

**The Council for the  
Development of Ministry**

**CONTENTS**

Membership ----- 308  
Structure----- 309  
Summary of the Council’s Work ----- 309  
Provincial Meetings----- 324  
Financial Report for the 1996-97 Triennium ----- 328  
Future Challenges for CDM----- 328  
Proposed Budget for the 1998-2000 Triennium ----- 329  
Resolution to Continue CDM ----- 329  
Appendix: Reports of Conferences and Membership Groups ----- 329

**MEMBERSHIP**

*Agency Board Representatives (1994-1997)*

- Dr. Harold H. Brown, Board for Theological Education
- The Very Rev. Joel A. Gibson, Board for Church Deployment
- The Rev. Noreen P. Suriner, Church Pension Group
- The Very Rev. Guy F. Lytle III, Council of Seminary Deans
- The Rev. Bavi Rivera-Moore, Executive Council
- The Rt. Rev. F. Clayton Matthews, House of Bishops Committee on Pastoral Development,  
*Vice Chair*
- The Rt. Rev. Robert H. Johnson, House of Bishops Committee on Ministry
- The Rev. Carolyn S. Keil, Standing Commission on the Church in Small Communities
- The Very Rev. J. Earl Cavanaugh, Standing Commission on Metropolitan Areas

*Provincial Representatives*

- Mr. Edward Farrell (Province I) 1998
- The Rev. Jorge M. Gutierrez (Province II) 2001
- The Rev. James C. Ransom (Province III) 1997
- Ms. Karen Keele (Province IV) 2000
- Ms. Mary Ann Miya (Province V) 2000
- Ms. Ellen Bruckner (Province VI) 2000
- The Rev. James E. Liggett (Province VII) 2001
- The Rev. Roberto Arciniega (Province VIII) 1997
- The Rev. Francisco Duque (Province IX) 2000

*Members for Triennium (1994-1997)*

- The Rev. Paul M. Collins, National Network of Episcopal Clergy Associations
- The Rev. Carol Gallagher, Committee on the Status of Women
- Ms. Ruth L. Schmidt, National Network of Lay Professionals
- Br. Justus Van Houten, SSF, North American Association for the Diaconate
- The Rev. Sandra Holmburg, Cornerstone Project

*Chair*

The Rev. Randolph K. Dales (New Hampshire) 1997

*Staff*

The Rev. John T. Docker, Coordinator for Professional Ministry Development, *Staff Officer*  
The Rev. Preston T. Kelsey II, Executive Director, Board for Theological Education  
The Rt. Rev. Harold Hopkins, Executive Director, Office of Pastoral Development  
The Rev. James Wilson, Executive Director, Church Deployment Office  
The Rt. Rev. Frank Cerveny, Executive Vice President, Church Pension Group  
Dr. Carol Hampton, Congregational Ministries Cluster

All of the members of the Council present at the November 6 - 8, 1996 meeting concurred with this report.

*Council representatives at General Convention*

Bishop Clayton F. Matthews and Deputies Randolph K. Dales, Sandra Holmburg, Jorge M. Gutierrez, Paul M. Collins, Carolyn S. Keil, and Ellen Bruckner are authorized to receive non-substantive amendments to this report.

STRUCTURE

The Council for the Development of Ministry (CDM, also referred to as “the Council”) was created by General Convention in 1976 to succeed the Ministry Council, established five years before. The Council has three categories of voting membership, totaling twenty-four persons: nine provincial representatives, nine agency representatives, five members for the triennium, and a chairperson. Provincial representatives are recommended by provincial meetings of the Commission on Ministry (COM) representatives to the provincial presidents for appointment to CDM for a six-year term. Agency representatives and members for the triennium are appointed by their bodies for three-year terms. Agency representatives are entitled to bring to each meeting staff persons who sit with voice but not vote. A six-member Executive Committee, chaired by the chairperson of CDM, includes the vice chair, one agency representative, one provincial representative, and one member for the triennium.

During the triennium, CDM met twice yearly; each meeting lasted three days. The CDM budget is part of the Professional Ministry Development Cluster (PMD) of the Office of the Presiding Bishop in the Consolidated Budget. The staff officer of CDM is the Coordinator for Professional Ministry Development of the PMD Cluster, and is accountable to the executive of that cluster.

SUMMARY OF THE COUNCIL’S WORK

The Mission Statement, Goal, and Objectives of CDM follow. Under the objectives are the agenda items for the triennium, an account of what was accomplished, and resolutions.

*Mission Statement*

The Council for the Development of Ministry [CDM] acts as leaven among the leadership of a changing Episcopal Church to invigorate all the baptized as they fulfill their ministries.

## DEVELOPMENT OF MINISTRY

---

### *Goal*

To provide a forum for representatives from the nine provinces and organizations concerned with ministry development to identify pertinent issues; to respond and initiate actions which address significant challenges and opportunities before the church.

**OBJECTIVE A.** To gather information and ideas from the church through its constituent bodies, identifying current local, provincial, and national ministry development issues and activities:

*Agenda 1. Discuss and review reports from Provincial Representatives, Agency Representatives, and Members for Triennium at biennial meetings of the Council.*

This agenda was accomplished at the meetings of CDM. The size and brevity of General Convention does not allow for prolonged theological discussion around the practical issues of lay and ordained ministry. In addition, there is no standing body of priests, deacons, and laity equivalent to the House of Bishops' committees on Ministry and Theology. CDM fills this void.

*Agenda 2. Initiate a discussion of the theology of ministry for the future particularly with respect to baptism and ordination.*

An essential component of CDM's work is the nine provincial meetings held annually for bishops and members of COMs. A summary of those meetings is part of this report. Provincial representatives to CDM have used these annual gatherings to initiate a discussion of the theology of ministry for the future with respect to baptism and ordination. CDM believed such a discussion of the theology of ministry, baptism, and ordination was essential for bishops, COMs, seminaries, and representatives of others agencies and committees directly involved in the recruitment, training, deployment of people for ministries in the church--both professional and volunteer. Utilizing the Very Rev. Dr. Guy Fitch Lytle's paper "The Recovery of Priestly Identity and the Revival of the Church," (*Sewanee Theological Review*, 38:3 (1995), 227-240) and chapter III, "Rethinking our Theologies of Ordination," from the Rev. James C. Fenhagen's book *Ministry for a New Time* (Bethesda: Alban Institute, 1995), church leaders from the provinces engaged in conversations about the theological underpinnings of ordination and total/shared ministry. Response at provincial meetings has confirmed CDM's belief that the church has spent insufficient time on these theological tasks at all levels.

To enable this discussion, especially at the diocesan level, CDM developed a process that could be replicated in an appropriate and useful way in every diocese. In addition to the papers cited above, Dean Lytle drafted a bibliography of recent books on the theology of ordained ministry and a check-list of novels, plays, and films dealing directly with issues of the ordained ministry. CDM will make these lists available throughout the church.

As a result of this theological work and the widespread discussions during this triennium, CDM is convinced that even more extensive theological conversation is essential in the future. There is a general lack of a theological foundation in the local dioceses for the work of COMs. Most dioceses acknowledge spending little time developing or discussing a theology of ordained ministry as they assess the "present and future needs for ministry in the diocese." The wider church needs to assist this work by moving from an analysis of the problem to holding up

well-articulated theologies of the ministry of all baptized peoples reflected in the ministries of those in Orders. Topics for future discussion must include: the various understandings and implementations of programs of total ministry; issues of direct ordination and the indelibility of orders; the ordinal in the Book of Common Prayer; clergy identity and wellness, and lay-clergy relations; call and election procedures; and other theoretical and practical considerations. In partnership with other relevant groups, CDM plans to initiate various conferences, publications, etc., to enable these essential conversations to progress.

