

# The Council for the Development of Ministry

## CONTENTS

<b>Members</b> .....	177
<b>Goals and objectives</b> .....	178
<b>Structure</b> .....	178
<b>Summary of the Council's work</b> .....	179
Study of the diaconate ministry .....	180
Study of Title III, Canon 8 .....	183
Commission on Ministry review .....	185
<b>Provincial meetings</b> .....	185
<b>Ministry development collaboration</b> .....	187
Total Ministry Task Force .....	187
Seminarians with Lay Vocations .....	188
<b>Review of Title III Canons</b> .....	188
<b>Resolutions</b> .....	189
<b>Preparation for new challenges</b> .....	192

## MEMBERS

### Agency Board Representatives

- The Rev. Terry Meadows, Board for Theological Education.
  - Mr. Matthew Chew, Church Deployment Board.
  - The Rev. Craig W. Casey, Church Pension Fund.
  - The Very Rev. Durstan R. McDonald, Council of Seminary Deans.
  - The Rt. Rev. Robert C. Witcher, House of Bishops Committee on Pastoral Development.
  - Mr. Harry C. Griffith, Standing Committee of Education for Mission and Ministry of the Executive Council, Representing Lay Ministry.
  - The Rt. Rev. John F. Ashby, House of Bishops Committee on Ministry.
- [All the above concurred]*

### Provincial Representatives

- Mrs. Nancy BonSignor, Province I.
  - The Rt. Rev. Vincent K. Pettit, Province II.
  - Mrs. Patricia G. Drake, Province III.
  - The Rev. Canon Robert G. Tharp, Province IV.
  - Professor Joseph H. Smith, Province V.
  - Mrs. Eleanor Robinson, Province VI.
  - The Rev. Richard J. Petranek, Province VII.
  - The Rev. Paul E. Towner, Province VIII.
  - The Rev. Ashton J. Brooks, Province IX.
- [All the above concurred]*

### Chairperson

- The Rt. Rev. Jackson E. Gilliam.
- [Concurred.]*

---

## THE BLUE BOOK

---

### Staff

- Mr. D. Barry Menuet, *Executive*, Education for Mission and Ministry.  
The Rev. John T. Docker, *Field Officer*, Council for the Development of Ministry.  
The Rev. Fred Howard, *Executive Assistant*, Education for Mission and Ministry.  
The Rev. Preston T. Kelsey, *Executive Director*, Board for Theological Education.  
The Rt. Rev. David E. Richards, *Director*, House of Bishops Committee on Pastoral Development.  
Mr. William A. Thompson, *Executive Director*, Church Deployment Office.  
The Rev. Harry B. Whitley, *Clergy Coordinator*, The Church Pension Fund.

### Representatives of the Council at General Convention

- The Rt. Rev. Jackson E. Gilliam, House of Bishops.  
The Rt. Rev. John F. Ashby, House of Bishops.  
The Rev. Canon Robert Tharp (East Tennessee), House of Deputies.  
The Rev. Richard J. Petranek (Dallas), House of Deputies.

[The above named are authorized by the Council to receive nonsubstantive amendments to the report.]

## 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 to 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 three primary objectives:

1. To establish a network of communication on ministry throughout the Church for sharing information about ministry needs and resources.
2. To identify those issues and needs that are outstanding for the Church, and initiate appropriate studies.
3. To convene appropriate groups for action or make recommendations for action to the appropriate bodies.

## STRUCTURE

The Council for the Development of Ministry, as constituted by the 1982 General Convention, has two categories of voting membership, totaling 17 persons: 7 agency representatives, 9 provincial representatives, and a chairperson. 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 Chairperson of the Council for the Development of Ministry, which includes the Vice Chairperson, 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 is the Coordinator for Ministry Development of the Education for Mission and Ministry Unit. He also serves as Coordinator for Mutual Ministry and is accountable to the Executive for Education for Mission and Ministry for the responsibilities of both posts.

Agency representatives on the CDM are appointed by the various agencies for three-year terms. Provincial representatives are chosen at the meeting of bishops and Diocesan Commission on Ministry representatives, and recommended to the provincial presidents for appointment to the CDM for six-year terms. During the triennium, representatives of the Standing Commission of the Church in Small Communities and the Standing Commission on Metropolitan Areas attended meetings of the Council as observers, and a representative of the Total Ministry Task Force attended to report on mutual ministry development issues.

### SUMMARY OF THE COUNCIL'S WORK

Too often Church agencies can understand and serve part of the Church without ever seeing the whole Church and the needs for ministry. In 1970 an ad hoc Ministry Council was established by the General Convention to "assist in the coordination of the Boards, Committees, and Commissions which dealt with ministry concerns in the Church and to work in collaboration with Bishops and Diocesan Commissions on Ministry." It, however, soon became apparent "that it was unrealistic to expect the Council to coordinate the programs of relatively autonomous agencies."

In 1976 the General Convention created the Council for the Development of Ministry (CDM) with the mandate to move beyond coordinating ministry-serving agencies of the Church toward assisting and supporting the development of ministry itself, both lay and ordained.

The meaning of this mandate for the structure and work of the Council has evolved over the last nine years. The work of the Council was aided during this triennium by a self-evaluation of the Council that, in addition to the mission statement that begins this report, moved from sharing perceptions of the Council to recommendations regarding its structure and membership.

