

Common and Uncommon Themes Between the Collaborative and Mission Models

Common Themes Between Structures

1. Both structures recognize the need to organize ourselves in a way that prevents duplicative, competing work among our leadership groups.
2. Both structures stress communication that helps the people of the diocese feel empowered in their call to ministry and mission.
3. Both structures encourage relationships among the parishes and missions of the diocese to share resources that enable doing the best job we can at fulfilling the work that God calls us to do.
4. Both structures propose the merger of Corporation and Council, since both groups work on programs involving investments, mission facilities, and other common issues.
5. Both structures propose a change from the present seven deaneries to three. The intent in the Collaborative model is to provide critical mass and synergy among deanery members to accomplish a higher level of functionality in the deaneries. The intent in the Mission model is to optimize the geographic running of programs and mission work.
6. Both structures propose that the Deaneries elect their own leaders, as opposed to them being appointed positions.
7. Both structures propose the same Standing Committee functions as we have today; namely, that they serve as council of advice to the Bishop, have responsibility in the ordination process, help in matters of ecclesiastical discipline, personnel issues, and in the alienation and sale of property.
8. Both structures propose that the number of positions on the diocesan office staff remain at the present level.
9. Both structures propose that the work of Convention Secretary be limited to the work of Convention. Other diocesan bodies would elect their own secretaries.
10. Both structures propose that delegates be elected to Convention on the basis of a congregation's Average Sunday Attendance, as opposed to the present basis of Communicants in Good Standing.
11. Both structures propose that the present DIEM be renamed the Department of Missions, and that it be broadened in scope to provide oversight of ALL missions, and guidance for small struggling parishes.
12. Both structures confirm that Convention determines program and budget for the diocese.
13. Both structures confirm that the diocesan office staff must manage all bookkeeping of income and expenditures of all diocesan funds.
14. Both structures confirm the need to make responsibilities of diocesan groups well defined and simplified.
15. Both structures confirm that we be meticulous to abide by the Constitution and Canons of the Episcopal Church and the Diocese.

16. Both structures confirm our understanding that structure alone will not solve the problems we have experienced in recent years. Healthy functioning of our work as diocese will depend on our implementation details, and on our spirit of working together to accomplish God's mission for our Diocese.

Differences Between the Two Structures

- 1) Program Management
 - a) The Collaborative model places program management authority in the centralized Board of Trustees, with appointed committees of diocesan members reporting to the Board.
 - b) The Mission Model places program management authority in the Great Commission Council, and places the work in the regional Convocations.
- 2) Membership of the Board of Trustees / Great Commission Council
 - a) The Board of Trustees in the Collaborative model consists of 12 members, plus 2 ex officio voting members, the Bishop and Treasurer.
 - b) The Great Commission Council in the Mission model consists of 12 members, plus 2 ex officio non-voting members, the Bishop and Canon for Evangelism and Congregational Growth.
- 3) Mission Oversight
 - a) The Collaborative model provides mission oversight in the Department of Missions, reporting to the Bishop.
 - b) The Mission model provides mission oversight in the Convocations, reporting to the Great Commission Council.
- 4) Education Oversight
 - a) The Collaborative model proposes education oversight directly by the Bishop.
 - b) The Mission model proposes education oversight by the Convocations.
- 5) Funding
 - a) The Collaborative model proposes administration of funds by the Board of Trustees, as decided by the Convention. The Board may decide to fund local projects.
 - b) The Mission model proposes control of a specific percentage of diocesan funds by the Convocations, providing local control of programs.