*Agenda 3. Undertake a review of diocesan practices in the implementation of Title III Canons.*

In the early 1970's, COMs were established in each diocese. These commissions are mandated by canon to assist bishops in the development and affirmation of the ministry of all the baptized and in determining the present and future needs for ministry in the dioceses. During the spring of 1996, CDM circulated a survey questionnaire, to determine the practice of the church in implementing the Title III Canons that lead to ordained ministry. The instrument was professionally designed by the Rev. William S. Stafford, Ph.D. and the Rev. Lawrence Falkowski, Ph.D. and was sent to all active bishops, chairs of COMs and presidents of standing committees. The authors analyzed the data received from 161 responses representing 97 dioceses. The respondents were asked to state their opinions; the resulting data indicate the perspectives of the people responsible for diocesan ordination processes. The complete report is available from the Professional Ministry Development Office at the Episcopal Church Center. The authors and the Council thank the respondents, who took time from demanding ministries to complete the survey. Some observations and a recommendation follow:

- The survey does not reveal any consistent pattern of implementation of the canons throughout the church.
- The number of dioceses that regard postulancy as commitment to ordain are almost equal to those that regard postulancy as merely probationary. This lack of agreement on what step, if any, prior to actual ordination, is definitive, suggests that the categories of "postulancy" and "candidacy" are unclear.
- The number of dioceses that involve the Standing Committee in granting postulancy is almost equal to those that do not.
- The overwhelming majority of respondents believe that their dioceses require an applicant to go through fewer than 25 "steps" from first contact to ordination. In fact, Title III Canons mandate more than 45 steps.
- Under Title III, a congregational process in the local parish gives way to a diocesan process in the Commission on Ministry and (often) Standing Committee, to an academic and communal process in seminary, all of them overlapping and recurring several times, with occasional contacts with a bishop.
- The current Title III process focuses on the credentials and endorsements of the person seeking ordination, not on continuing formation and oversight of the person.
- The canons contain no requirement that dioceses clearly charge anyone with responsibility for shepherding a person through the process in a continuous way, with an eye to the spiritual, academic, and personal formation of a Christian minister.
- Basic steps in the ordination process are defined poorly. Transitions from one stage to the next are unclear and uncertain.

## DEVELOPMENT OF MINISTRY

---

- The examinations leading to certification of candidates' "proficiency" in the seven canonical areas of learning are vexed both by lack of consensus on the meaning of "proficiency," and by disagreement between or within dioceses as to whether the examinations are diagnostic or, rather, must-pass qualifications like the bar exam.
- Respondents are very confident that members of minority groups are not denied access to the discernment process. However, they are much less certain that the process is designed to be "appropriate to the cultural background of the nominees," as the canon requires.
- Few consider their COM to be in the business of *recruiting* clergy as opposed to selecting among those who put themselves forward.

### **Resolution A086 CDM to Review Title III**

- 1 *Resolved*, the House of \_\_\_\_\_ concurring, That the Council for the Development of Ministry
- 2 continue to develop a clear theology of ministry; and be it further
- 3 *Resolved*, That the Council for the Development of Ministry be requested to undertake a full
- 4 review of Title III Canons in order to propose a complete revision to the 73rd General Convention
- 5 in consultation with the Standing Commission on Constitution and Canons.

#### *Explanation*

The review of diocesan practices in implementing Title III Canons indicates a need for a complete review of those canons, keeping in view that the purpose of the ordination process is to identify and form servant leaders in the church. The revision of the Title III Canons must be based on a clear theology of ministry.

*Agenda 4. Ask Commissions on Ministry [COMs] to describe how their ministry development work at the diocesan level relates to their diocesan mission strategy.*

COMs are charged with assisting the bishop "in determining present and future needs for ministry in the Diocese" (Canon III.2.2.(a)). During the triennium the provincial Representatives asked COMs to describe how their ministry development work relates to their diocesan mission strategy. Collations of responses from 60 dioceses in Provinces II, IV, V, VI, and VII show that Canon III.2.2.(a) is mostly ignored. This study showed there to be little official reflection about the needs of the diocese or the overall role of the COM in a larger vision of diocesan mission and ministry. Few of the dioceses that have mission strategies reported that the strategy aids the COM "in determining present and future needs for ministry in the Diocese." Sixty-five percent of the participating COMs had regular contact with the bishop but these meetings were not concerned with diocesan strategy. There was very little relationship between diocesan mission strategy and recruitment and screening of candidates for ordination, nor was diocesan mission strategy a measurement for the annual review of the work of COMs. These findings will be discussed at future provincial meetings.

*OBJECTIVE B.* To act on General Convention resolutions and Provincial or Agency initiatives which focus on ministry needs:

*Agenda 1.* With the Standing Commission on Constitution and Canons, study the role and function of standing committees with regard to the consent process and the selection and certification of candidates for ordination [ 1994: A131a].

At the direction of the 71st General Convention (1994: A131a), and working with the Standing Commission on Constitution and Canons (SCCC), CDM undertook a study of the role and function of Standing Committees in the consent process for the consecration of bishops and in the selection and certification of candidates for ordination. Two papers were commissioned: "Certification of Candidates for Ordination to the Diaconate and Priesthood," by Ms. Alice M. Ramser, and "Consents in Episcopal Elections," by Robert C. Royce, Esq. The full report, *The Role and Function of Standing Committees in the Selection and Certification of Candidates for Ordination to the Priesthood and Diaconate and in the Consent Process for the Ordination and Consecration of Bishops*, is available from the Professional Ministry Development Office at the Episcopal Church Center.

The report proposes no canonical changes with regard to ordination to the priesthood and diaconate but makes the following recommendations:

- A. that the Standing Committee, the COM, and those responsible for mission strategy and clergy meet annually, under the direction of the bishop, to establish goals, explore diocesan ministry needs, develop standards and criteria for recruitment, and agree upon process and procedures;
- B. that Standing Committees work in partnership with COMs so that Standing Committee members have opportunities to meet new applicants, postulants, and candidates, and, if possible, interview all postulants before certifying them for candidacy, and all candidates before certifying them for ordination; and
- C. that CDM evaluate and rewrite Canons III.9, 10, and 11 to clarify the educational process, simplify the specific steps and include the wording of the appropriate text when other applicable Canons are cited.

In regard to the consent process, the report rejects the idea of a canonical listing of impediments to consent, while affirming the solemn responsibility of Standing Committees to give or withhold consent based on the general reputation of the one to be made bishop. The report offers two canonical changes: a provision for declaring a denial of consent with a time limit for action by the Standing Committees and a provision for the concurrent polling of both Standing Committees and Bishops. The Resolution to amend Canon III.22.4.(a). and III.22.6. is found in the Standing Commission on Constitution and Canons Report.

*Agenda 2.* With the Church Deployment Board [CDB], the Church Pension Group [CPG], and the Women in Mission and Ministry Office, study the status of women presbyters and monitor Resolution C004sa.

With the Committee on the Status on Women, CDM monitored the outcomes of Resolution 1994: C004sa and shared data on the status of women presbyters.

## DEVELOPMENT OF MINISTRY

---

*Agenda 3. Review for the purpose of revision Title III of the Canons and report to the 72nd General Convention.*

During the triennium the Province VII Provincial meeting asked CDM to review the requirement that Deacons and Local Priests ordained under Canon III.9 take medical and psychological and psychiatric examinations both at the time of Postulancy and before Ordination. With Deacons and Local Priests this can mean two expensive sets of examinations within about a year of each other. In consultation with the Medical Trust of the Church Pension Group, CDM proposes the following amendments to Title III.

### **Resolution A087 Amend Canons III.6.3 and III.9.3: Health Examinations for Deacons and Local Priests**

- 1 *Resolved*, the House of \_\_\_\_\_ concurring, That Canon III.6.3. be amended as follows:
- 2 Sec. 3. Before the ordination of a Deacon, the Bishop shall require the applicant to submit to a
- 3 thorough examination, covering both medical and psychological condition, by professionals
- 4 appointed by the Bishop *only if the examinations required under Canon III.4.2.e. indicate an area*
- 5 *of concern*. The forms for medical and psychological and psychiatric reports prepared by The
- 6 Church Pension Fund shall be used for these purposes. These reports shall be kept on file by the
- 7 Bishop and shall be available to the Standing Committee; and be it further
- 8 *Resolved*, That a new section (c) be added to Canon III.9.3. as follows:
- 9 (c). *Canon III.7.4. applies only if the examinations required under Canon III.4.2.e. indicate an*
- 10 *area of concern.*

#### *Explanation*

This amendment would revise Canon III.6.3 and Canon III.9.3 to allow that a second medical or psychological/psychiatric examination is not required in the case of deacons (Canon III.6) and local priests (Canon III.9) before ordination. However in these cases there must have been a thorough initial testing as required under Canon III.4.2.e. If concerns are raised in the initial examinations, there must be a follow-up examination.

The Brotherhood of St. Gregory submitted the following resolution.

### **Resolution A088 Amend Canon III.8.4(f): Ordination Process for Members of Religious Orders**

- 1 *Resolved*, the House of \_\_\_\_\_ concurring, That Canon III.8.4(f) be amended as follows:
- 2 ~~If~~ *When* the applicant is a member of a Religious Order or *Christian Community* officially
- 3 recognized by Canon III.2930, the certificates referred to in Sec.4(d) *and any other requirements*
- 4 *of a Congregation or Member of the Clergy in Charge, may shall* be given by the Superior or
- 5 person in charge, and Chapter, or other comparable body of the Order or Community.