The Council has undertaken several studies as well as provided support for the work of others. This has included:

- A major study of the diaconate ministry based on the experience of eight dioceses.
- A documentation of the clergy ordained under Title III, Canon 8.
- With the Board of Theological Education, the development of *A Resource for Evaluation* for use by dioceses in evaluating the goals and work of Commissions on Ministry.
- A review and revision of the Title III Canons on Ministry in order to prevent the identification of minister or ministry with those in Holy Orders.
- The publication of *Healthy Relationships Between Priests and People*, which has been republished by Forward Movement Publications under the title *Parish and Priest: Growing Together*.
- Work with the Committee on Episcopal Ministry in Institutions in recommending to the House of Bishops a process to certify professional ministries.
- Support of the 1983 Pacific Basin Conference and the East Coast Roland Allen Conference planned for 1986.

As the primary goal of the Council has been to develop the ministry of the entire Church, it has striven to deepen understandings of the meaning of ministry. Examples of this are:

- Commissioning John Booty to develop a study resource on the diaconate ministry, which was published as *Servant Ministry* (Morehouse-Barlow, 1982).
- Developing a theological statement on the work of the Council as part of the Council's self-evaluation.
- Including the voice of others, such as representatives from the Total Ministry Task Force, through presentations to the Council and in general discussions of the Council.

Much of the work and many of the accomplishments of the Council are not evidenced by written documents, larger conferences, or particular recommendations. The Council often serves the Church simply by bringing people together, raising questions, and focusing discussions. And it is often in the discussions in response to reports and presentations by boards, commissions, agencies, and others that broader issues are raised and practical actions suggested. The contents of this report and the specific recommendations to General Convention can, therefore, only begin to indicate the importance of the Council to the development of ministry in the Church.

### Study of the Diaconate Ministry

#### *Background and Purpose of the Study*

The House of Bishops requested the Council for the Development of Ministry (CDM) to sponsor a study of the permanent diaconate in 1978. Dr. Adair T. Lummis of Hartford Theological Seminary developed the research design and was the primary author of the report, *The Church, the Diaconate, the Future*, which was submitted by the Council to the House of Bishops at the 1979 General Convention. As a result of this submission, the House of Bishops requested the CDM to undertake a further study of the diaconal nature of the Church. With the support of CDM, Adair Lummis continued her research study of the permanent diaconate by an evaluative survey of the diaconate programs in eight dioceses: Albany, California, Central Florida, Hawaii, Michigan, Pittsburgh, Nevada, and Spokane. Representatives from these dioceses, with Dr. Lummis, Mr. D. Barry Menez, and the CDM Field Officer, constituted the research committee. *Raising Up Servant Ministry: Eight Dioceses Work Toward the Future of the Diaconate and the Enablement of Servant Ministry* is the final report of the project. The full report may be obtained from the Office for Ministry Development.

*Raising Up Servant Ministry* does not tell what should be but what is being done, and how laity, deacons, priests, and bishops feel about the diaconate programs in their dioceses. The survey monitored the recruitment, education, training, deployment, and accountability of deacons within the participating dioceses. Data were collected on deacons now in training but not yet ordained, and on those who have been ordained for varying periods of time. An effort was 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 purpose of *Raising Up Servant Ministry* is to use the experience of eight dioceses in developing their programs and deploying recent graduates of these programs to illuminate issues involved in describing and implementing the concept of the diaconate as an ordained position symbolic of and actualized by engaging in servant ministry.

*Major Findings of the Study*

According to the report, one of the challenges that any diocese or congregation must face in maximizing the impact of deacons is to help others in the diocese or congregation understand what a permanent deacon is. The symbolic importance of the deacon, at the very least, will not be fully realized without this understanding.

Both in the national sample and in the participating dioceses, the definition of what a deacon is still varies from congregation to congregation, even among those with deacons, and there is no significant difference between the 1978 and 1983 surveys in proportions of clergy supervisors and deacons who report "how well the bulk of the congregation understands what a permanent deacon is." The clergy supervisors and deacons were slightly more optimistic than the lay leaders about what proportion of their congregations understood what a permanent deacon is, although a majority of each in the participating dioceses thought that at least "quite a few" in their congregations understood.

Nevertheless, as far as understanding what the deacon is supposed to be and do in the *diocese as a whole* (presumably primarily among clergy, and lay leaders or diocesan commissions and committees), the participating dioceses appear to have made a better showing than the 1978 national sample. In the 1978 survey nearly two-thirds of the clergy supervisors felt that in their dioceses "the permanent diaconate was in a gray area with few, if any, distinctive features." But only about half the clergy supervisors in the 1983 study of the eight participating dioceses agreed that this statement reflected the situation in their dioceses, and their opinion was echoed by an identical proportion of lay leaders in churches where there were deacons.

Despite this improvement exhibited by the participating dioceses in 1983 over the 1978 national sample in developing a diocesan definition or understanding of the diaconate, there are substantial ambiguities, disagreements, and dilemmas in and among the participating dioceses in conceptualizing the diaconate, symbolically and practically. In the full report, there is a discussion of the qualities or achievements that are or should be required for and recognized by ordination to the diaconate. The full report also considers whether, to what extent, and how ordination enhances the ministry of the deacon. Another set of ambiguities and disagreements, not unrelated to the ones surrounding the area of diaconal ordination, is discussed: To what extent and in what ways is the diaconate a separate but equal order to the priesthood?

