

**Reflections on
Shared Ministry
in the Diocese of Hawai'i**

By the Rev. Canon Liz Beasley

March 2012

Table of Contents

Introduction	3
<i>Why Shared Ministry?</i>	3
<i>Practical Reasons</i>	5
<i>Theological Reasons</i>	7
<i>Death and Resurrection</i>	8
<i>What Name to Use?</i>	9
General Principles	10
<i>Someone needs to be in charge</i>	10
<i>Can't work the clergy to death</i>	13
<i>The worship service must be treated with integrity</i>	13
<i>Clergy should meet weekly</i>	14
<i>Centralize and streamline the administration</i>	14
<i>Raise up and use Deacons</i>	16
<i>Use the differing gifts of the different participating clergy</i>	17
Specific Scenarios	18
<i>Shared Ministry Scenarios</i>	18
1. Associate in a larger congregation serves as Vicar of a smaller one	18
2. Congregation raises up someone to be ordained	19
3. Calling a bivocational priest	20
4. The "St. Elizabeth's model"	20
5. Several priests share the leadership of several congregations	21
6. A congregation led by licensed laity, with occasional supply	23
7. A rotating team of visiting clergy	23
8. Be a teaching church	23
9. Share clergy with a Lutheran congregation	24
<i>Applications to Specific Congregations</i>	25
Big Island	26
Kaua'i	27
Maui	28
Moloka'i	28
O'ahu	29
Training	33
<i>Safe Church Trainings</i>	35
<i>Proposed Training Program</i>	36
<i>Discernment for Ministry</i>	37
Conclusion	39

Introduction

The Episcopal Diocese of Hawai'i is beginning to move to a different model of ministry—or perhaps return to a variation of a model that it knew in its days of being a missionary diocese. Rather than having one priest per congregation, the model toward which the Diocese is moving is some form of “shared ministry”; that is, several clergy share the leadership of several congregations, or one priest serves more than one congregation. Because this way of arranging for clergy leadership is new and unfamiliar to many in the Diocese, and represents a significant change from the standard practice of the past few decades, at least, this report attempts to describe what this new model might look like in practice. It will suggest some general principles to follow, including differences from the way shared ministry is practiced in other dioceses; sketch out some possible scenarios for implementation in the various regions of the Diocese; and describe some of the changes needed in other areas of diocesan life, such as training for laity and clergy.

Changing how we provide clergy leadership to congregations has implications for other areas of diocesan life. These implications, as well as examples of what I describe and an occasional warning, are set off from the general flow of the text throughout this document.

Why Shared Ministry?

Why are we even considering “shared ministry,” under any configuration? It represents a significant, and not necessarily comfortable, change to life as we have known it.

The model that has existed in recent memory in this Diocese has been one of having “parishes” and “missions.” Parishes have been those congregations that fit several characteristics: they own their own building; they support a full-time priest, called a Rector; and they are financially self-supporting—i.e., they do not rely on a financial subsidy from the diocesan budget. The exact requirements are in diocesan Canon 20.B.20.2.)

Mission congregations, on the other hand, have been congregations that do not meet one or more of these criteria (“fail to meet” might better describe the mindset that has accompanied being a mission congregation). The criterion that has been most often lacking has been the requirement that the congregation be financially self-supporting. Each year missions have had to apply for funding from a diocesan committee. The exact committee and method of application each have varied over the years, but the requirement has still existed. The expectation and the push has always been that mission congregations are expected to become self-supporting. To become a parish implied that the congregation had finally “succeeded.”

The priest of a mission congregation is called a “Vicar,” and the governing body, instead of being a Vestry, is called a Bishop’s Committee. The Bishop appoints both the Vicar and the Bishop’s Committee, the latter after nomination by the congregation. Thus the Bishop has greater control of a mission congregation than of a parish.

Mission congregations have often behaved as though they believe there is a “Diocese” out there that should support them, without realizing that the “Diocese” is simply all the congregations, and that the money used to support them comes largely from the other churches in the Diocese. They also have seemed to believe that parishes are doing well financially, while missions struggle. In my experience, parishes often struggle financially, running deficit budgets that necessitate their drawing down endowments, while a number of mission congregations have had surpluses at the end of the fiscal year. In effect, some mission congregations have used their diocesan subsidies to supplement their own savings. (I do not know how many missions have done this. I do not mean to imply that all of them have, as I know some missions struggle; however, I can name several off the top of my head, despite having limited knowledge of the budgets of individual congregations.)

Implication

As we move to a different model of ministry in congregations, we will have to examine and change the definitions of *parish* and *mission* in the diocesan canons. The Standing Committee suggested some changes to the relevant canons at the Annual Meeting of the Diocesan Convention in October 2011, but the Convention chose to refer the matter to Diocesan Council for further study. This was wise (in my opinion), as the models of ministry we use and thus the best definitions of these terms are in flux.

In recent years, subsidies from the diocesan budget to individual congregations have decreased or disappeared. At the same time, some parishes have either exhausted their endowments or have made the hard decision to stop drawing on their savings, other than taking a portion of their earnings. The global financial meltdown in 2008 and subsequent economic difficulties have accentuated all these trends. Several parishes have voted to become mission congregations, in order to receive a subsidy or because they could no longer afford a full-time priest. Even some formerly “cardinal parishes”—i.e., congregations that at one time were large and financially strong and were the central congregation in a region—have questioned whether they can afford a full-time priest.

Practical Reasons

Obviously, financial concerns are the primary practical reason for considering shared ministry. If a congregation cannot afford a full-time priest, then joining forces with one or more other

congregations perhaps will enable them to call a full-time priest. Most priests need a full-time salary; few are able to work part-time (or “part-salaried,” as the saying goes: a euphemism for the fact that clergy generally work more than whatever portion of full-time they have been asked to serve).