#### *Explanation*

This is part of the ordination process for members of religious orders not living in residential communities. The current canon works well for monastic or residential communities, but is not as appropriate for apostolic communities whose major work is parochial. Changing "shall" to "may" sees to it that the canon is applied when needed, but not enforced where the parish is the most appropriate sponsor for ordination. The phrase concerning other requirements takes into account

portions of Canon III.4 not expressly covered by the current canon, which applies only to certificates provided by the vestry and member of the clergy in charge.

*Agenda 4. Facilitate conversations between CDM, COMs, the Council of Seminary Deans, and other groups responsible for selection and formation for ordained ministry to enhance clarity of purpose and cooperation.*

This dialogue has taken place at Provincial Meetings sponsored by CDM.

*Agenda 5. Participate in Church Deployment Board [CDB] work on transitions to appropriate ministries [e.g. outplacement] as people and circumstances change both in crisis and non crisis situations.*

The CDB has reported to CDM on this issue.

*Agenda 6. Participate fully with the Church Pension Group [CPG] in its wellness initiatives.*

Representatives of the Church Pension Group reported to CDM on this process.

*Agenda 7. Work with the Board for Theological Education [BTE] on its continuing education project.*

The Council discussed this and supports the resolution on continuing education submitted by the BTE.

CDM is a forum for conversation and cooperation among a host of church agencies and commissions concerned with ministry, which are listed at the beginning of this report. In addition to collaboration with the Professional Ministry Development Cluster and Agenda Items listed under this Objective, from time to time conferences involving member organizations are reported through CDM. The following conference was held during the triennium.

### **Colloquium of Episcopal Professional and Vocational Associations**

CDM worked with the National Network of Episcopal Clergy Associations [NNECA], the National Network of Lay Professionals [NNLP], and the North American Association for the Diaconate [NAAD] to coordinate a meeting of professional and vocational ministry support groups to discuss common concerns of just treatment of those who work for the church. Twenty-three leaders gathered at the Bishop Mason Center in the Diocese of Dallas. The conference gave birth to a new association called the Colloquium of Episcopal Professional and Vocational Associations [CEPVA]. CEPVA prepared a statement called "Principles of Justice and Accountability in the Church Workplace," outlining principles and practices of fair employment for clergy and laity in the Episcopal Church. The statement and a resolution calling the church to adopt these principles and practices is found in the Appendix.

## DEVELOPMENT OF MINISTRY

---

### Agenda 8. Coordinate study of the role of suffragan bishops.

The Indianapolis Convention called for a study of “the role of Suffragan Bishops within the House of Bishops and the role of the office of suffragan bishops within the dioceses of the church. . .” (B009). The Presiding Bishop asked CDM to coordinate that study and the vice-chair, the Rt. Rev. F. Clayton Matthews, served as chair of the committee. Other members of the committee were the Rt. Rev. Charles L. Keyser, the Rt. Rev. Jack M. McKelvey, the Rt. Rev. Richard F. Grein, the Very Rev. Joel Gibson, and Ms. Judith Carlson. Special thanks is extended to the Rev. Dr. Harold T. Lewis, and Mr. Michael F. Rehill, who contributed material to the study. The report has been distributed to the House of Bishops and may be obtained from the Office for Professional Ministry Development. The following papers form the report of the committee: “History of Bishops Suffragan: Beginnings to the Reformation;” “History of Bishops Suffragan: In the American Episcopal Church;” “Bishops Suffragan and the Problem of Jurisdiction;” and “A Model of *episcopas*; Bishops for the Armed Forces and the Convocation of American Churches in Europe.”

The number of bishops suffragan has grown by 50% in the last ten years. It is unacceptable that a bishop suffragan should be seen within either the diocese or the wider church as an “anomaly born of pastoral or practical necessity.” The Committee agrees that the full sacramental gifts for the exercise of *episkope* are given at ordination; therefore, the full capacity to function as a bishop is also given. Jurisdiction, however, is a canonical status and cannot be delegated. Responsibility for *episkope* (oversight) can be and ought to be delegated in ways that are clearly defined for all.

The committee concludes that there can be no *episcopas* (bishop) without *episkope* (oversight); therefore when responsibility for *episkope* is delegated, it is permissible to use all sacramental gifts of ministry as a bishop within a defined area. The role of a bishop suffragan is essentially trinitarian in nature, substance, and function: the nature of the office is collegial, emphasizing the synodical nature of the office of bishop; the substance of the office is as vicar, emphasizing that the one bishop, the diocesan who presides over the Eucharistic fellowship, constitutes the center and sign of unity; the function of the office is in a defined area of geography and/or program, emphasizing the role of a bishop as pastor and teacher in an apostolic tradition. All three models of episcopacy reside in each suffragan at all times and are experienced just as one experiences the Trinity.

The committee recommends that a suffragan be referred to as a “bishop suffragan” in order to place emphasis on “collegiality” and that all active bishops suffragan be given vote on all matters of an episcopal nature. The committee was charged only to deal with the role of bishops suffragan but recommends that an additional study be made regarding the role of assistant, retired, and resigned bishops who no longer have *episkope* (oversight), addressing such questions as, “What areas of church life are the appropriate responsibilities of retired and active bishops?” and, “Should the Church grant voting privileges according to active *episkope* rather than canonical jurisdiction?”

The diocesan/suffragan relationship is rightly and unavoidably very personal, and depends in some measure on a good working understanding and mutual loyalty. The committee

recommends that each bishop suffragan be given a staff or crozier to carry within the diocese on official occasions when not in the presence of the diocesan. It also recommends that bishops suffragan continue to be elected in accordance with national and diocesan canons. The committee further recommends that national canons reflect the following concerns to be answered prior to an election: (1) the intentions of how *episkope* will be shared with a bishop suffragan; (2) a prescribed or defined period of time for mutual discernment between a potential nominee and the diocesan before the names of the final nominees are announced publicly.

The committee concludes that each bishop suffragan should have a defined territorial and/or programmatic area, a sphere of community life, within the diocese, or as in the case of Suffragans of the Presiding Bishop, who are elected by the House of Bishops, as defined by the Presiding Bishop. A clear definition of the bishop suffragan's vicarial tasks or areas of responsibility is an important element in achieving a harmonious ministry.

**Resolution A089 Constitutional Amendments Regarding Bishops Suffragan, First Reading**

1 *Resolved*, the House of \_\_\_\_\_ concurring, That Articles I, II, and IV of the Constitution are  
2 hereby amended to read as follows:

3 **ARTICLE I.**

4 Sec. 2. Each Bishop ~~Diocesan~~ of this Church having jurisdiction, every Bishop Coadjutor, every  
5 Suffragan Bishop Suffragan, every Assistant Bishop, and every Bishop who by reason of advanced  
6 age or bodily infirmity, or who, under an election to an office created by the General Convention,  
7 or for reasons of mission strategy determined by action of the General Convention or the House of  
8 Bishops, has resigned a jurisdiction, shall have a seat and a vote in the House of Bishops. A  
9 majority of all Bishops entitled to vote, exclusive of Bishops who have resigned their jurisdiction  
10 or positions, shall be necessary to constitute a quorum for the transaction of business.

11 **ARTICLE II.**

12 Sec. 4. It shall be lawful for a Diocese, with consent of the Bishop of that Diocese, to elect one or  
13 more Suffragan Bishops Suffragan, without right of succession, and with seat and vote in the  
14 House of Bishops. A Suffragan Bishop Suffragan shall be consecrated and hold office under such  
15 conditions and limitations other than those provided in this Article as may be provided by Canons  
16 of the General Convention and by the Canons of the electing Diocese not inconsistent with this  
17 Constitution or the Canons of the General Convention A Suffragan Bishop Suffragan shall be  
18 eligible for election as Bishop Diocesan or Bishop Coadjutor of a Diocese, or as a Bishop  
19 Suffragan in another Diocese.

20 Sec. 5. It shall be lawful for a Diocese to prescribe by the Constitution and Canons of such  
21 Diocese that upon the death of the Bishop Diocesan a Suffragan Bishop Suffragan of that Diocese  
22 may be placed in charge of such Diocese and become temporarily the Ecclesiastical Authority  
23 thereof until such time as a new Bishop Diocesan shall be chosen and consecrated; or that during  
24 the disability or absence of the Bishop Diocesan a Suffragan Bishop Suffragan of that Diocese  
25 may be placed in charge of such Diocese and become temporarily the Ecclesiastical Authority  
26 thereof.