Underlying the specific issues and concerns that the survey raises is the need to have a coherently developed theology of diaconal ministry that is shared by a diocese as a whole. Such a theology, moreover, needs to include a clear description of what a deacon is and is to do. The report itself identifies five purposes or roles of the deacons that are most often perceived by both laity and the ordained: the deacon as (1) a symbol of servant ministry; (2) a person committed to develop and execute a ministry; (3) a liturgist and in most situations a preacher; (4) an authorized leader in the Church; and (5) an enabler of lay ministry. While these roles may complement each other, they more accurately reflect a range of expectations that are often taken for granted as complementary when in fact they reflect significant and unresolved tensions between differing concepts of ministry and the diaconate.

Such questions and dilemmas understandably create difficulties in knowing how best to design a training program for persons interested in the permanent diaconate. Leaders in the eight dioceses worked hard at developing their training programs and created some innovative solutions. However, few in these dioceses would consider their diaconal programs "perfect" and were continuously engaged in trying to improve them. This resulted in substantial changes being made in most of the programs in the eight dioceses during the course of the three-year study. A major dilemma in designing diaconate training

programs is deciding how much emphasis should be placed on teaching the basics of biblical exegesis, theology, Church history, and Christian ethics in comparison to the emphasis placed on practical ministerial skills, such as counseling, preaching, and designing programs and procedures involving the laity in ministries in the Church and community.

Another set of dilemmas uncovered by research in these participating dioceses was in the area of deployment and oversight of deacons. Even within these eight dioceses, there were different theological perspectives on whether the deacon should be ordained to a particular congregation from which he or she was raised up, or ordained to the diocese to be attached directly to the bishop and deployed as he wished. Most of the dioceses in the current study fell between these extremes, revealing a mixed pattern of deployment. Oversight of deacons by either the diocese or clergy supervisors, though an area that certainly showed improvement in the participating dioceses over the national survey, still seems to need some more work in most of these dioceses. For example, a majority of the eight dioceses had no clear guidelines as to what should happen when the rector leaves the congregation. Without a clear, consensual definition of the diaconate, and, with no clear relationship between education and the ministry the deacon is expected to do, these further ambiguities remain sources of potential problems.

Lay leaders, clergy supervisors, and deacons themselves were asked in the participating dioceses, in regard to a variety of areas of congregational life, whether the area had improved or deteriorated since the deacon has been serving in the congregation, as well as how much of this change (if any) could be attributed to the deacon. The survey revealed that, overall, the most noticeable improvement in congregational life they attribute to the deacon is the highly visible Sunday morning service, where an increase in "quality" was observed and attributed to the deacon both by lay leaders and clergy supervisors. Second, they noticed the deacon's impact on the proportion of members who were now actively involved in the church's service and ministry. Deacons were also credited to a somewhat lesser extent in improving the image and reputation of the church with the surrounding community among nonparishioners and local commercial and civic organizations. Generally, the deacons appear to be having an impact in the participating dioceses on enabling lay ministry and bringing the world to the Church and the Church to the world.

For all these reasons, almost all of the lay leaders, clergy supervisors, and deacons surveyed in the participating dioceses agreed at least moderately with the statement that "the renewal of the diaconate should be continued and encouraged by the national Episcopal Church and this diocese," and over two-thirds of each group *strongly* advocated this as a diocesan and national Church policy. In addition, 80% of 107 bishops surveyed in 1984 agreed with this statement at least moderately (50% agreed *strongly*). The report concludes that the climate looks favorable for dioceses and the national Church to continue working toward the future of the diaconate and the enablement of servant ministry. There is an increasing enthusiasm and sense of purpose and importance in the diaconate as it aids in the development of ministry in the Church.

### *Comment and Discussion*

The value of the survey is that it indicates how people are responding to what is happening. The gleanings should be helpful in identifying areas and issues that need to be considered by dioceses that are reviewing programs, and especially by those that are just beginning diaconate programs. In addition to the findings in this report, dioceses would be aided by examining specific diocesan programs for the development and support of diaconate ministry.

One clear tendency from the eight dioceses surveyed is the professionalization of the diaconate. A profession may be defined as a body of experts who are in command of a particular body of knowledge, giving them authority to provide counsel and direction to others and thereby providing them with respect and esteem from those they serve. Although ordained ministry is more than a profession, it has increasingly become at least a professional occupation. The result is seen in several areas.

Deacons are sacramental signs of the ministry to which all Christians are called in baptism. The deacon's role, however, most often focuses on doing ministry within the congregation—for example, visiting the sick and shut-ins, teaching, organizing lay members, and participating in liturgical worship. In consequence, the deacon tends to become an assistant to the priest. The distinctive ministry of the deacon then becomes less a sacramental sign for the people of God (the *laos*) and more a separate ministry. This may be seen as a higher ministry than the laity, although lower than the priest, especially since most deacons work part-time and are not paid.