The Episcopal Church on West Kauai may be the oldest such configuration in the Diocese. It consists of two congregations—St. John’s, ‘Ele‘ele, and St. Paul’s, Kekaha—that have been served by one priest since St. Paul’s was

founded in 1947 (St. John’s had been founded several years before, in 1941). In this case, they have a combined name because in 1993 they chose to be one congregation (thus, they have one Bishop’s Committee) with two worship sites, rather than retain the distinction of being two separate congregations.

For a time, Christ Memorial, Kilauea, and St. Thomas, Hanalei, remained two separate congregations being served by one priest. This arrangement ended in 2010, when St. Thomas voted to dissolve and its members joined Christ Memorial.

In addition to the finances needed for paying a priest, an additional practical reason exists for sharing ministry that has more to do with the laity, and that is simply the

Implication

Some of the realities described in this report—such as missions putting subsidies into their savings and parishes drawing down endowments—and some of the suggestions, such as congregations sharing priests, imply some sort of centralized funding. Some people have suggested paying all clergy from a common pot: paying for the clergy constitutes the diocesan subsidy, and the church then pays for the other items in its budget on its own. Essentially, all clergy (or most of them?) would be on the payroll of the Office of the Bishop.

This development would imply that the Diocese would have more say over how much priests are paid, beyond simply setting minimums for compensation, as is currently the case. In other words, if a priest’s compensation is coming out of the common pot (i.e., the diocesan budget), the Diocese as a whole has a vested interest in how much any individual priest is paid. Congregations have occasionally inflated a priest’s salary in order to increase the priest’s Highest Average Compensation, a computation that determines the amount of the priest’s pension when he or she retires. Priests have demanded, or have been offered, a compensation beyond the minimum. Perhaps, as a compromise, the Diocese would set the base pay, according to whatever criteria it chooses to use. The congregation could then supplement the salary, if it chose to do so.

decreasing availability of volunteer labor in churches. I remember in the 1980s, hearing someone (a church consultant, I think) say that churches in the United States had depended for decades on the volunteer labor of women who did not hold jobs in the workforce; he or she warned that this source of labor was disappearing. At that time I already could see the truth of this warning.

Nowadays, volunteer labor is even harder to come by. Various changes in society, such as changes in the workforce and in communications, and generational differences, have meant that laity, in general, feel more time pressures and are less inclined to participate in churches in the ways they did in the past: by serving on committees, volunteering for the work that churches need to keep themselves running, and participating in educational offerings, such as adult education classes that meet for several hours in an evening for weeks at a time.

Diana Butler Bass, drawing on research by historian E. Brooks Holifield, describes how the nature of congregations in the United States has changed over the decades. (My observation is that these descriptions also apply to Hawai'i.) From 1870 to 1950, churches were “social congregations,” which “initiated an array of programs to meet the religious and social needs of a changing society.” The parish hall was “the most important sacred space on their property.” From 1950 to the present (but seeming to be fading away), churches were “participatory congregations.” These churches “developed innovative worship and new programs as evangelism tools for recruiting new members.... The programmatic strategies employed by these congregations tended to be market oriented—defining faith as a product and congregants as religious consumers.”¹

Both these models depended (it seems to me) on a large time-commitment on the part of the laity, whether in social commitments (such as frequent potlucks, Round Robin dinners, and church bazaars) or through participation in programs and small groups. I do not see laity, as a whole, desiring this same level of time commitment in their church.

On the other hand, people do devote great amounts of time, money, and effort to various other commitments, such as children's soccer, hula, martial arts, and the like. Why not the church? (This opens another whole set of questions and issues.)

Sharing ministry among several congregations can reduce the amount of volunteer work needed if the sharing extends beyond simply the clergy. One of the possibilities I will discuss below is sharing the administrative work among several congregations.

¹ Diana Butler Bass, *The Practicing Congregation: Imagining a New Old Church* (Herndon, VA: Alban, 2004), pp. 15-17.

Theological Reasons

The reason usually given to sharing ministry among several different congregations is that it better fulfills the Baptismal Covenant. As I conducted research to see how other dioceses, both within the United States and in other Provinces of the Anglican Communion, share ministry, I found that they generally practice some form of what has been called Total Ministry. In this model, usually applied in dioceses with rural or otherwise small congregations (such as Nevada or Northern Michigan), a congregation discerns which of its members might fulfill certain roles in the church's life, such as catechist, pastoral care giver, administrator, preacher, and the like. One person (or perhaps more than one) is designated the sacramentalist and this person is ordained a priest, so that he or she can officiate at the sacramental rites for the congregation. The sacramentalist may or may not also be the preacher. (This is a very succinct description of Total Ministry.)

One rationale given for this model is that it allows everyone in the congregation to fulfill their Baptismal Covenant by sharing in the leadership of the church. However, this assumes that the "ministry" to which laity are called is in the church, by filling some role that in previous eras was restricted to the clergy. I believe it far more likely, and far more faithful, that the ministry to which laity are called is in the world: precisely by fulfilling the responsibilities of their everyday life, such as those associated with work, school, family, and community, in a Christlike way.

(There are other problems with Total Ministry, and signs that it has not always functioned in the way desired, but they are not necessary to go into here.)

The more compelling reason for sharing ministry across several clergy and congregations is the communal nature of the Church. Much of American church life has been individualistic, reflecting American life in general. Individual congregations, and individual priests, have tended to compete with one another for the "sheep." A sign of success has been to have a larger congregation and a larger salary. The Episcopal Church derives from the English parish system, in which churches have geographical boundaries. In practice and at heart, we tend more to operate like congregationalists, in which each individual congregation is treated as a discrete unit and the various congregations are competing with one another.