## DEVELOPMENT OF MINISTRY

---

27 Sec. 7. It shall be lawful for the House of Bishops to elect a *Suffragan Bishop Suffragan* who,  
28 under the direction of the Presiding Bishop, shall be in charge of the work of those chaplains in  
29 the Armed Forces of the United States, Veterans' Administration Medical Centers, and Federal  
30 Correctional Institutions who are ordained Ministers of this Church. The *Suffragan Bishop*  
31 *Suffragan* so elected shall be consecrated and hold office under such conditions and limitations  
32 other than those provided in this Article as may be provided by Canons of the General  
33 Convention. The *Suffragan Bishop Suffragan* shall be eligible for election as Bishop *Diocesan* or  
34 Bishop Coadjutor or *Suffragan Bishop Suffragan* of a Diocese.

35 Sec. 8. A Bishop who has for at least five years next preceding, exercised jurisdiction as the  
36 *Bishop Diocesan Ordinary*, or as the Bishop Coadjutor, of a Diocese, may be elected as Bishop  
37 *Diocesan*, Bishop Coadjutor, or *Suffragan Bishop Suffragan*, of another Diocese. Before  
38 acceptance of such election a resignation of jurisdiction in the Diocese in which the Bishop is then  
39 serving, conditioned on the required consents of the Bishops and Standing Committees of the  
40 Church to such election, shall be submitted to the House of Bishops, and also, if the Bishop be a  
41 Bishop Coadjutor, a renunciation of the right of succession. Such resignation, and renunciation of  
42 the right of succession in the case of a Bishop Coadjutor, shall require the consent of the House of  
43 Bishops.

### 44 ARTICLE IV.

45 In every Diocese a Standing Committee shall be elected by the Convention thereof, except that  
46 provision for filling vacancies between meetings of the Convention may be prescribed by the  
47 Canons of the respective Dioceses. When there is a Bishop in charge of the Diocese, the Standing  
48 Committee shall be the Bishop's Council of Advice. If there be no Bishop *Diocesan* or Bishop  
49 Coadjutor or *Suffragan Bishop Suffragan* canonically authorized to act, the Standing Committee  
50 shall be the Ecclesiastical Authority of the Diocese for all purposes declared by the General  
51 Convention. The rights and duties of the Standing Committee, except as provided in the  
52 Constitution and Canons of the General Convention, may be prescribed by the Canons of the  
53 respective Dioceses.

**Resolution A090 Canonical Amendments Regarding Bishops Suffragan**

1 *Resolved*, the House of \_\_\_\_\_ concurring, That Canons I.9, I.11, III.3, III.8, III.16, III.22,  
2 III.23, III.24, III.26, III. 27, and III.28 are hereby amended to read as follows:

3 **CANON I.9.**

4 Sec. 5. Every Bishop *Diocesan* of this Church, having jurisdiction within the Province, every  
5 Bishop Coadjutor, *Suffragan* Bishop *Suffragan*, and Assistant Bishop, and every Bishop whose  
6 episcopal work has been within the Province, but who by reason of advanced age or bodily  
7 infirmity has resigned, shall have a seat and vote in the House of Bishops of the Province.

8 **CANON I.11.**

9 Sec. 3(e). The election of the Bishop of a Missionary Diocese, in the event of a vacancy, or, when  
10 canonical consent is given, the election of a person to be Bishop Coadjutor or *Suffragan* Bishop  
11 *Suffragan*, shall be made by a Diocesan Convention in accordance with its own Canons, and the  
12 provisions of Canons III.22 and III.23 of the General Convention.

13 **CANON III.3.**

14 Sec. 1(b). The Presiding Bishop or the *Suffragan* Bishop *Suffragan* for the Armed Forces may  
15 license a member of the Armed Forces to exercise one or more of these ministries in the Armed  
16 Forces in accordance with the provisions of this Canon.

17 **CANON III.8.**

18 Sec. 3(a). For the purpose of this and other Canons of Ordination, the *canonical* authority  
19 assigned to the Bishop of the Diocese as the Ordinary may be exercised by a Bishop Coadjutor,  
20 when so empowered under Canon III.22.2(a), or by a *Suffragan* Bishop *Suffragan* when requested  
21 by the Bishop of a Diocese, or by any other Bishop of the Anglican Communion canonically in  
22 charge of a Diocese, at the request of the ordinand's Bishop.

23 **CANON III.16.**

24 Sec. 4(a). Any Member of the Clergy desiring to serve as a Chaplain in the Armed Forces of the  
25 United States of America or as Chaplain for the Veterans' Administration, or Federal Correctional  
26 Institutions, with the approval of the Ecclesiastical Authority of the Diocese in which canonically  
27 resident, may be given ecclesiastical endorsement for such service by the Office of the *Suffragan*  
28 Bishop *Suffragan* for the Armed Forces of the Executive Council of the Church.

29 Sec. 4(b). Any Member of the Clergy serving on active duty with the Armed Forces shall retain  
30 the Member of the Clergy's canonical residence and shall be under the ecclesiastical supervision  
31 of the Bishop of the Diocese of which the Member of the Clergy is canonically resident, even  
32 though the Member of the Clergy's work as a Chaplain shall be under the general supervision of  
33 the Office of the *Suffragan* Bishop *Suffragan* for the Armed Forces, or such other Bishop as the  
34 Presiding Bishop may designate.

35 **CANON III.22.**

36 Section 1(a). The election of a person to be a Bishop in a Diocese shall be held in accordance with  
37 rules prescribed by the Convention of the Diocese and pursuant to the provisions of the  
38 Constitution and Canons of this Church. *With respect to the election of a Bishop Suffragan, the*

## DEVELOPMENT OF MINISTRY

---

39 *Diocese shall establish a nominating process either by Canon or by the adoption of rules and*  
40 *procedure for the election of the Bishop Suffragan at a regular or special Diocesan Convention*  
41 *with sufficient time preceding the election of the Bishop Suffragan.*

42 Sec. 1(e). The Secretary of the Convention electing a Bishop *Diocesan*, Bishop Coadjutor, or  
43 ~~Suffragan~~ Bishop *Suffragan*, shall inform the Presiding Bishop promptly of the name of the  
44 person elected. It shall be the duty of the Bishop-elect to notify the Presiding Bishop of his  
45 acceptance or declination of the election, at the same time as *the Bishop-elect* notifies the electing  
46 Diocese.

47 Sec. 3(d). If a majority of the Bishops of this Church exercising jurisdiction *or delegated*  
48 *oversight*, consent to the ordination, the Presiding Bishop shall, without delay, notify the Standing  
49 Committee of the Diocese electing and the Bishop-elect of the consent.

50 Sec. 4(a).

51 ... If a majority of the Standing Committees of all the Dioceses consents to the ordination of the  
52 Bishop-elect ... the Presiding Bishop, who shall immediately communicate them to every Bishop  
53 of this Church exercising jurisdiction *or delegated oversight*. ...

54 Sec. 6.

55 ... in case a majority of all the Bishops exercising jurisdiction *or delegated oversight* do not  
56 consent ...

57 Sec. 9(a). Within ten days after the election of a Bishop *Diocesan*, a Bishop Coadjutor, or a  
58 ~~Suffragan~~ Bishop *Suffragan* by a Diocesan Convention, delegates constituting no less than 10% of  
59 the number of delegates casting votes on the final ballot may file with the Secretary of the  
60 Convention written objections to the election process, setting forth in detail all alleged  
61 irregularities. Within ten days after receipt thereof, the Secretary of the Convention shall forward  
62 copies of the same to the Bishop *Diocesan*, the Chancellor and Standing Committee of the  
63 Diocese, and to the Presiding Bishop, who shall request the Court of Review of the Province in  
64 which the Diocese is located to investigate the complaint. The Court of Review may invite  
65 response by the Bishop *Diocesan*, the Chancellor, the Standing Committee and any other persons  
66 within the electing Diocese. Within thirty days after receipt of the request, the Court of Review  
67 shall send a written report of its findings to the Presiding Bishop, a copy of which report the  
68 Presiding Bishop, within fifteen days, shall cause to be sent to the Bishop *Diocesan*, the  
69 Chancellor, the Standing Committee and the Secretary of the Convention of the electing Diocese.

### 70 **CANON III.23.**

71 Sec. 5. Any Bishop or Bishops elected and consecrated under this Canon shall be entitled to a seat  
72 and vote in the House of Bishops, and shall be eligible to the office of Bishop or Bishop  
73 Coadjutor or ~~Suffragan~~ Bishop *Suffragan* in any organized Diocese within the United States;  
74 Provided, that such Bishop shall not be so eligible within five years from the date of his  
75 consecration, except to the office of Bishop of a Diocese formed in whole or in part out of his *such*  
76 Missionary Diocese.