Professionalization is reflected in the expectation that deacons should enable the ministry of the laity. Enabling often means the ability to recruit, develop, and manage volunteers who engage in a variety of projects. Education, accordingly, needs to provide specialized skills in this area. At present, education for the diaconate is focused on the traditional theological disciplines. However, the courses required for candidates for the diaconate are less rigorous than those required for candidates for the priesthood. The desire for equality with the priesthood and at the same time distinctiveness has led many of those surveyed to criticize this focus. However, instead of looking at what it means for deacons to be raised up from communities as sacramental signs of servanthood, the response has been to propose the development of a new profession, the deacon as professional "enabler" of ministry.

The effectiveness of recruitment and selection, education, placement, supervision, and support of deacons is dependent upon a clear conception of the diaconate that is shared throughout a diocese. When this is not present, there is conflict between expectations for the deacon, skills and training, and opportunities for ministry. The conflict may focus on the deacon's relationship with a congregation or with the priest with whom he or she works. There may be no clear relationship between the deacon's education and the ministry the deacon is expected to do. Or there simply may be no supervision and support for the deacon and his or her ministry.

In spite of current enthusiasm, all should not be viewed as in order. From those surveyed in *Raising Up Servant Ministry*, it is clear that there is not a consistent or necessarily coherent vision of what the diaconate should be, specifically what is distinctive about what the deacon is to do in order to be an effective sacramental sign of our common ministry of servanthood in Christ.

### Study 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. During the 1979-82 triennium, a study began of the several score clergy, ordained under this Canon to provide sacramental and pastoral ministries for communities that are isolated geographically or ethnically, by identifying, training, ordaining, and supporting those in the local communities under different standards and with geographical restrictions on movement. The beginning review centered on consultations held in 1981 and 1982 in Arizona. The practice was affirmed as one limited to specific geographic and ethnic situations, but seen to offer some learnings and inspiration for the Church at large. It appeared that a practice begun

for economic and geographical reasons might be turning into a creative alternative model of clergy ministry.

In the present triennium, 1982-85, the study continued under the supervision of Dr. Timothy Sedgwick, the Very Rev. John Booty, and the Rev. Paul Towner, using the professional research services of the Rev. James L. Lowery of Enablement, Inc., and became formalized as "The Canon 8 Project." At the same time the Dioceses of Alaska and Nevada had the elements of their Canon 8 programs evaluated by another party.

Nevada's Canon 8 thrust is part of a complete restructuring of the Diocese in a total ministry context aimed at self-support. This was achieved in 1984 by providing every parish with the means to carry on worship, ministry, and mission outreach in its own area through the raising up and supporting of indigenous ministers, lay and ordained, in each congregation; through making full-time professional clergy roving consultants part of their time; and through people at diocesan headquarters becoming full-time or nearly full-time coordinators and resource people

As a result, the structure of the Diocese has radically changed. Whereas in 1975 there were 22 professional positions in the Diocese of Nevada, in 1982 there were 15 full-time professional positions, nine Canon 8 clergy in congregations, one Canon 8 prison chaplain, and four local candidates still in training, as well as two full-time resource coordinators at headquarters and three regional vicars serving as resource coordinators.

In Alaska, the pioneering Canon 8 jurisdiction, 23 people were ordained in the first ten years of the program. Half of these are seen by the diocese as really successful, and, of these, half are perceived as being outstanding. The strategy was to identify about 15 functions performed by local priests, separate these functions, and ordain sacramentalist priests (under Canon 8) to perform the one function specifically reserved for the priestly order, while commissioning other indigenous people to be pastor, preacher, clerk, teacher, church board head, and so on. The sacramentalists were ordained, but few of the functionaries commissioned. Often terrible pressures are being put on the sacramentalists in the local villages to take on the other functions, which they are not ordained or trained for. According to diocesan staff members this situation was brought about by the resignation of key employees at inconvenient intervals. Staff members also stated that while the diocesan agenda was ministry development, the staff agenda was too often educational development. Nonetheless, a pioneering job was done which has changed the look of the Alaskan church, put more Native Americans and Inuits in leadership positions, and made significant progress toward the still far-off goal of self-support.

The Canon 8 Project discovered that (1) in the first ten years of the existence of the Canon, 51 priests and 21 deacons were ordained under Canon 8; (2) these people were recruited and selected either by the congregation, or the bishop, or by candidates presenting themselves; (3) they were trained by a variety of methods, ranging from reading privately for Orders, to diocesan programs, to use of the Sewanee and Cook School theological education by extension materials, supplemented for ordination purposes; (4) they are usually deployed in the local community; (5) they are very well supervised in some places and receive little supervision in others; (6) they function as teachers, preachers, or pastors as well as sacramentalists; (7) movement out of the original community and diocese is rare; and (8) they are rated as highly effective in what they are doing.

The findings concluded that clergy ordained under Canon 8 are here to stay and appropriate in limited numbers for certain situations. They are more effective and happy under certain concrete conditions. First, Canon 8 clergy work better where there is a push for total shared ministry of clergy and laity: one Body with many equally shared gifts. Second, Canon 8 clergy are more effective and happy where there is a mission strategy for the diocese. Third, there must be support and supervision for Canon 8 clergy.

And, finally, in the rural or isolated situations, a team of Canon 8 clergy combining what sociologist Wade Clark Roof has distinguished as the "locals" and the "cosmopolitans" often succeeds because of the complementary type of support the people turn out to be for each other.