We can accomplish more together, however, than we can separately. When people use the Baptismal Covenant to justify shared ministry, they tend to use references in the Apostle Paul's Epistles to all of us having differing gifts, which are all necessary in the fullness of the Body of Christ. Similarly, different congregations have different gifts, styles, and personalities. They, too, are all necessary to show the fullness of Christ and the Church.

One could argue that adopting styles, patterns of life, and attitudes common on the United States Mainland does not fit in Hawai'i, for a number of reasons. What has become the Episcopal Church of Hawai'i was originally founded by the Church of England and not by American missionaries. I believe it is more fruitful to look to models in the British Isles, such as Ireland and England, and in Asia, such as Polynesia and Aotearoa/New Zealand, than it is to look to models in the American Episcopal Church.

Death and Resurrection

Let's be honest: Changing the way we provide for clerical and other leadership in our congregations from a one-priest-one-congregation model to some kind of shared model will feel like death for a number of people. Many people may feel a sense of failure that their church cannot manage to pay a full-time priest. They may grieve that they have to share "my priest" with another congregation. Expectations of what church "looks like" will need to be different. Priests themselves may feel a sense of failure, that they were unable to build up their congregation to self-sufficiency, or that the church declined in attendance or finances "under my watch."

I myself struggle with these feelings of death in the church: the very fact that we *need* shared ministry to me represents some kind of loss of vitality: our numbers are dropping, we are saddled with expensive buildings, people are disinclined to give their money to the church, and the whole concept of "church" seems foreign or irrelevant to an increasing portion of the general populace.

On the other hand, what passed as "vitality" in a previous generation often had little to do with faith. Having multiple church bazaars and potluck suppers, as characterized churches a generation or two ago, has little to do with faith in Jesus Christ; these activities are more the signs of a social institution. People joining a church in order to "get ahead" in society, a reason that many people joined Episcopal churches in the past, at least on the U.S. Mainland, likewise is hardly a sign of faithfulness and vitality. It is more a sign that Episcopalians tended to be upper-middle-class or wealthy. Joining a church to "get ahead" is more an example of pride and materialism than of any Christian virtue.

Perhaps the current situation, which may feel like "death," is more an opportunity for resurrection: to focus on faith in Jesus Christ, how we can live this faith in our daily lives, and how we can call other people to know the power of Christ to transform lives in the midst of a troubled world.

What Name to Use?

What name should we use to designate a group of churches that are working together and sharing clergy, in whatever configuration? One could say *region*, because these groupings are likely to be geographically based, in large measure. *Region*, however, already has a technical definition in our diocesan canons (Canon 13A). To use the same word in another sense could be confusing.

Another possible term is *consortium*. This is accurate, to a certain extent, but sounds too businesslike. It is not terribly exciting to say, "I belong to the Windward Consortium," for example.

The Church of Ireland uses the term *union*. I think this term would suggest to many people the notion that the congregations are actually merging: in other words, becoming one congregation. Since many people are afraid of merging congregations, I think this term would not work here.

To have a Hawaiian term would be useful and appropriate, in our context. Some have suggested the word *hui*, which has connotations of a grouping or an association. One website says it means "a tight knit group that is not related."² Whether it is the appropriate term to use for a group of churches working together and sharing clergy, or if there is a better word to use, I will leave to someone who is more conversant with the subtle meanings of Hawaiian words than I am.

In this document, I have chosen to use the word "consortium," despite its disadvantages. Wikipedia defines it as "an association of two or more individuals, companies, organizations or governments (or any combination of these entities) with the objective of participating in a common activity or pooling their resources for achieving a common goal."³ Since this describes the basic intent in having churches share ministry and clergy, and because I could not find a better term, I am using it for the purposes of this report.

I have also attempted to avoid the terms *rector*, *vicar*, *parish*, and *mission* because, as indicated above, the meanings of these terms, as defined at present, may not fit the models of ministry to which we are moving. I have occasionally used the term *rector*.

² Discover Hawaii Tours website, describing common Hawaiian terms; <http://www.discoverhawaiitours.com/blog/2009/06/03/hawaiian-words-you-should-know/>; retrieved February 21, 2012.

³ "Consortium," on Wikipedia, <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Consortium>; retrieved February 24, 2012.

General Principles

One could share ministry between clergy and congregations in any of a number of different scenarios: for example, two clergy serve three congregations; the part-time Associate Rector in a larger congregation is the part-time Priest-in-Charge of a smaller congregation. Several general principles, however, should hold true no matter what the configuration. These are enumerated below. Doubtless there are others that could also be listed and that we will discover as we put shared ministry into practice.

Someone needs to be in charge

Someone needs to be in charge of a congregation, whether a priest or a licensed Pastoral Leader. In addition, in a group of congregations sharing clergy leadership, ideally one of the clergy is in charge.

When I visited the Church of Ireland, which has multiple examples of several priests serving several congregations, I always observed that one of the priests was in charge (perhaps with the title Rector, while the others were Associates or Curates). This is not to say that such is always the case, as my experience was not particularly widespread, but it did seem to be the general practice.

Stipulating that someone must be “in charge” directly contradicts one of the principles of the Total Ministry model. In that model, the leadership of the congregation is a collaborative venture in which the people holding the various roles (sacramentalist, administrator, pastoral caregiver, etc.) make decisions for the congregation together. This particular model of ministry goes by different names in different places. Local Collaborative Ministry is the phrase various dioceses around the world use to describe a model that sounds the same as what is generally called Total Ministry or Mutual Ministry in the United States.

For example, the Diocese of Rupert's Land in Canada (the diocesan see city is Winnipeg, Manitoba) says quite explicitly that no one is in charge. A document on the diocesan website entitled “Local Collaborative Ministry in Practice,” has a section entitled “Who will be in charge?” The answer to this question is, in part, as follows:

Experience has shown that there is a problem with designating one person as “in charge” of a congregation committed to LCM. When that person is a non-resident priest, the designation perpetuates an unhealthy sense of dependency. When it is a locally identified person, he or she quickly becomes the local cleric with all the old expectations that go with that role, despite everyone's efforts to the contrary.