77 Sec. 6(a) When a Diocese, entitled to the choice of a Bishop, shall elect as its *Bishop* Diocesan, or  
78 as its Bishop Coadjutor, or as a ~~Suffragan~~ Bishop *Suffragan*, a Missionary Bishop of this Church,  
79 if such election shall have taken place within three months before a meeting of the General  
80 Convention, evidence thereof shall be laid before each House of the General Convention, and the  
81 concurrence of each House, and its express consent, shall be necessary to the validity of said  
82 election, and shall complete the same; so that the Bishop thus elected shall be thereafter the  
83 Bishop of the Diocese which has elected him *such* Bishop.

84 **CANON III.24.**

85 Sec. 3(b) The ~~Diocesan~~ Bishop *Diocesan* shall not be absent from the Diocese for a period of  
86 more than three consecutive months without the consent of the Convention or the Standing  
87 Committee of the Diocese.

88 Sec. 3(c) A ~~Diocesan~~ Bishop *Diocesan*, whenever leaving the Diocese for six consecutive months,  
89 shall authorize in writing, under hand and seal, the Bishop Coadjutor, the ~~Suffragan~~ Bishop  
90 *Suffragan* if the Constitution and Canons of the Diocese so provide, or, should there be none, the  
91 Standing Committee of the Diocese, to act as the Ecclesiastical Authority thereof during the  
92 absence. The Bishop Coadjutor, or the ~~Suffragan~~ Bishop *Suffragan* if the Constitution and Canons  
93 of the Diocese so provide, or, should there be none, the Standing Committee may at any time  
94 become the Ecclesiastical Authority upon the written request of the Bishop and continue to act as  
95 such until the request is revoked by the Bishop *Diocesan* in writing.

96 **CANON III.26.**

97 **Of Suffragan Bishops *Suffragan***

98 Sec. 1 (a) With the consent of the ~~Diocesan~~ Bishop *Diocesan*, a ~~Suffragan~~ Bishop *Suffragan* shall  
99 be elected in accordance with Canon III.22.1.

100 (b) Before the election of a ~~Suffragan~~ Bishop *Suffragan* in a Diocese, the consent of the General  
101 Convention or, if General Convention is not in session, the consent of a majority of the Bishops  
102 exercising jurisdiction *or delegated oversight* and of the several Standing Committees must be  
103 obtained.

104 Sec. 2 (a) *The* ~~Suffragan~~ Bishop *Suffragan* shall act as an assistant to and under the direction of  
105 the ~~Diocesan~~ Bishop *Diocesan*.

106 (b) *Before the election of a Bishop Suffragan in a Diocese, the Convention of such Diocese shall*  
107 *adopt a Canon or Canons which describe the role and duties of the Bishop Suffragan.*

108 Sec. 3. The tenure of office of a ~~Suffragan~~ Bishop *Suffragan* shall not be determined by the tenure  
109 of office of the ~~Diocesan~~ Bishop *Diocesan*.

110 Sec. 4. No ~~Suffragan~~ Bishop *Suffragan*, while acting as such, shall be Rector or Member of the  
111 Clergy in charge of a Parish or Congregation.

## DEVELOPMENT OF MINISTRY

---

112 **CANON III.27.**

113 Sec. 2. An Assistant Bishop may be appointed from among the following:

114 (a) ~~Diocesan~~ Bishops *Diocesan*, ~~Coadjutor~~ Bishops *Coadjutor*, or ~~Suffragan~~ Bishops *Suffragan*,  
115 who under the Constitution and Canons of this Church would be eligible for election in that  
116 Diocese, Provided, that at the time of accepting such appointment a ~~Diocesan~~ Bishop *Diocesan*,  
117 Bishop Coadjutor or ~~Suffragan~~ Bishop *Suffragan* shall resign that office;

118 **CANON III.28.**

119 Sec. 1. When it is certified to the Presiding Bishop, by at least two licensed medical doctors,  
120 psychologists or psychiatrists, who have examined the case, that a ~~Diocesan~~ Bishop *Diocesan* is  
121 incapable of authorizing the Bishop Coadjutor, if there is one, or a ~~Suffragan~~ Bishop *Suffragan*, if  
122 there is one, or the Standing Committee to act as the Ecclesiastical Authority, then, upon the  
123 advice of five Bishops of neighboring Dioceses, to be selected by the Presiding Bishop, the  
124 Presiding Bishop shall declare the Bishop Coadjutor, if there is one, or a ~~Suffragan~~ Bishop  
125 *Suffragan*, if the Constitution and Canons of the Diocese so provide, or the Standing Committee  
126 to be the Ecclesiastical Authority for all purposes set forth in these Canons and to retain such  
127 *canonical* authority until the Presiding Bishop, acting on a like certificate, declares the said  
128 ~~Diocesan~~ Bishop *Diocesan* competent to resume official duties.

### *Explanation*

These amendments to the Constitution and Canons address four areas of concern: (1) the role and duties of the Bishop Suffragan; (2) the manner in which Bishops Suffragan are elected and the role of the Bishop Diocesan in the selection/election process; (3) the role of Bishops Suffragan in the House of Bishops; and (4) the identity of Bishops Suffragan as bishops first and then “Suffragan”.

1. The first concern (the role and duties of the Bishop Suffragan) is dependent upon the vision of the Bishop Diocesan. Authority for the exercise of *episkope* (oversight) is given at ordination. Every bishop has the full capacity to function as a bishop, regardless of the scope of an individual’s jurisdiction. All bishops are ordained in the same way, and receive the same sacramental gift of *episkope*. While “jurisdiction” is a canonical status (and cannot be delegated), responsibility for *episkope* can be delegated by the Bishop Diocesan. Since there is no *episcopas* without *episkope*, when oversight responsibility is delegated, such delegation constitutes permission to use the full sacramental gifts of ministry as a bishop in a particular area of diocesan life. The model may be “conciliar” (e.g., Newark); or “area” (e.g., New York), or other models might be considered or developed.

The role and duties of a Bishop Suffragan could be defined either formally (by Canon) or informally (by “job description”). The former could be in the form of Canonical requirement that the role of a Bishop Suffragan be defined by (a) Diocesan Canon(s). Such Canon(s) would be adopted by Diocesan Convention prior to the election of the Bishop Suffragan. (See proposed revisions to Canon III.26.) The latter could be accomplished by a Canon which called upon the Bishop Diocesan, with the advice of her/his Standing Committee, to provide the definition: e.g., “The Bishop Diocesan and the Standing Committee shall define the scope, role, and functions for the Bishop(s) Suffragan.”

2. The second concern recognizes the need for some Canonically-sanctioned role of the Bishop Diocesan in the selection/election process, in that the Diocesan and the Suffragan will have to work closely together for many years.

Among the alternatives being considered is a petition process which allows for nomination by petition up to 30 days prior to convention to supplement the nominating committee's slate but prohibits nominations "from the floor." Other possibilities considered include: (a) the right of the Bishop Diocesan to "veto" candidates prior to convention; (b) the right of the Bishop Diocesan to nominate/propose candidate(s) for consideration; and (c) the right of the Bishop Diocesan to designate some members of the nominating committee.

Rather than imposing a single method of nominating and electing Bishops Suffragan, it is recommended that General Convention make the requisite Canonical changes to formally provide authority in each of the several Dioceses to establish its own nominating process (a) by Canon; or (b) by the adoption of rules and procedure for the election of a Bishop Suffragan at a regular or special diocesan convention substantially in advance of the election of the Bishop Suffragan. See proposed amendment to Article II, Section 4 of the Constitution and to Canon III.22.1(a). These changes may appear (and probably are) redundant, as the Constitution and Canons already give each Diocese such authority; however, they would have the effect of requiring the adoption of such procedures.

3. The third concern arises out of the distinction between Bishops Suffragan and Bishops "with jurisdiction" (Bishops Diocesan). The Canons give to Bishops Diocesan the right to give or withhold consents to episcopal elections and consecrations, and the exclusive right to bring charges against another Bishop for holding and teaching doctrine contrary to that of this Church, while conferring on all Bishops, including long retired and inactive Bishops the right to vote at meetings of the House of Bishops and the right to give consent to trial on presentments for heresy.

It is suggested that all Bishops actively exercising episcopal oversight should have the same role with respect to both episcopal consents and episcopal discipline. The Canons could be amended to change the term "Bishops with jurisdiction" to "Bishops actively exercising episcopal oversight." Perhaps such "active Bishops" could be described as "all Bishops in good standing other than those who have resigned or retired because of infirmity or age."

4. The fourth concern (the identity of Bishops Suffragan as Bishops first and then "Suffragan") will require the greatest number of Constitutional and Canonical changes (with Bishops hereinafter designated "Bishop Diocesan," Bishop Coadjutor," "Bishop Suffragan," etc.

*OBJECTIVE C.* To provide resources and training on Ministry Development to Bishops and Commissions on Ministry.