### **Commission on Ministry Review**

The Council, in 1981, in collaboration with diocesan Commissions on Ministry, undertook a study and evaluation of the roles and functions of Commissions on Ministry (COMs) as they have evolved during their first ten years. During the ten years that COMs were organized in compliance with the canons, the CDM and the Board for Theological Education (BTE) were asked by COMs for help in planning and reorganization. After ten years, many believed that COMs had come to the end of a natural life cycle and wanted to examine closely their past and future work.

An evaluation instrument, entitled *Commission on Ministry After One Decade: A Resource for Evaluation*, was designed by a joint committee of the CDM and the BTE for the use of diocesan COMs. Training sessions were held in each province to train COMs in the use of *A Resource for Evaluation*. The purpose of the review was to gain a greater understanding of the current experiences of COM's in order to carry on their responsibilities for strengthening ministry throughout the Church in the future. COMs were asked to report on the issues that were identified in the process in order to help the CDM and the BTE provide better support and resources for COM's.

### **PROVINCIAL MEETINGS**

Under the leadership of the provincial representatives, there was a meeting of bishops and diocesan Commission on Ministry representatives in most provinces during the triennium, and some provinces held yearly meetings. 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 in which local concerns for ministry were raised and placed in a national perspective and in which the Council could inform COM representatives of findings discovered in other provinces. These meetings reported on the work of COM's in the screening, selection, and support of persons preparing for the ordained ministry; the relationship between theological seminaries and dioceses; current developments in the permanent diaconate; and specific concerns within the different provinces themselves.

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

**Province**—Nancy BonSignor, representative.

Two colloquies on the support and nurture of the newly ordained took place in 1984. Participants represented nine dioceses, the Episcopal Divinity School, and the Alban Institute. There was a general sense that concern for new clergy was vital for dioceses and seminaries to address. A second gathering in December was called to move toward planning a program design for dioceses to use with new clergy. Such a program would need to be a collaborative effort of diocesan Commissions on Ministry, bishops, seminaries, and the national Church.

### **Province II**—The Rt. Rev. Vincent K. Pettit, representative.

Meeting at Princeton, in 1984, representatives of Province II raised concerns about being more pro-active in recruiting candidates for ordination, the permanent diaconate, and the situation of married seminarians. They also had a dialogue with the Deans of General Theological Seminary and Bexley Hall on the relationship between COM's and the seminaries.

### **Province III**—Patricia G. Drake, representative.

At the 1985 meeting, members of the Province considered the issues around the selection of candidates for ordination. The Rev. Philip G. Porcher gave a presentation on what congregations are looking for in rectors. The Rev. Carole A. Crumley described the work of the Center for Career Development and Ministry in the screening process and the Very Rev. Richard Reid of Virginia Seminary and the Rev. Carole J. McGowan of Bexley Hall discussed issues and concerns of the seminaries. The Rt. Rev. A. Heath Light and the Rt. Rev. Lyman C. Ogilby shared what they look for in aspirants who present themselves for ordination.

### **Province IV**—The Rev. Canon Robert G. Tharp, representative.

Issues raised at the 1984 meeting included continuing education of clergy, training for the permanent diaconate, relationship with aspirants, postulants, and candidates, and support of lay ministry in education. The Rt. Rev. Charles J. Child, Bishop of Atlanta, gave a presentation on the program of that diocese for the selection of candidates for ordination.

### **Province V**—Joseph H. Smith, representative.

Issues raised at 1983 and 1984 meetings included development and training for lay ministry and the perpetual diaconate, how do DCOMs become more humane, need for models for mentors for postulants, dealing with candidates who attend non-Episcopal seminaries, continuing education of clergy, training of black clergy, care of clergy, and dissolution of the pastoral relationship.

### **Province VI**—Eleanor Robinson, representative.

At the 1983 meeting, the Rev. Steven Charleston gave a presentation on the support and development of ministry with Native Americans. Other issues discussed included the permanent diaconate, and the selection and screening of aspirants.

### **Province VII**—The Rev. Richard J. Petranek, representative.

In 1982, advocacy for ministry, an exploration of the ways in which COMs can become nurturing entities for the development of total ministry, was the theme of the provincial meeting. A conference on the problems and issues of dealing with rejected aspirants was held in 1983. In 1984 the theme of the provincial meeting was the diaconate and support systems for clergy. Deacon Ormand Plater led a presentation and discussion concerning the diaconate and various training programs for this redeveloping office.

### **Province VIII**—The Rev. Paul E. Towner, representative.

The major issues at the 1983 provincial meeting were the diaconate, its history, theology, and current use in terms of recruitment, selection, training, deployment, su-

pervision, and support. In 1984, presentations and workshops on using *A Resource for Evaluation* were held. At the provincial meeting, the Church Divinity School of the Pacific, its present curriculum, faculty, mission, and goals; spiritual development of candidates for ordination; and the Roland Allen Conference were discussed. In 1985, the major issues considered were career and personal support systems for clergy; preordination diocesan training and evaluation programs; philosophy and methodology of theological education by extension; continuing education for lay and ordained persons; Hispanic ministry; and the diaconate study.

**Province IX**—The Rev. Ashton J. Brooks, representative.

Development of a clear articulation of a theology of ministry on which to base a support system for full-time and self-supporting ministries is under way.