As a result, LCM structures need to operate within a model of shared or circular leadership....

Shared leadership will be a special challenge for congregations that continue to have a full-time stipendiary Rector or priest-in-charge. While she or he takes on new roles as the mentor and trainer for the congregation and team, attention will have to be given to sharing the traditional leadership functions which have gone with that position.

It is commendable to want to avoid the clericalism of earlier decades. However, this model of completely shared leadership will not work in Hawai'i, for two reasons. One is that, in our experience, congregations here look for someone to be in charge. Clergy on the U.S. Mainland in recent decades have been taught that the church belongs to the congregation and that the role of the priest is to encourage the laity to determine what they want to do and then to help them achieve it. Whenever a priest has adopted this attitude and role in a congregation here, the relationship between the priest and congregation has fallen apart. The congregation has looked to the priest to *lead*. Authoritarianism does not work here

Warning

If the method of leadership that works here in Hawai'i involves a priest getting to know the people of a congregation, then we have to beware of any model of shared leadership that does not allow the cultivation of relationships. For example, if the priest has charge of so many congregations that he or she is "on the road" all the time, then the priest will never have time to know the people. One might say that the priest will not have time just to sit and talk story.

Example

Several examples exist in the Diocese of Hawai'i from the past decade of congregations that grew, flourished, or went in a new direction under the leadership of a priest who was quite intentional about setting a vision for ministry and calling on the people to follow it. Two examples are St. Michael and All Angels, Lihue, and St. Elizabeth's, Honolulu (Palama).

either: the priest cannot simply order people around. Instead, what works is for the priest to listen to the people in the church, discern their character, hopes, and dreams; to pray and discern how God calls the congregation to be; and then to set a vision, communicate it, and guide the people in working towards that vision. Congregations in Hawai'i often do talk in terms of "collaborative leadership," but what that seems to mean in practice is the priest avoiding authoritarianism and being able to be with the people as a spiritual guide.

The second reason that the circular model of leadership would not work has less to do with Hawai'i and more to do with human nature: in a vacuum of leadership, *someone* will take charge. In the words of a title of a now-famous essay, this method of leadership leads to “the tyranny of structurelessness.” The essay was written by a feminist, Jo Freeman, after observing feminist groups that tried to operate on a basis of shared leadership, in which no one was in charge. Originally a talk in May 1970 to the Southern Female Rights Union, the essay was first published officially in 1972. Freeman writes,

...the idea [of “structurelessness”] becomes a smokescreen for the strong or the lucky to establish unquestioned hegemony over others. This hegemony can be so easily established because the idea of “structurelessness” does not prevent the formation of informal structures, only formal ones.... Thus structurelessness becomes a way of masking power.... As long as the structure of the group is informal, the rules of how decisions are made are known only to a few and awareness of power is limited to those who know the rules. Those who do not know the rules and are not chosen for initiation must remain in confusion, or suffer from paranoid delusions that something is happening of which they are not quite aware.⁴

Hilary Wainwright, writing about Freeman's article in Zmag, synthesized the article in these words: “this apparent lack of structure too often disguised an informal, unacknowledged and unaccountable leadership that was all the more pernicious because its very existence was denied.”⁵

For these reasons, as we move to a model of shared ministry, we should ensure that we formally invest someone with decision-making power. Traditionally, in the absence of a Rector or Vicar, during an interim time, the Senior Warden or Bishop's Warden is in charge. (We even joke that the Senior Warden is not truly needed until there is no Rector, when suddenly they find out just what their role entails.) If a congregation has only occasional clergy leadership, we may do well to select, train, and license a Pastoral Leader for the congregation. In the Canons of The Episcopal Church, a Pastoral Leader is “a lay person authorized to exercise pastoral or administrative responsibility in a congregation under special circumstances, as defined by the Bishop” (III.4.3).

⁴ Jo Freeman aka Joreen, “The Tyranny of Structurelessness,” <http://www.jofreeman.com/joreen/tyranny.htm>, p. 2 when downloaded as a PDF, accessed February 23, 2012. I first encountered this article in a class in group dynamics at Harvard Divinity School. The version of the essay on the website cited is a compilation of three different, officially published versions. (The essay also was unofficially published many times.)

⁵ Hilary Wainwright, “Imagine there's no leaders,” <http://www.zmag.org/znet/viewArticle/2999>, Transnational Institute, October 9, 2006. Quoted in Wikipedia, “The Tyranny of Structurelessness,” retrieved February 23, 2012.

Can't work the clergy to death

The temptation in a model of ministry in which clergy might serve more than one congregation is to schedule priests' time in such a way that they spend all their time on the road, traveling back and forth between congregations. The result would be that they would become functionaries, whose only role is to be the "magic hands" officiating at the Eucharist and to offer occasional pastoral care in the case of emergencies. Such a scenario elicits the image of the priest rolling into the parking lot in order to rush into the church in time to officiate at the Eucharist and then rolling out again on their way to the next church service. When I was on sabbatical in Ireland, I saw a priest who had charge of five congregations in five different villages in a remote corner of the country. I met him on the one Sunday of the month in which he came to the congregation in the village in which I was staying. He officiated at the Eucharist and then held a Vestry meeting and then left. He seemed exhausted. The other Sundays in the month, the congregation held Morning Prayer, with a diocesan Lay Reader officiating.

We need to structure models of shared ministry so that the clergy are not spread too thin among several congregations.