## DEVELOPMENT OF MINISTRY

---

*Agenda 1. Promote diocesan use of “The Voice of This Calling” and “A Resource on Cultural Sensitivity in the Ordination Process” at provincial meetings. [1994: A045a]*

The Council promoted resources developed during the past triennium, developed new ones mentioned in this report, and assisted in the publication of *Ministry in Daily Life, a Guide to Living the Baptismal Covenant*, available from Episcopal Parish Services.

### **Structural Revision and CDM**

Prior to this triennium, CDM worked with the Board for Church Deployment (BCD), the Board for Theological Education (BTE), and a consultant, Mrs. Mary Williams, to consider the structural merging of these three organizations. After considerable study, it was concluded that much would be lost in such a unification. Provincial representatives bring direct contact with dioceses to CDM. A single board would not include the large representation of other agencies concerned with ministry issues, and the forum function of the Council would be eliminated. During this triennium, CDM met with members of the Standing Commission on the Structure of the Church to reiterate its belief that the church would be better served by the continuation of three separate bodies. The Commission did not agree and is considering replacing CDM, BTE, and CDB with a 24 member Standing Commission on Ministry. The membership of CDM, and representatives of COMs at provincial meetings strongly object to this suggestion. The officers and staff of the three bodies have met during the triennium in order to avoid duplication of efforts and to further collaboration. Should a Standing Commission on Ministry be established by the General Convention, the Executive Committee of CDM strongly recommends that it assume the work currently done by BTE and CDM but that a separate BCD be continued.

### **PROVINCIAL MEETINGS**

While much of the work of the Council is accomplished at its meetings, a major part of its work is done on the provincial level through the nine provincial representatives who work directly with COM's. These meetings provide an opportunity for bishops and representatives of COM's, as well as other persons such as Deployment Officers and members of Standing Committees, to communicate with each other, with the PMD Cluster, seminaries, and other agencies of the church involved in issues of concern to COM's. A summary of reports from the Provincial Representatives follows.

#### **Province I**

The first meeting of the triennium focused on the importance of connecting diocesan mission strategy with the process of recruiting, selecting, and preparing people for the ministries of the church. The strong consensus was that the greatest needs for ministry in the province would be better answered by lay persons or deacons rather than priests. The second meeting, facilitated by Dr. Fredrica Thompsett of the Episcopal Divinity School, focused on helping lay persons claim or reclaim their ministries in the world. The triennium's final meeting discussed the church's theology of ordination and addressed the proposed changes in structure regarding ministry.

Edward Farrell, Representative

**Province II**

In October of 1994 representatives from five dioceses met in Rochester NY, concurrently with deployment officers from the province and focused on the report from the BTE, "Recruiting for Leadership: Challenges and Hopes." Information was shared on the various local approaches to recruiting persons for ministry. In May of 1995, efforts were begun to create a partnership between Provinces II and VIII designed to explore, develop, and train lay and ordained leaders in Province II in alternative methods of congregational development and support for those engaged in ministry with multicultural and ethnic specific and/or rural isolated ministries. January of 1996 saw representatives of six dioceses and four seminaries come together at General Theological Seminary in New York for a discussion on the theology of priesthood. In May of 1996 the Provincial Synod at its annual meeting in Rochester, NY approved funding of a conference to be held in 1997.

The Rev. Jorge M. Gutierrez, Representative

**Province III**

The 1995 meeting was held at Virginia Theological Seminary, with the theme, "Development of Ministry Opportunities and Challenges for the Next Century." Prior to the meeting, participants answered a pilot Title III Survey and the results were reported by Dr. William Stafford, Assistant Dean, and Professor of Church History. This work led to a survey used by CDM in 1996. Several papers were presented on lay and ordained ministry. Presentations were also made by several bishops on new ordination initiatives, including the ordination of transitional deacons prior to their senior year.

The Rev. James C. Ransom, Representative

**Province IV**

Minority recruitment was highlighted in a keynote speech by the Rev. Reynell Parkens at the 1995 meeting held in Atlanta. Panel and small group discussions enabled participants to better understand the role of minorities in the church today. The 1996 meeting at Honey Creek Conference Center in Georgia entitled "A Seminar on Ministry and Change" featured the Rt. Rev. Henry Louttit and the Very Rev. Guy Lytle, who spoke on about how ministry is changing, and what it will look like in the next century. Dean Lytle led discussions on the relationship between baptism and ordination. The 1997 meeting, held in Memphis, focused on the proposed Episcopal-Lutheran Concordat. The group also reviewed Title III Canons in light of the Concordat and in response to the CDM report "The Implementation of the Title III Canons: A Review of Diocesan Practices."

Karen Keele, Representative

**Province V**

The Diocese of Chicago was host to the 1994 meeting. The main presentation was entitled "Putting All the Pieces Together" in which each piece of the ordination process was examined from various points of view: the local parish, the COM, the Standing Committee, the bishop, the seminary, and the BTE. Nashotah House was host to the 1995 meeting which included a presentation and discussion led by the Very Rev. Gary Kriss and the faculty of Nashotah House on

## **DEVELOPMENT OF MINISTRY**

---

the role of Episcopal seminaries in the formation of priests. The Rt. Rev. Roger White presented a Cornerstone Program, *A Spirituality Consultation*, as a process for spiritual reflection, sharing, and discerning in a small community. The 1996 meeting, hosted by the Diocese of Ohio, discussed issues of priestly identity.

Mary Ann Miya, Representative

### **Province VI**

The topics for the triennium have focused mostly on preparation for ministry. Dialogues about a variety of methods of education and training have identified a tension between maintaining quality education and training, and at the same time recognizing the situations of persons who are called to ordained ministry. The growing use of Canon III.9 has resulted in exploration of the concerns -- as well as the opportunities -- this route provides the church. These discussions have led to the area of discernment, and understanding how discernment applies to all the People of God and their ministries, not just the ordained ministry. These ideas converged at the 1997 gathering where the topic was "Education for Leadership in the Church."

Ellen Bruckner, Representative

### **Province VII**

The Rev. Dr. Roy Oswald, of the Alban Institute spoke at the 1995 meeting on, "Finding Leaders for Tomorrow's Church." Dr. Oswald led reflections on issues of recruitment, recruitment strategies for younger applicants, minority applicants, and specialized ministries. Other issues included dialogue on the proposed Concordant with the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America and concerns over the requirement that psychological/psychiatric examinations be given both at the time of Postulancy and before Ordination for deacons and local priests.

At the 1996 meeting the Very Rev. Guy Lytle led a discussion on "Thinking Theologically about Ordained Ministry," outlining the historical development of several strands of the church's theological perspective on the nature and meaning of ordained ministry. The conference included discussions on what theology of ministry COMs hold and how that theology affects what they do. Participants discussed results of the CDM Title III Survey, the proposal of the Committee on Structure, and better collaboration between COMs and seminaries.

The Rev. James E. Liggett, Representative

### **Province VIII**

The Province of the Pacific met in 1995 to explore "Training Leaders for the Ministering Community." Case studies describing trends in complementary/alternative education for ministry around the province showed that lay ministry and inter-cultural ministry are priorities. The dioceses of Olympia, Hawaii, Minnesota, Los Angeles, Eastern Oregon, and Nevada provided a range of models.

The 1996 conference focused on "The Theology of Ministry of the Future," and featured a dialogue on the theologies of baptism and of the priesthood. The conference discussed the

implications of the disparity between the Baptismal Rite and the Rites of Ordination, especially that of the priesthood.

The Rev. Roberto Arciniega, Representative

### **Province IX**

La Provincia Novena para la facilidad del trabajo, en el desarrollo del ministerio, se ha dividido en regiones tales como ARENSA que incluye a Venezuela que es una diócesis autónoma, Centro América que incluye a Costra Rica que es una diócesis autónoma, y el Caribe que incluye a Cuba y Puerto Rico que son otras diócesis autónomas. ARENSA se ha preocupado por reestructurar sus cánones locales en cuanto hace relación a las ordenes sagradas y a los ministerios laicos, al igual que ha implementado en sus cánones la disciplina eclesiástica, y los perfiles de los aspirantes al Episcopado siguiendo los parámetros de los cánones generales. Una de las mayores preocupaciones en el área es el estudio continuado para el Clero, con el fin de que su mejor preparación sirva como estímulo al desarrollo de sus comunidades locales.

Centro América en su proceso de autonomía ha elaborado su propia estructura, y sus cánones de acuerdo a sus propias necesidades, y cada una de las Diócesis mira hacia su autonomía.