In September 1983, a conference on the theology of ministry was held, the first of its kind in Province IX. Two Province IX regional conferences, held in August 1984, raised the following needs: local theological and ministry training, establishment of theological libraries, and continuing education programs for clergy and laity. A November 1984 resolution committed the CDM "to continue its interest in the development of ministry in Province IX as it pursues autonomy, be an advocate for such development, and serve as a resource in terms of ideas, staff, expertise, and in securing funding."

### MINISTRY DEVELOPMENT COLLABORATION

In 1983, the staff position of Field Officer for the Council for the Development of Ministry and that of Coordinator for Mutual Ministry Development were combined, bringing the Council into a closer relationship with the ministry of the laity. This collaboration is reflected in the following two reports.

#### Total Ministry Task Force

The Total Ministry Task Force, a recognized arm of the Education for Mission and Ministry Unit, works on issues involving the development of mutual ministry concepts. It serves as the steering committee for the Total Ministry Network and is both a "think tank" and a group that implements programs encouraging mutual ministry development across the Church. The Task Force exists to enable, affirm, and authenticate total ministry.

The Task Force sponsored a national conference on total ministry in Menlo Park, California, January 1983. The Rt. Rev. Wesley Frensdorff was keynote speaker. The conference included practical workshops and a presentation on diocesan models for supporting and encouraging the ministry of the laity.

In April 1983, three Task Force members made presentations to the CDM on parish, diocesan, and national efforts to develop support systems for total ministry, with particular concern for the ministry of the laity. As a result of this meeting, the Task Force was invited to send a representative to CDM meetings with voice but no vote.

In November 1983, the CDM adopted "Suggested Next Steps for the Ministry of the Laity," which included helping dioceses implement Title III, Canon 29, encouraging Task Force and CDM dialogues, researching and developing systems and structures that embody the values of total ministry, and supporting lay Church workers.

Work in 1984 included the development of *Day by Day*, an audio-visual resource on total ministry and dialogues with seminarians and diocesan mutual ministry commissions. In February 1985, the Task Force sponsored a total ministry conference in Dayton, Ohio, with Verna Dozier as keynote speaker.

A number of issues have been considered by the Task Force during the triennium, including ministry in the workplace, clergy-lay relations, the theology of work, support, and accountability of ministry in the world, skill training for clergy to help them support the ministry of the laity, rejected aspirants, lay professionals, diocesan structures for support of the ministry of the laity, and authenticating, validating, and commissioning of lay ministries.

### **Seminarians with Lay Vocations**

The goal of the Network of Seminarians with Lay Vocations, established in 1980, is twofold: to encourage lay theological education and to support students with lay vocations in seminaries. In January 1984, the Network held its third conference for students in nonordination programs at Episcopal seminaries. Forty-eight students and faculty from eight seminaries attended "A Celebration of the Ministry of the Laity" at the College of Preachers in Washington, DC. Dr. Marianne Micks of Virginia Theological Seminary provided the keynote address, and Dr. Frances Young preached at the closing Eucharist. Workshops explored vocational discernment, seminary shaping, and the ministry of the laity in the workplace and in the institutional Church. Employment possibilities for lay seminary graduates were presented in a Jobs Idea Notebook compiled from reports by recent graduates.

The Network Steering Committee prepared a brochure entitled, *Is Seminary for Me If I'm Not Thinking About Ordination?* This was published by the Office for Ministry Development and sent to every seminary admissions office. Response has been positive, and the Network hopes to make the brochure more widely available in dioceses and parishes.

The Steering Committee is an advocate to the Total Ministry Task Force and the Council for the Development of Ministry, and voices concerns to the seminary deans. Steering Committee members organize activities for seminarians with lay vocations at their campuses and foster interseminary communication. The Network is jointly sponsored by the Office for Ministry Development and the Board for Theological Education.

### **REVIEW OF TITLE III CANONS**

The 67th General Convention asked the Council for the Development of Ministry to act in consultation with the Standing Commission on Constitution and Canons for a thorough review of the Title III canons (Resolution C-13A). From the beginning, the Committee, to whom this responsibility was entrusted, agreed that the task involved making no substantial changes. Its task was to clarify the practical realities already in place and in effect. The following issues were used as a basis for review:

1. Designing the Canons in a more logical order, in view of the Church's understanding of ministry and in light of the Book of Common Prayer.
2. Clarifying language, for example not to use "minister" or "ministry" when reference is made to ordained persons alone; identifying order—bishop, priest, or deacon—when specific reference is made.
3. Whenever the term "member of the clergy" is used in these Canons, it shall be understood to refer to a person ordained or received as a bishop, priest, or deacon as the Canons of this Church prescribe.
4. In some cases, the words "rector" and "parish" are used due to legal necessity under the corporate charters of the states in which the parish resides.

5. It will be noted that III. 12.5(a)(1) can be considered a substantial change. At present, a person already ordained by a bishop in historic succession must be received into a diocese as a deacon of this Church, and be such for four months, before being received as a priest. The new Canon would “receive the person into this Church in the Order to which he has already been ordained by a Bishop in the historic succession. . . .”

