participants focused on the selection process: Where does it begin? What is the relationship between the various diocesan training schools and the seminaries? What standards should be set for people entering seminary re biblical knowledge, field experience, etc.

## CDM REVIEW

In early 1982 the CDM launched a self-evaluation process. This effort is designed to help the CDM assess the adequacy of its structure and composition for carrying out its mandate from General Convention. Since the General Convention of 1976 formally established the CDM, this agency has gone through many developmental stages as it has attempted to be faithful to its task.

This review process will begin with interviews with the leadership of the member agencies in order to measure their perception of agency roles and relationships: Does the present structure and work of the CDM make possible mutuality of effort in ministry development between the respective agencies and CDM? What changes are needed to face the challenges of this decade? These questions and others will be addressed and recommendations will be prepared for action by the CDM at its November meeting.

## PREPARATION FOR NEW CHALLENGES

The building of a future agenda always open to the new, is an ongoing discipline within CDM. Part of the building process is to make hearing time available to interest groups within the Church who come to CDM to present their concerns and request CDM consideration and action where appropriate.

During this past triennium the CDM has welcomed many delegations and provided time on the agenda for their presentations. Among those heard from were:

*Office for Black Ministries.* The Officer for Black Ministries, Episcopal Church Center, reported on two recently completed studies available through his office: "Report on Black Clergy in the Episcopal Church and Who Wants Them" and "Suggestions and Recommendations on Recruitment, Training and Deployment of Black Clergy in the Episcopal Church."

*Alban Institute.* A survey of their current research and training priorities was given by the Director. Emphasis at that session was placed on concerns regarding clergy firings.

*Women Clergy Ad-Hoc Committee.* This committee reviewed their research into the issues of women as clergy, problems they encounter in dioceses after ordination (geographical and upward mobility and competition with other minorities), and the discernment of a new "vision" of women as clergy and what the Church as a whole can learn from that.

*Committee on Episcopal Ministry in Institutions.* Representatives from this committee outlined the pressing issues for the Church's support of institutional chaplains: training; Canon 8 and its effect; chaplains in the military and VA hospitals and endorsement by the Office for the Armed Forces; accreditation of chaplains in correctional institutions run by the Federal government; diocesan accreditation of chaplains in Episcopal hospitals; the effect of clergy "oversupply"; certification through the Association of Clinical Pastoral Educators; the place of deacons and lay persons in our system of accreditation; whether deacons can serve in the military or VA systems as chaplains; and relations with an ecumenical accrediting body for correctional homes and institutions.

In each of these exchanges of ideas and information, specific action has been asked of CDM. The responses of CDM are indicated throughout this report in the descriptions of the Provincial meetings, the committee work, and the research completed or under way.

Future agenda items come to CDM from its member agencies, the Provincial Representatives and Members-at-Large, and other interested agencies and individuals throughout the Church.

We know that great change in ministry development and support is underway. One has only to survey the huge volume of material being written about ministry to grasp the scale of these changes. What is also clear is that no solid consensus has emerged as to the nature of these changes, even though we might all agree that they are substantive and various. Perhaps in the future of development of ministry we are facing pluriformity as a value: not equally held by all, maybe even seen as evil by some, but certainly a dimension with which we must somehow work.

Each subgroup with which the Council meets can state a number of changes in stance that both have and will enhance their work. These changes in stance are in some cases antithetical to each other and certainly find no consensus even with members of the Council. For example, one constituency may need to begin to see the professional vocation of priest as a high calling—to offset a tendency among their number to regard it as low status in a time when low-status occupations are not regarded favorably or listened to—whereas another constituency may need to take the ordained person off a pedestal so that all can come to see the value of Christian action and not reserve it for a few hired for the job.

A central task for the Council for the Development of Ministry is to identify and explore the implications of these tensions:

- How can we support ministry when the values held are so strongly divergent?
- How can we hold up to the Church a correcting vision from the tradition and the lore?
- Should we hold up a correcting vision or should this come from somewhere else?
- How can we be supportive to those ordained persons who feel powerless over their own lives in these changing times, and at the same time nourish those who challenge the old ways?
- How can we effectively get the work of the Council out into the Church at large?
- Who wants the Council to do its job and to whom does it really answer?
- Is the work accomplished by the Council worthwhile and valued significantly in relation to its cost of doing business?

The Council for the Development of Ministry invites response from all readers of this report. For details and/or copies of the complete reports contact the CDM Office.

**Resolution #A—91.**

***Resolved, the House of \_\_\_\_\_ concurring, That the 67th Convention continue the Council for the Development of Ministry consonant with the goals and objectives as reported to this Convention, that it continue to be funded through the Program Budget of the Executive Council and that it report to the next General Convention.***

Respectfully submitted,

The Rt. Rev. Jackson E. Gilliam, *Chairperson*  
Mr. D. Barry Menuez, *Field Officer*