ARENSA tiene como una de sus metas la construcción de un centro de estudio y reflexión teológica que sirva para la provincia y las Iglesias Anglicanas del Cono Sur de América. Todavía en esta área no existe un centro de estudios formal o seminario que avale o acredite los estudios o programas de educación teológica de la provincia. Los estudios de teología para los aspirantes al ministerio ordenado se dan o desarrollan en cada una de las Diócesis, tomando recursos humanos y el material local, o importando, el material de Seminario Bíblico Latinoamericano de Costa Rica o de otros centros de estudios teológicos, de acuerdo a las necesidades y los recursos Diocesanos.

[Province IX divided itself into regions to facilitate the work for developing its ministry. The regions are ARENSA, which includes Venezuela, an autonomous diocese; Central America, which includes Costa Rica, an autonomous diocese; and the Caribbean, which includes Cuba and Puerto Rico, which are autonomous dioceses. ARENSA has been concerned with restructuring its local canons related to the sacred orders and lay ministries. Likewise, by means of its canons, it has implemented the ecclesiastical discipline, and by following the parameters contained in the general canons it has started using the profiles of the candidates to the episcopate. One of the major concerns in the area is the continued education of the clergy, so that their formation may serve as an incentive to the development of local communities.

Central America in its autonomy process has developed its own structure and its canons according to its own needs, and each diocese is looking forward to autonomy.

One of ARENSA's goals is building a center for studies and theological reflection to serve the province as well as the Anglican Churches of the Southern Cone of America. There is no study center in this area that may credit or endorse theological education studies or programs for the province. Studies on theology for the candidates to the ordained ministry occur in each diocese by taking into consideration human resources, local or imported material resources, materials from

## DEVELOPMENT OF MINISTRY

---

the Latin American Biblical Seminary of Costa Rica or other centers of theological studies; this is done based on the diocesan needs and resources.]

The Rev. Dr. Francisco Duque, Representante

### FINANCIAL REPORT FOR THE 1995-97 TRIENNIUM

*Income is from the Consolidated Budget of the Episcopal Church. These figures do not include salaries and other personnel costs which are reported elsewhere in the Consolidated Budget.*

	1995	1996	1997
Resources	\$1,654	\$2,589	\$7,500
Council Meetings	23,986	27,689	25,000
Provincial COM Meetings	1,389	815	2,000
Committees	2,594	5,924	3,500
NCCC, Prof. Church Leadership	2,000	2,000	2,000
<i>Total</i>	<i>\$31,623</i>	<i>\$39,017</i>	<i>\$40,000*</i>

\* budgeted

### FUTURE CHALLENGES FOR THE COUNCIL

During the next triennium, based on its Mission, Goal, and Objectives, CDM sees the following challenges which need to be addressed:

- follow up on the results and implications of the Title III Survey completed in 1996 and work toward a comprehensive revision of the Title III Canons;
- review Canons III.9 and III.10 as recommended by the study on the role of Standing Committees;
- continue work on the theology of the ministry of the baptized and the ordained by working collaboratively with the Cornerstone Project, the School of Theology of the University of the South, and other interested parties;
- follow up on the results and implications of the Diocesan Mission Strategy Survey conducted in 1996;
- cooperate with CDO to address issues surrounding the outplacement of clergy and lay professionals;
- cooperate with CPG, NNECA, NNLP, and CDO to address issues facing marginal and minority clergy and lay professionals;
- work with the Council of Seminary Deans on issues of the scope and breadth of educational needs of the present and future church;
- continue to work closely with the BTE and the BCD for greater cooperation and efficiency in ministry areas;
- continue to have annual contact with COM's, Standing Committees, and Bishops for better education, support, and exchange of ideas;
- respond to work given to CDM by the General Convention; and
- utilize the network of CDM's Provincial meetings.

**Resolution A091 New Members for the Council for the Development of Ministry**

- 1 *Resolved*, the House of \_\_\_\_\_ concurring, That the 72nd General Convention add the National
- 2 Network of Lay Professionals, the North American Association for the Diaconate, and the
- 3 National Network of Episcopal Clergy Associations to the membership of the Council for the
- 4 Development of Ministry.

*Explanation*

These three organizations have participated in the Council for the Development of Ministry for a number of years as partners in the discussion of ministry concerns. As a result of this partnership, these bodies applied for membership, and CDM has decided to admit them as member agencies, subject to the approval of the General Convention.

**PROPOSED BUDGET FOR THE COMING TRIENNIUM**

	<i>1998</i>	<i>1999</i>	<i>2000</i>
<b><i>Expenses</i></b>			
Resources	\$7,500	\$7,500	\$10,000
Council Meetings	29,000	30,000	31,000
Provincial COM Meetings	3,000	3,000	3,000
Committees	16,000	22,000	8,000
NCCC Prof. Church Leadership	3,000	3,000	3,000
	-----	-----	-----
<i>Total</i>	\$58,500	\$65,500	\$55,000

**Resolution A092 Continue the Council for the Development of Ministry.**

- 1 *Resolved*, the House of \_\_\_\_\_ concurring, That the 72nd General Convention continue the
- 2 Council for the Development of Ministry consonant with the mission, goal and objectives as
- 3 reported to this General Convention, that it continue to be funded through the Consolidated
- 4 Budget of the Episcopal Church, and that it report to the next General Convention.

**APPENDIX: REPORTS OF CONFERENCES AND TRIENNIUM MEMBERSHIP GROUPS**

The following resolution, which has the support of CDM, was developed at the meeting of the Colloquium of Episcopal Professional and Vocational Associations.

**Resolution A093 Justice and Accountability in the Church Workplace**

- 1 *Resolved*, the House of \_\_\_\_\_ concurring, That this 72nd General Convention calls on each
- 2 diocese to present to its convention these principles and practices for discussion and action; and
- 3 be it further
- 4 *Resolved*, That other Episcopal organizations and institution discuss and act on these principles
- 5 and practices; and be it further
- 6 *Resolved*, That the Executive Council report to the 73rd General Convention on the compliance of
- 7 the Episcopal Church with these principles and practices.

## **DEVELOPMENT OF MINISTRY**

---

### **JUSTICE AND ACCOUNTABILITY IN THE CHURCH WORKPLACE**

#### **PRINCIPLES**

If the Episcopal Church is to fulfill its mission to the world to proclaim and to teach gospel values of personal dignity and justice in our common life, it must practice those same values in everyday church working relationships. Workplace issues such as wages, pro-forma resignations, and regular evaluations should not be addressed apart from the principles of our Baptismal Covenant.

People who work in the church – including bishops, kitchen aides, presbyters, headmasters, sextons, deacons, secretaries, musicians, youth workers, teachers, administrators, and others – each, according to assigned responsibilities and personal talents, serve the church's mission.

Therefore, in various church workplaces – parishes, schools, seminaries, camps, institutions, diocesan and national church administrations, and so on – we need to promote the right ordering of relationships by fostering the principles of personal dignity, justice, accountability, and participation. By such principles we seek to promote both the dignity of individuals and the corporate responsibilities of church institutions.

Using such principles, it is imperative that we develop church workplace procedures and policies that honor the rights of individuals while serving faithfully the over-arching common good entrusted to us as the church, that is, the mission of Jesus Christ to the world.

1. Employment policies and practices in the Episcopal Church--recruitment, selection, training, policy development, salary, benefits, due process, termination, and retirement-- must manifest respect for the dignity of every person, in accord with the Baptismal Covenant.
2. Common commitment for the mission, ideals, and structures of the organization is expected of all who work within the church.
3. Respect for the rights and responsibilities of each worker is essential to church workplaces.

#### **EMPLOYMENT PRACTICES FOR LAITY AND CLERGY**

##### *The Call*

1. The format of the calling process is to be publicly stated in writing.
2. The description of each position and its requirements is to be clearly defined in writing.
3. A definite calendar and sequence of the process is to be publicly stated in writing.
4. Members of the calling community are to be represented in the selection process.

##### *The Covenant between the Person Called and the Calling Community*

1. The responsibilities of the person called are to be stated in a clear and definite format within a written covenant.
2. The responsibilities of the calling community to the person called are to be stated in a clear and definite format within a written covenant.
3. Provision for mutual, annual evaluation is to be included in the written covenant.
4. The dates for the inception and expiration of the covenant are to be specified within the written covenant.

5. A complete compensation package, including how and when it will be reviewed, is to be specified within the written covenant.

### *Continuing the Covenant*

1. The spiritual, mental, physical and social health of every employee deserves support through opportunities for professional development, spiritual nurture, personal growth, and personal time.
2. A standard and regular process of mutual reporting by all parties on their covenanted responsibilities is essential to their shared ministry.
3. All parties share responsibility for fostering a wholesome working environment.