The worship service must be treated with integrity

Theoretically, it would be possible to structure a priest's time among different congregations so that a layperson (a licensed Worship Leader) led the Liturgy of the Word, and possibly even that a licensed Preacher delivered the sermon, so that the only role required of the priest is to officiate at the Eucharist itself. This would be a

Warning

The Episcopal Church has tended toward an ontological view of ministry (though the question of whether the priesthood is simply a function or involves an ontological change—a change in one's being—is a source of continual debate). Our ordination vows reflect an ontological view of ordained ministry: a priest is asked, "Will you do your best to pattern your life...in accordance with the teachings of Christ, so that you may be a wholesome example to your people?" (Deacons are asked the same question, except that the question concludes with "all people" instead of "your people.")

Models of shared ministry, with priests serving several congregations, can easily lead to a functional view of ministry: the priest has certain roles he or she is expected to fulfill (primarily officiating at the Sacraments, especially the Eucharist, since congregations increasingly want Eucharist every week, and deacons and laity are not *allowed* to officiate). In other words, it is tempting to consolidate priests' time so that the only role they are truly expected to fill in a congregation is a sacramental one. This robs the priesthood of the whole notion that it is the *personhood* of the priest that matters, through which one fulfills one's ministry, as given by God. Thus, we would do well to ensure that we do not structure our shared ministry models such that the emphasis is on the functional roles of the priesthood.

convenient arrangement if two congregations served by one priest had their services so close in time that the priest could not arrive at the second church by the time the service began. Convenience, however, does not mean that it is the right thing to do. Word and Sacrament are meant to be of one piece. Theoretically, the congregation might manage to experience the worship service as a seamless whole. It is more likely that they would experience an underlying anxiety (“will the priest really arrive on time?”) that would not be conducive to true worship. This setup could also accentuate the already-existing tendency to treat the Peace as “halftime.” The priest, however, would likely have no sense of worship as worship; the Eucharist itself would be completely divorced from the Liturgy of the Word (during which time the priest would be driving).

Thus, in conclusion, it is most desirable that we structure any kind of shared ministry such that a priest is present in a church for the entire worship service.

Clergy should meet weekly

If several clergy are serving a group of several churches, the clergy should meet weekly—or at least every other week. This meeting should include not just planning and discussion of any issues that have arisen; it should also include Bible study and prayer. It is essential to base the meeting in Scripture and prayer in order to help cement the group and keep it from being merely a business meeting. (No doubt through reading Scripture and praying together, the group will also discover their differences! Far better, however, to reveal their differences openly in a context of prayer than to have the group know their differences but never talk about them, or to fall simply into debating with one another.)

Meeting weekly may seem like a large time commitment, especially for people whose time is likely already going to be stretched thin. I have heard repeatedly, however, that clergy groups that meet weekly are more likely to “work” whereas those that meet monthly or less can more easily degenerate into “bitch and brag” sessions. (Unfortunately, I cannot document this evidence.)

Centralize and streamline the administration

Administration is a task that is almost universally disliked in congregations. Priests complain about it and lament that seminaries do not teach them how to do it. Laypeople complain when their priests neglect to fill administrative duties. Part-time priests literally do not have time to handle the administration of a congregation. More than once, when leading a Mutual Ministry Review in a congregation with a part-time Vicar, I have stressed to the Bishop’s Committee that if their priest is supposed to be working 20 hours a week, or even 30, that having the priest handle the administrative tasks is a waste of the priest’s time

and the congregation's money. It is rarely the area of a priest's expertise—they are far more likely to enjoy preaching, leading worship, teaching, and caring for people, which are in fact the central roles of the priesthood.

On the other hand, we also have congregations who lament not being able to afford a full-time priest who nevertheless employ a church administrator for a substantial sum. Perhaps they could afford the priest if they got rid of the administrator. The Vestry or Bishop's Committee then wonders who will take care of all those administrative tasks. The quick answer is that they could be divided between the priest and volunteers.

This brings us back to the question of volunteers and where a layperson should be focusing his or her own attention and God-given gifts. Unless someone specifically enjoys administrative tasks (and some do), it makes little sense to saddle a layperson with administrative duties simply to fill a puka.

What administrative duties are we talking about? These are the tasks usually named: compiling and printing a weekly worship bulletin; compiling and printing a newsletter; updating a church website; maintaining a mailing list; opening or distributing the mail; and routing phone calls. Sometimes administrators fill some financial duties, such as making deposits or being the bookkeeper.

Some of these tasks could be fulfilled by volunteers. For example, playing with websites is fun for some people, so updating the website could be handled by a church member. Maintaining a mailing list is not terribly time-consuming, but it does mean making sure the channels of communication are clear, so that changes can reach the person handling the task.

In general, it would be best to streamline and centralize administrative tasks.

Administration could be centralized in a region of congregations, by hiring a person (at whatever percentage of full-time is necessary) to handle the administration for that group of churches. Individual church phone numbers could be forwarded to a central office. The administrator could print the bulletins for each of the congregations, maintain the mailing and membership lists, and handle basic correspondence.

Example

One consortium of churches that is already using a central administrator is the Episcopal Church in Micronesia. Although their congregations are not part of the Diocese of Hawai'i, our Bishop has oversight of ECIM, and their clergy are canonically resident in our Diocese. ECIM has four congregations: three on Guam and one on Saipan. An administrator works at the "church office," located at one of the Guam congregations, and handles the administration for all four congregations.

It would also be wise to streamline administration to eliminate some of the standard tasks. For example, churches do not truly need church bulletins. The Sunday readings can be ordered on handouts, if desired. For worship, one can use Prayer Books and a hymn board, or project the service onto a screen (someone has to set up the projector, however). Or, if a congregation likes having the entire service printed in a bulletin, rather than using Prayer Books, a congregation can create seasonal worship booklets. I created such booklets when serving as a part-time Vicar; they have the added advantage of allowing for seasonal variations in different elements of the service, such as the Prayers of the People, the Eucharistic Prayer, and the musical setting for the service music (the Gloria, the Sanctus, etc.).