The Council is grateful for the early leadership of the Rt. Rev. Wesley Frensdorff, Bishop of Nevada, who, with the Rev. John C. Keester and the Rev. Canon Robert G. Tharp, made up the original committee. Canon Tharp continued on as chair and was joined by the Rt. Rev. John F. Ashby, Bishop of Western Kansas, and the Rev. Craig W. Casey. During that time, the committee has met with a subcommittee of the Standing Commission on Constitution and Canons, and otherwise been in touch with them on a regular basis. Our thanks also to the Rev. Canon Charles Scott, who did editorial work for the committee.

The full text of the Title III Canons review, published as a separate document for distribution to all bishops and deputies, should be considered as part of this report. The report and text are now offered to the 68th General Convention with the following resolutions:

**Resolution #A—113**

Revision of Title III Canons.

*Resolved, the House of \_\_\_\_\_ concurring, That Title III, Canons 1-30 be repealed in their entirety and the text of Title III, Canons 1-30 as submitted by the Council for the Development of Ministry be adopted by this 68th General Convention.*

**Resolution #A—114**

Continuance of a committee to review Title III.

*Resolved, the House of \_\_\_\_\_ concurring, That the Council for the Development of Ministry be requested to continue its review of Title III Canons in order to propose necessary substantial changes to the 69th General Convention.*

**Resolution #A—115**

Amend Canons for sexually inclusive language.

*Whereas, the Constitution and Canons of the Episcopal Church use language that now in common usage is either ambiguous or sexually exclusive; therefore, be it*

*Resolved, the House of \_\_\_\_\_ concurring, That the 68th General Convention charge the Standing Commission on Constitution and Canons to review and revise the Constitution and Canons in order to ensure usage of language that is consistently sexually inclusive.*

**Resolution #A—116**

Amend Title III.22.

*Resolved, the House of \_\_\_\_\_ concurring, That Title III, Canon 22 be amended as follows:*

CANON 22.

Of the Dissolution of the Pastoral Relation

Sec. 1. Except as provided in III.21, Sec. 10, a Rector may not resign his Parish without the consent of the said Parish, or its Trustees, whichever may be authorized to act in the premises, nor may any Rector canonically or lawfully elected and in charge of any Parish be removed therefrom by said Parish, Vestry, or Trustees, against his will, except as hereinafter provided.

Sec. 2. If for any urgent reason a Rector or Minister as aforesaid, or the body authorized to elect a Rector in the Parish committed to his charge, shall desire a separation and dissolution of the pastoral relation, and the parties be not agreed respecting a separation and dissolution, notice in writing may be given by either party to the Ecclesiastical Authority of the Diocese. ~~The Bishop, in case the difference be not settled by his godly judgment, shall ask the advice and consent of the Standing Committee of the Diocese, and proceeding with its aid and counsel, shall be the ultimate arbiter and judge. If the Diocese be vacant, the Ecclesiastical Authority shall select a Bishop of an adjacent Diocese to act as Bishop, and with like force and effect. The judgment shall be either that the pastoral relation between the parties shall cease and determine at a time and upon terms therein specified, or that the said relation shall not be terminated, and such judgment shall be binding upon both parties. In the event of the failure or refusal of either party to comply with the terms of such judgment, the Bishop may inflict such penalties as may be provided by the Constitution and Canons of the Diocese, and in default of any provisions for such penalties therein, the Bishop may (1) in the case of a Rector, or Minister, suspend such Rector or Minister from the exercise of his priestly office until he shall comply with said judgment, (2) in the case of a Vestry or Trustees, recommend to Diocesan Convention that the union of the Parish or Mission with Convention shall cease until they have complied with his judgment.~~

Sec. 3. ~~In the case of the regular and canonical dissolution of the connection between a Rector or Minister and his Parish, under this Canon, the Ecclesiastical Authority shall direct the Secretary of the Convention to record the same. As chief pastor of the Diocese, the Bishop shall thereupon initiate a procedure to ascertain the current situation in said Parish and the role therein of the Rector, the Vestry, and the Congregation, which report shall be completed and reported in writing to the Bishop within ninety days. Upon receipt of the report, the Bishop or his Deputy shall mediate to assist in resolving the dispute. It shall be the duty of all concerned to labor for the amicable resolution of differences.~~

Sec. 4. *In the event that any person is accused of any canonical or moral offense, he shall be entitled to representation, a written bill of particulars, and the name of accusers, and all rights set out in Title IV of these Canons.*

Sec. 5. *If either party shall continue to desire dissolution of the pastoral relation, after completion of the pastoral process described in Section 3, the Bishop shall proceed as follows:*

*(a) Within thirty days after such notice, the Bishop shall render a godly judgment, with the advice and consent of the Standing Committee, after a*

hearing if so requested by the Rector. The Bishop shall be the ultimate arbiter and judge.

(b) If the pastoral relation is to be continued, the Bishop shall require the parties to agree on definitions of responsibility and accountability for Rector, Vestry, and Congregation.

(c) If the relation is to be dissolved:

(1) The Bishop shall set forth in writing the reasons for the dissolution.

(2) A copy of this judgment shall be sent to the Secretary of the Diocesan Convention to be recorded. It shall be held in confidence, except that at the request of the Rector it shall be accessible to public inspection.

(3) The Bishop shall require such compensation or indemnity as shall seem just and compassionate, and shall undertake to offer, as may be suitable, such supportive services as career counseling and vocational retraining.