### *Ending the Covenant*

1. Sufficient notice is to be given by either party intending not to renew the covenant upon its stated expiration.
2. When a covenant is not renewed, reasons for the decision are to be given.
3. Appropriate assistance for continuing ministry is to be offered by and to each party.
4. The covenant may be ended, by mutual agreement, prior to the expiration of its stated term.
5. If one party believes the provisions of the covenant are not being fulfilled and wishes, therefore, to terminate the covenant prior to the expiration of its stated term:
  - a. when applicable, canonical procedures will be followed.
  - b. written documentation, based on the provisions of the covenant must be presented by the terminating party.
6. The dignity of all parties shall be respected in leave taking. Leave-taking should be marked by the community in a mutually agreed upon manner.

As a Council that provides a forum for representatives of organizations concerned with ministry development, CDM invites members for the triennium to have access to the General Convention through its Blue Book Report. These reports have not been the subject of CDM action and the accompanying resolutions have neither been adopted nor rejected by the Council.

## NATIONAL NETWORK OF LAY PROFESSIONALS

The National Network of lay Professionals (NNLP), begun in 1984, exists to develop a national support system for lay people employed in the mission and ministry of the Episcopal Church. Lay professionals are defined as "lay people employed in the mission and ministry of the Episcopal Church who:

1. regard their work as vocation, as their response to God's call in their lives;
2. have acquired appropriate preparation and training for their work;
3. are committed to continuing their education to improve skills and enhance performance; and
4. who hold themselves accountable to the particular institutional structure within which they work, and to the wider community of the faithful, all for the love of Jesus Christ, through the power of the Holy Spirit to the greater glory of God.

## DEVELOPMENT OF MINISTRY

---

Begun as a Task Force at the Episcopal Church Center, the network is now an independent, self-supporting organization. Funding for the NNLP comes from the dues of its membership. During the triennium, issues worked on included:

1. pro forma and other involuntary, without cause resignations;
2. follow-up on the implementation of the 1991 lay pension resolution;
3. parity for lay and clergy pensions;
4. rewriting the NNLP position paper;
5. membership development; and
6. strengthening working relationships of all people employed in the ministry of the Episcopal Church by being a part of the founding of the Colloquium of Episcopal Professionals and Vocational Associations.

The NNLP continues to publish "Callings," a newsletter which is distributed to a wide cross-section of the church. The 6th National Gathering held in New Orleans had the theme, "Spirituality in Lay Vocations." Seminarians with lay vocations were a part of the meeting. The theme of the 7th National Gathering held in January 1997 was, "Follow Me - Lay Professionals Journey into the next Millennium."

Ann Kloeppe, Chair

### **Resolution A094 Pro Forma Resignations**

- 1 *Resolved*, the House of \_\_\_\_\_ concurring, That the Episcopal Church confirm the Statement
- 2 on Pro Forma Resignations (or other involuntary resignations without cause) as the practice
- 3 within the Episcopal Church.

### **STATEMENT ON PRO FORMA RESIGNATIONS**

During the course of a lay professional's ministry in any given faith community, s/he will welcome the opportunity to contribute to a true partnership in ministry with other leaders, both lay and ordained. The lay professional will honor his/her baptismal vows to "strive for justice and peace among all people and respect the dignity of every human being" and can expect to be respected in return. When it has been determined through mutual ministry review that a partnership is not possible, it is expected that the lay professional will be treated with dignity, and that his/her work will be honored so that leave taking will be fair.

#### *Explanation*

In some instances, it has been the practice to require pro forma resignations of lay staff members upon the change of diocesan and parochial clergy in charge. The National Network of Lay Professionals believes that this devalues the work of a loyal employee and is not in keeping with the Baptismal Covenant.

**NORTH AMERICAN ASSOCIATION FOR THE DIACONATE**

The North American Association for the Diaconate (NAAD), continues to link and serve deacons and diocesan diaconate program leaders while promoting the diaconia of all believers. NAAD publishes a newsletter, *Diakoneo*, monographs, and other papers; hosts biennial conferences (1995) in Des Moines, 1997 in San Francisco); staffed a continuing education program for deacons in conjunction with CDSP, arranged a workshop for those with responsibilities for formation and nurture of deacons; maintained links with Episcopal and ecumenical groups concerned with deacons and Diakonia; and served as a catalyst for the foundation of an association of deacons in New Zealand. Approximately half the deacons and half the dioceses of the Episcopal Church are members of NAAD as well as deacons from the Anglican Church of Canada, the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America, and numerous bishops, presbyters, and laity.

Br. Justus Van Houten, SSF, President

**Resolution A095 Review Canons Related to the Diaconate**

- 1 *Resolved*, the House of \_\_\_\_\_ concurring, That the Council for the Development of Ministry
- 2 review the canons relating to the diaconate for the purpose of evaluating the academic and
- 3 practical preparation required for ordination and establishing general guidelines for dioceses to
- 4 work within, and to present any proposed changes to the 73rd General Convention.

*Explanation*

The growth of the diaconate and the proliferation of diocesan diaconal training programs indicates the need for some degree of consistency of benchmarks for competency across the church.

**Resolution A096 Canonical Amendments to Allow Direct Ordination**

- 1 *Resolved*, the House of \_\_\_\_\_ concurring, That the Council for the Development of Ministry
- 2 address canonical changes to allow for ordination *per saltum* (direct ordination) and present them
- 3 to the 73rd General Convention.

*Explanation*

Through baptism, all Christians share in the eternal priesthood of Christ. Through ordination, the church calls a few of its members to several distinct offices, as focal points and sacraments of Christ in particular ministries of leadership. Acting on this principle, the church in the early centuries ordained baptized persons directly to the diaconate, presbyterate, and episcopate, without requiring them to pass through another order. Gradually, however, culminating in the middle ages, the church introduced a discipline of ordaining persons through a sequence of orders. Because the only sacramental prerequisite for ordaining a bishop, priest, or deacon, is baptism, this resolution asks the church to return to the early tradition of ordaining persons directly to the order to which they have been called. All members of the church should be eligible for ordination directly to any of the three orders. The Lambeth meeting in 1998 allows for the completion of the study, reflection, and dialogue with other Anglican and ecumenical partners called for by the Theology Committee of the House of Bishops in 1993.

## DEVELOPMENT OF MINISTRY

---

### NATIONAL NETWORK OF EPISCOPAL CLERGY ASSOCIATIONS

The National Network of Episcopal Clergy Associations' (NNECA) Mission Statement reads: "NNECA seeks, serves and proclaims Christ by leading clergy in the Episcopal Church into collegial relations for education, self-care, and advocacy." NNECA has been providing leadership for clergy for 26 years, primarily through Diocesan Clergy Associations. A highlight of the triennium was a quarter century celebration at the Annual Conference in Sacramento, California in June of 1995. The 1996 Conference was held at St. John's College, the largest Benedictine Abbey in the world, on the theme of "Clergy Wholeness and Holiness."

The NNECA Board, comprised of representatives elected at the annual conference from members of local associations, has worked closely with the Presiding Bishop, the PMD Cluster, and the Church Pension Group, raising issues for all the clergy of the church. An important contribution has been the implementation of the Episcopal Election Project, designed to improve the process of Episcopal Elections and insure a positive relationship between the newly elected bishop and the diocese. NNECA has also worked to improve clergy pensions and medical benefits, including mental health, has engaged in significant dialogue on the Title IV Disciplinary Canons, and initiated the conference out of which developed the newly formed Colloquium of Episcopal Professional and Vocational Associations.

In twenty-six years, NNECA has seen Clergy Associations come and go, some the victim of their own success. Until recently, the only way to become a member of NNECA was to live in a diocese that has a Clergy Association. Since NNECA believes it represents the interest of all clergy, not only those who are NNECA members, it has decided to offer direct, individual membership to clergy in dioceses where there is no association. That way, clergy who wish to support these efforts and become involved in the work of NNECA, can do so, regardless of their diocesan situation.

The Rev. Barbara H. Schlachter, President

#### **Resolution A097 Amend Canon IV.1.2: Salary and Benefits for Clergy Under Temporary Inhibition**

- 1 *Resolved*, the House of \_\_\_\_\_ concurring, That the following clause be added to Canon
- 2 IV.1.2.:
- 3 (h). *A temporary Inhibition shall not deprive the Priest or Deacon of the continuation of salary,*
- 4 *benefits, house, or livelihood from ecclesiastical employment between the time of its imposition,*
- 5 *and either a Voluntary Submission to Discipline, or a Judgement of guilt by the Ecclesiastical*
- 6 *Trial Court.*

#### *Explanation*

This provision would guarantee the continuation of salary and benefits for a member of the clergy under a Title IV temporary inhibition until the lifting of the inhibition or a judgement, or voluntary admission of guilt.