Another method of streamlining administration is to have a regional newsletter. This has the added advantage of fostering communication among the congregations in a consortium. Each congregation could have its own section, but events common to the group as a whole, diocesan notices, and clergy columns could all be included.

A website could also be regional. In England and Ireland, congregations that share clergy typically have a website for the entire consortium (or “union,” as they are often called). Again, each congregation could have its own section, and other sections would contain news or information common to all the congregations.

Raise up and use Deacons

Most of this document deals with the sharing of priests. However, deacons could have a vital role in shared ministry among congregations. Bishop Robert Fitzpatrick, from the time of his ordination to the episcopate in March 2007, has called for congregations to raise up more deacons: those people whose gifts, talents, and orientation is toward a role of leadership in being a bridge between the church and the world, in taking the ministry of the church to the broken and needy of the world and in bringing the concerns of the world to the church. (I mean here vocational deacons, whose call is to the diaconate, and not transitional deacons, who are preparing for ordination to the priesthood.)

In a model of shared ministry, deacons could both serve their local communities and also “float” among the congregations. The model I have heard from Bishop Fitzpatrick is that their community ministry might be in the neighborhood of their own particular congregation. Their liturgical ministry, however, would be to all the congregations in the consortium, so that on any given Sunday they would be serving in any one of the congregations. One advantage of this model is that all the congregations would witness and experience the ministry of a deacon on Sundays. Deacons, like priests (and anyone else), are quite different, with different gifts and foci for their ministries. With several deacons in a

region, Bishop Fitzpatrick could ask each one to focus on a different area of ministry in the community, such as homelessness, substance abuse, or being the voice of the Church in the business community. (Technically, deacons work for the bishop.)

Having several deacons in a consortium also frees up the priest for the ministry of Word and Sacrament. In recent decades, priests often have been made to focus (or have chosen to focus) on community ministry. While a priest plays a certain role in the community, and cannot simply go sit in the church office away from the world, the role of the priest, according to the ordination vows, is more focused on the church itself and on the ministries of teaching, preaching, worship, and pastoral care. When any given priest might be serving more than one congregation, it is even more imperative that priests' time be focused in those roles that properly belong to the priesthood. Having a greater number of deacons to serve in the community, and to be leaders in such ministry, frees up the priests' time.

Use the differing gifts of the different participating clergy

Having a division of labor, in essence, between priests and deacons, according to the ministries to which they are called and for which they are ordained, is an example of a principle that should also operate on a wider scale: to use in any given consortium the differing gifts and predilections of the clergy participating in the group. Likely all of them will be needed for preaching and leading worship. However, some might be better at pastoral care, some might like to teach, some might be especially good at planning, and so on. They should be encouraged to exercise the ministries for which they are best suited and to share the other responsibilities with others in the group.

Implication

To share the varying roles of ministry within any given group of churches means a certain giving up of control that may not come easily to clergy. As I said in my sabbatical report, in discussing congregations sharing clergy:

“A major ingredient in congregations sharing clergy successfully is the attitude of the priests. This kind of ministry seems to require a different mindset than what has been the case in American denominations. In the United States, there has been a focus on ministry as a ‘career’ or a ‘profession,’ emphasizing self-reliance and minimizing cooperation and collegiality. To share clergy successfully, it seems the focus must be on the health of the Diocese as a whole, and priests have to be willing to work together.”

Specific Scenarios

Desiring to move to a model of shared ministry, and laying out general principles, are both well and good in theory, but how would it work in practice? Trying to put together exactly how several congregations would share clergy or cooperate in other ways is often difficult, because of differences in personalities of the congregations and of the clergy, and because of logistical considerations, usually conflicts in Sunday service times.

It is often easiest to put together a shared ministry situation when the several churches involved are all in transition: they happen to be without clergy leadership all at the same time, and so a priest or priests can be called with the express purpose of creating a shared ministry situation or consortium of churches. This was the case with the recent call of a clergy couple, the Revs. Mike and Becky Tinnon, to serve three congregations in West O'ahu (see Example under #5 below).

Several possible scenarios exist for sharing clergy leadership and for providing leadership to small congregations. I will describe below, in no particular order, scenarios that I have seen or that have arisen in conversation in recent months. Doubtless there are others. I will then describe how these scenarios might be applied in the various regions or the various churches of the Diocese.

One caveat: I have proposed scenarios for clergy leadership in the congregations as they currently exist. It is always possible that some congregations will close or that others will be created.

Shared Ministry Scenarios

1. Associate in a larger congregation serves as Vicar of a smaller one

In this scenario, two priests would be serving two congregations. One would be the Rector of the larger congregation. The second priest would serve in two part-time roles: as the Associate Rector of the larger congregation and as the Priest-in-Charge or Vicar of a smaller, nearby congregation. The Rector might or might not be ultimately responsible for the smaller congregation, depending on how the arrangement was set up.

On Sundays, the Associate would serve primarily in the smaller congregation, although occasionally the Associate and the Rector should swap places. The Associate's role in the larger congregation could be whatever is most needed, such as pastoral care, adult education, or evangelism, as several possible examples.

Example

In my research of how ministry is shared in other dioceses, I saw an example of this model in St. Luke's, Rochester, Minnesota. They began this arrangement in 2008 by calling a curate (a newly graduated seminarian), who served as the Associate at St. Luke's and as the Priest-in-Charge of a nearby small congregation, St. Peter's, Kasson, about 15 miles from St. Luke's. The curate's appointment is for three years. In July 2011, a new curate started in this ministry. He divides time on both Sundays and weekdays about equally between the two congregations (<http://stlukesepiscopal.org/about/clergy-staff-and-vestry/>, retrieved February 20, 2012).