Sec. 6. In the event of the failure or refusal of either party to comply with the terms of such judgment, the Bishop may inflict such penalties as may be provided by the Constitution and Canons of the Diocese; and in default of any provisions for such penalties therein, the Bishop may act as follows:

(a) In the case of a Rector, suspend such Rector from the exercise of the priestly office until the suspended Priest shall comply with said judgment.

(b) In the case of a Vestry or Trustees, recommend to Diocesan Convention that the union of the Parish with Convention shall cease until they have complied with the Bishop's judgment.

Sec. 7. If there be no Ordinary, the Ecclesiastical Authority shall select a Bishop of an adjacent Diocese to act as the Bishop, and with like force and effect.

Sec. 8. For urgent cause, the Bishop may extend the time periods specified in this Canon, provided that all be done to expedite these proceedings. All parties shall be notified in writing of the exact length of any time extension that may be provided.

Sec. 4 9. This Canon shall not apply in any Diocese which has made, or shall hereafter make, provision by Canon upon this subject, nor in contravention of any right of any Rector, Minister, Parish, Congregation, or Vestry under the law of the Civil Authority.

EXPLANATION: For some years it has been apparent to many in the Church, including bishops, vestries, and rectors, that there are serious problems with the Canon: "Of the Dissolution of the Pastoral Relation." It is not clear from its present wording that the intention of this Canon is to describe a pastoral process to deal with a breakdown in interpersonal relationships, as opposed to the crimes, negligences, etc. addressed in Title IV. The present Canon makes no clear and specific provision for the due process and protection of rights that are generally taken for granted in our society. It makes no provision for just compensation and supportive services when a dissolution is effected, a standard of humane business practice that ought to be manifested in the life of the Church. Many authorities believe that bishops, dioceses, vestries, and parishes are unnecessarily exposed to lawsuits when this Canon is applied. This proposed revision is designed to alleviate these problems.

### PREPARATION FOR NEW CHALLENGES

The Council for the Development of Ministry is sensitive to the Church's changing needs for ministry and ministry expression in the future years. This sensitivity is expressed through the process of future agenda building done by the Council. Part of the process of this agenda building consists in listening to various groups within the Church who have ministry concerns and interests. At times, these groups appear before the Council in person. At other times, their interests are brought to the Council through various represented agencies or the provincial representatives. In any case, primary effort is always given to listening to the voice of the Church as it seeks to develop Christ's ministry in the world.

The Council has had interesting and productive discussions with such groups as the Total Ministry Task Force, the Standing Commission on the Church in Small Communities, the Standing Commission on the Church in Metropolitan Areas, the Evangelism and Congregational Development Ministries of EFMM, the Committee on Episcopal Ministry in Institutions, the National Network of Episcopal Clergy Associations, and others who have ministry as a primary concern.

From time to time the Council is asked to perform special studies and projects by various agencies of General Convention. Some of this work is published for the Church at large and some is done in cooperation with other agencies. A complete listing of CDM published works may be obtained from the Office for Ministry Development. The Council is frequently asked to do research and background work on the Canons of the Church that deal with ministry. The restructuring of Title III, for example, that is presented to this 1985 General Convention, is an example of that work.

As part of its service to the Church the Council provides leadership to the Provincial Diocesan Commission on Ministry conference. A significant conference held in Province IX in 1983 will have far-reaching ramifications in the development of ministry in Latin America.

Some future agenda items will be built on unresolved issues and unfinished business, but much of the work of the Council will center on issues brought to CDM by various agencies and representatives within the Church itself. The Council has been in dialogue with representatives from the so-called ethnic desks at the national Church headquarters about the special ministry needs and contributions their segment of the Church has. The CDM is becoming more and more involved with the ministry of the laity and lay ministry training programs. Questions involving theological education and especially the education of those entering the permanent diaconate are anticipated areas of study. A few dioceses are now beginning to experiment with a philosophy called "recruitment for ministry." This may demand a close study on behalf of the whole Church. The Council for Women's Ministries is presenting some exciting new challenges to the ministry expressions of the Church, and the CDM expects to be involved in these new directions. CDM always deals with various aspects of the total ministry concept and is currently considering some work on diocesan structures that would allow total ministry to develop. This does not exhaust the list of possibilities, but it does give a sense of the direction that CDM will be taking in the future.

The Council for the Development of Ministry is not a monolithic structure that always speaks with one mind and one voice on every issue. As changing demands and needs in ministry produce tension in the Church, so that tension is reproduced on the Council itself. A central task for the Council is always to seek ways to use this tension creatively. The CDM is constantly exploring ways of developing better lines of communication, of creating meeting formats that will allow the maximum exchange of ideas,

of dealing with developing ministries in ethnic or geographical communities, of serving both as a forum and as an action group, of hearing all representative voices within the Church, and of dealing with the demands placed upon it to become an advocate for certain models of ministry.

In all things, the Council for the Development of Ministry invites response and comments from readers of this report. The Council is here to serve the Church as it seeks to express the love of Christ through the ministry of the Church in God's world.

**Resolution #A—117**

***Resolved*, the House of \_\_\_\_\_ concurring, That the 68th General 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*  
The Rev. John T. Docker, *Field Officer*