

Report #3

Diocesan Evaluation and Structure Committee

August 5, 2006

Agenda

- Opening Remarks, Guidelines for Forum
- Pros & Cons presentation for Mission Model
- Pros & Cons presentation for Shared-Traditional Model
- Q&A Forum on Structure
- Funding presentation
- Q&A Forum on Funding

Forum Guidelines

Presentation of two proposed Diocesan Structures-90 minutes.

- The presentation of each structural model will be 10 minutes in length. Total time 20 minutes
- After the presentations of the structural models, each person asking questions or making comments from the floor will have three minutes to speak. Those who wish to speak again must wait until all those who have not spoken and wish to have had their turn. Total time for questions and comments will be 1 hour and 10 minutes.

Presentation on the four proposed funding formulae-70 minutes.

- The presentation on the four funding formulae will be 10 minutes long.
- After the presentation on the funding formulae each person asking questions or making comments from the floor will have three minutes to speak. Those who wish to speak again must wait until all those who have not spoken and wish to have had their turn. Total time for questions and comments will be 1 hour.

Note: During the question/comment time remarks should be addressed to the moderator. There is no debate between speakers.

Mission Model Structure

August 5, 2006

Key Elements

- Diocesan bodies united through regular communications and collaborative governance style.
- GCC responsible for all programs which engage ECR in the Great Commission.
- Convocations provide local emphasis and customizing of programs, funding priorities, structure to meet local needs.
- Parish and Mission members directly engaged in the mission, ministry, programs of the diocese.

Pros p1

- Strong emphasis on communications and collaboration among diocesan governing bodies.
- Refocus of diocesan hub on enabling, empowering, encouraging, training, sharing best established practice, providing central resources to enhance the work of every member congregation.
- Charter of GCC to push out all possible program implementation to Regional Convocations, providing empowerment, training, budget resources, etc.

Pros p2

- Convocations determine local structure and program focus, determining funding level from diocesan budget.
- Every parishioner feels engaged in purposeful service, needed, knowledgeable of ministry and mission beyond local parish.

Pros p3

- Adopting this model conveys to bishop candidates and the national church that we are not accepting *status quo*. We require a bishop modeling collaborative ministry.
- Rejecting *status quo* also communicates our commitment to model vital growth not found nationally in the Episcopal Church, versus merely changing documents to match current reality in funding and structure.

Cons

- This refocus will require transition time for changes in membership of governing bodies-(areas of expertise, # of representatives).
- A period of training and defining of policies and procedures will be required in the diocesan hub and in the Convocations.

SHARED- TRADITIONAL STRUCTURE

Merger of Customary and Shared
August 5, 2006

KEY ELEMENTS

- Program management at local level possible if initiated locally
- Secular function in Council-Corporation
- Ministerial and canon-mandated functions in Standing Committee, e.g, responsibilities in ordinations, vicars, ecclesiastical discipline, personnel issues, dissolution pastoral relationship.
- Oversight of all missions by Dept. of Missions, Bishop and staff
- Structure rationalized, simplified, flexible, efficient
- Diocesan Secretary focuses on convention; other bodies elect secretaries

COUNCIL-CORPORATION

- Council merged into Corporation.
- Members constitute Corporation Board, legal entity
- Responsibilities for Finance (budget, investments, risk management), Property, Stewardship, Programs, Communications.
- Subcommittee for each responsibility; members appointed by Council-Corp., except Finance by Bishop with concurrence of Council-Corporation
- Campus ministries
- Camp-Conference Center (when and if)

COUNCIL-CORPORATION ELECTIONS

- THREE OPTIONS (and dependent on whether/how deaneries reconfigured)
 - A. 20 members elected by 7 deaneries on the basis of ASA of each deanery. 2/3 lay, 1/3 clergy.
 - B. 12 members elected at Convention from slate of Nominating Committee charged with finding nominees with requisite expertise and with geographic dispersal. At least one lay, one clergy from each deanery
 - C. 11 members. Each of 5 deaneries elects 1. Other 6 (half lay, half clergy) from Nominating Committee as in B.

PROS

- Roles and Responsibilities clear
- Encourages but does not mandate local people to initiate local programs
- Diocesan programs maintained if not begun by deaneries
- Keeps consolidation of resources for accomplishing programs efficiently

CONS

- Does not force local leadership and program management
- Does not require multi-congregational collaborations
- Deaneries, given their history, might not assume responsibility for any programs
- Not enough of a change for some people

TRANSITION

- Rewrite Constitution and Canons and present to October 2007 (and 2008 for Constitution) Convention for approval
- Restructure deaneries in first four months after October 2006 Convention.
- [Elect Nominating Committee at October 2006 Convention.]
- [Nominating Committee] OR [Deaneries] OR [both] presents candidates for new positions at October 2007 convention.
- Council-Corporation and Standing Committee work together in 2007 to determine optimum committee structure and find the best people to populate those committees.

COMMON THEMES OF TWO STRUCTURES

DESC

August 5, 2006

NEEDS

- Legislative side of Diocese needs to avoid competing, duplicative work
- People of ECR must feel empowered in their call to ministry and mission
- Share resources among 51 parishes and missions to do the best job we can at fulfilling the work that God calls us to do

COMMON STRUCTURAL ELEMENTS p1

- Merge Corporation and Council
- Consider the reconfiguration of deaneries; Reduce from 7 to 5 for shared-traditional, establish 3 larger Convocations for the Mission model , or keep the 7 deanery structure that we now have
- Diocesan staff positions should remain as they are today

p2

- All deanery leadership positions would be open to qualified persons in either order. But clericus with regional leadership and close connection to bishop is necessary.
- Confine work of Convention Secretary to Convention. Other bodies elect own secretaries; Convention Secretary is mentor for other secretaries.

p3

- Elect delegates to Convention on the basis of a congregation's Average Sunday Attendance, not number of communicants.
- Standing Committee is council of advice to Bishop; responsibilities in ordination matters, ecclesiastical discipline, personnel issues, and in the alienation and sale of property

p4

- Oversight of missions should include both Anglo and ethnic missions; small parishes in need of guidance
- Convention determines program and budget for the diocese
- Diocesan administrative staff manages income and dispersal of all diocesan funds
- Make responsibilities well defined. Rationalize, simplify

- Abide by Constitution and Canons of the Episcopal Church and the Diocese.
- Structure alone will not solve problems. Implementation, including willingness of all members of our diocese to work together, is essential.