Proposal

The practice in this Diocese has been to give subsidies from the diocesan budget to small congregations. Since the cost of clergy compensation is generally the largest line item in a small congregation's budget, one might say that the subsidy is helping the congregation pay for the priest.

At the same time, some of our larger congregations have reached a transition point in size where one priest can no longer effectively serve the congregation and still allow the congregation to grow. This is the classic choke point between a "pastoral-sized" and a "program-sized" congregation. The congregation is in a catch-22 situation: they need another priest if the congregation is to continue growing, simply because of the amount of programming and pastoral care required, but they cannot afford to call another priest, because their membership and attendance are not yet high enough to support a second person. Currently, only one congregation in the Diocese—St. Clement's, Honolulu—has a full-time Associate Rector.

What if we gave subsidies to some of the larger congregations to help them pay for an Associate, with the stipulation that the Associate would serve part-time at a nearby small congregation? We would not only be providing a small congregation with a priest, we would also be helping our larger congregations—something that is easy to neglect in the usual effort to help the smaller, financially struggling congregations.

2. Congregation raises up someone to be ordained

A congregation could identify someone in their congregation who has the gifts of priesthood and nominate the person for ordination. The person most likely would go through the local training program (rather than attend seminary) and would serve as the priest of the congregation. It would be wise, as part of this process, for the person to serve an internship or two in another congregation, perhaps first while in formation and then as a transitional deacon. This setup would allow for broader experience and would help the person adopt the role and personhood of a priest. Because congregations and priests both can have a hard time adjusting to a new role among people they have known for some time, these times of separation could help with such an adjustment.

It is likely that the priest would be bivocational: they would have another career that would be their main (or perhaps sole) source of income.

This model is essentially the same that used to exist as what was called a “Canon 9 priest”: a priest raised up within and trained for priesthood in a small, often rural congregation, who was not permitted to serve anywhere else. The Episcopal Church eliminated this particular Canon in 2003, but the basic model could still exist, except that the priest would be free to move to another congregation if he or she so chose.

Example

A person in the Diocese of Hawai'i who was essentially raised up this way is the Rev. David Gierlach. He had earned a Master of Divinity degree on the mainland some years before, but had not been ordained. After about 20 years of his being a lay member of St. John's by-the-Sea, Kane'ohe (Kahalu'u), the church nominated him for ordination. After ordination and after serving his transitional diaconate in another congregation, he returned to serve St. John's as their part-time Vicar for several years. During his time at St. John's, Gierlach continued working as an attorney.

3. Call a bivocational priest

As a variation of the above model, a congregation could call a priest who is bivocational—i.e., the person not only is ordained, but also has another skill or profession that allows him or her to earn at least part of a full salary. The other “job” could be anything: a social worker, an accountant, an editor, a graphic artist, a college professor, and a civil servant are just a few examples of possible jobs that could be an adjunct to serving as a priest. The reality is, however, that there are few priests who fit this description.

After seeing the changes that have happened in the Church and in the area of deployment (clergy placement in congregations) in just the seven years I have worked in the Office of the Bishop, I think that priests would do well to have another skill they can use to earn an income, at least part-time.

The reality, of course, is that any bivocational priest would have to be very organized and intentional about how he or she uses time. I think it would also help if the “other job” were not all-absorbing of time and energy.

4. The “St. Elizabeth’s model”

St. Elizabeth's, Honolulu (Palama), has essentially a unique model of shared ministry. Three priests serve there, more than any other in the Diocese; they did have four priests, before the death of the Rev. Saimone Lino in January 2012. The Rector, the Rev. David Gierlach, has general oversight; the Rev. Peter Fan, who is non-stipendiary, and the Rev. Imelda Padasdao, who is bivocational, serve specialized ministries to specific ethnic groups

but also assist in the main Sunday worship service. Lino, before his death, served as the priest of the Pacific Islander Ministries, a diocesan-funded initiative serving several congregations but based primarily at St. Elizabeth's. St. Elizabeth's has, essentially, several congregations under one roof. Theoretically, a priest assisting at St. Elizabeth's could also serve part-time at another congregation, in a variation of the first model mentioned above.

5. Several priests share the leadership of several congregations

Rather than having one priest serve two congregations, in this model several priests serve in a consortium of several congregations. If finances are a consideration (if the congregations cannot afford full-time priests), then the number of congregations has to be greater than the number of priests, and/or some of the priests must be part-time or retired. One of the congregations could be

Examples

In the past six months, the Diocese of Hawai'i has begun two different cases of several priests sharing leadership of several congregations, which are slightly different.

In one case, the Revs. Mike and Becky Tinnon, a clergy couple, were called to serve three congregations: St. George's, Honolulu (Pearl Harbor); St. Timothy's, Aiea; and Joy of Christ Lutheran Church, originally in Pearl City. Selected lay leaders of St. Timothy's and Joy of Christ had been meeting for several years to discuss how to share ministry, and Joy of Christ had begun worshipping at St. Timothy's. The Bishop added St. George's to the conversation, as they were in a clergy transition. The leadership of the three congregations recognized that the Tinnons had differing and complementary gifts, and that each of the congregations would benefit from having each of them involved in the ministry in the congregation.

The second example, begun in February 2012, is the Windward Regional Ministry. In this case, four congregations are sharing the leadership of initially three, and soon four, clergy. Each of the congregations cannot afford a full-time priest: Emmanuel, Kailua; St. Matthew's, Waimanalo; Kane'ohe Episcopal Mission (formerly Calvary), Kane'ohe; and St. John's by-the-Sea, Kane'ohe (Kahalu'u). The three initial clergy, all of whom are serving part-time, are the Revs. Peter Besenbruch, David Blanchett, and Carol Arney. Joining the team full-time in June or July is Leo Loyola, who will be graduating from Virginia Theological Seminary in May and was sponsored for ordination by St. John's by-the-Sea. Each of the four congregations has one of the priests as their primary priest-in-charge. That priest also serves in that congregation on most Sundays. About every six weeks, one of the priests conducts worship in two of the congregations.

For payment, the priests in the Windward Regional Ministry have been put on the payroll of the Office of the Bishop, and the congregations are billed for a portion of the total compensation package. In addition, a portion of the compensation comes from the diocesan budget. In the case of St. Timothy's, St. George's, and Joy of Christ, St. Timothy's takes care of payroll and the other two congregations reimburse them.

considered the central congregation of the consortium, and one of the priests could be the Rector or the Regional Dean. Each of the congregations should have one of the priests as the primary clergy-in-charge, who is with them on most Sundays, but the clergy should also rotate leadership on Sundays and they should take on various tasks according to their different skills and interests. Generally, at least one of the priests will have to lead the worship at more than one congregation on any given Sunday.

For this model to work, several factors have to be in place: the congregations need to be fairly close geographically to one another, as a priest has to be able to travel from one congregation to another, and the congregations have to agree on times of services that will allow the priests to serve them all. Conceivably, one or more of the congregations could have Morning Prayer, led by a Worship Leader, instead of the Eucharist; most congregations, however, object to not having Eucharist services on Sunday. Or, one or more retired priests could help out by supplying regularly on Sundays, but taking no other tasks in the consortium. Congregations might experiment with times of services other than on Sunday mornings, such as Saturday or Sunday evenings, if this fits their congregations.

This model also would work best if the members of the congregations see their congregational boundaries as more “fluid” than fixed—in other words, if the members would gladly join in activities in another church building

Implication

To have a consortium of congregations serve as the primary “congregational unit” implies several departures from standard Episcopal practice. One is simply a change in mindset on the part of both clergy and parishioners from “my congregation” and “my priest” to “our congregations” and “our priests.” I wonder if this change would happen over time, as people become used to the idea in practice. Sometimes as I think of this model of ministry, I am reminded of group practices on the part of physicians. I remember when they first came into existence, people objected to seeing a physician other than their own. Now I do not hear this complaint so often, and when I went to a group practice on Kaua'i, seeing another physician in the practice, as was occasionally necessary, was not objectionable at all.

The other implication concerns the Parochial Report. This report, required annually by The Episcopal Church, details membership, worship attendance, and financial statistics for the congregation. But in a consortium, in which some worship services might take place in a congregation other than “one’s own,” how would Sunday morning attendance be counted? (For example, it has been suggested on the Windward side that if any person wishes to attend an early Rite I service, they go to St. Christopher’s rather than attempt to have two such services occurring at the same time in a small geographical area.) How would Sunday school attendance and teachers be counted, if children attend the Sunday school of another congregation (as currently happens at the Cathedral of St. Andrew, whose children go to St. Peter’s for Sunday school)?

than their own. In effect, and perhaps in reality over time, the consortium itself would be the congregational unit, rather than the individual worship sites.

6. A congregation led by licensed laity, with occasional supply

A small congregation might be led by a licensed Pastoral Leader, with licensed Worship Leaders conducting Morning Prayer for the Sunday service. A neighboring priest should have oversight of the congregation, perhaps celebrating the Eucharist there once a month. If the congregation wanted Eucharist more frequently, they could recruit supply priests.

This model would work best in a congregation that is independent in nature with strong lay leadership.

7. A rotating team of visiting clergy

Recently in the Diocese, the suggestion has arisen for a small congregation that cannot afford full-time clergy to become a “sabbatical site.” The Bishop’s Office occasionally receives queries from priests who are planning sabbaticals and offer to serve in a congregation here for anywhere from two weeks to two months. One priest has suggested that a congregation could simply be served by priests on sabbatical.

As we have continued to consider this option, we have discovered that a better path would be to have a team of priests, most likely who are retired, to serve a congregation, each for about two or three months at a time. The priests would agree to return each year for perhaps several years. It would be like a congregational time-share. We have been discussing this option with the Episcopal Church on West Kauai.

In order for this model to work, the congregation would need to have a house that is furnished, at least with the basics, and would need to provide a vehicle. It would also help for the congregation to be in a site that visitors would find aesthetically appealing; to be blunt, part of the attraction for the priest is to be in a lovely place for several months.

Thus, the church would provide a house, a car, and perhaps a minimal salary. The priests might provide their own transportation to get to Hawai'i (if they do not already live here). It would be helpful for the administrative tasks to be handled by a part-time administrator, volunteer(s), or a Pastoral Leader. A neighboring priest would still need to have oversight of the congregation.

8. Be a teaching church

Seminarian interns can be a great way to supplement the ministry of a congregation—or conceivably to serve a small church under the oversight of another. They also can be less expensive than an ordained priest (they are not yet on the pension plan, and they may already have health insurance). Being a teaching church—having an intern for at least a

portion of the year—also can be enlivening for a congregation: each year (or whatever the time period may be), a new seminarian—with his or her own personality, gifts, interests, and enthusiasms—comes to the congregation. When I was in seminary, I served a nine-month internship in a congregation in another part of the country that was a significant part of my education. The internship was endowed: members or friends of the congregation provided housing and a car, and my small stipend came from income from the endowment.

This model is essentially a combination of #1 (Associate in one church serves part-time in another) and #7 above (rotating team of clergy). A small congregation would be affiliated with a larger one. The intern would primarily work in the smaller congregation, while the priest of the larger congregation would have oversight of the smaller one and would serve as a mentor for the intern. The primary drawback is that the intern would not be able to officiate at the Eucharist, so the worship would be Morning Prayer. On some Sundays, the priest and the intern could switch churches, or the smaller congregation could have a supply priest perhaps on one Sunday a month. With supply, the intern would conduct the Liturgy of the Word and preach, and the supply priest would celebrate the Eucharist. This scenario has the added benefit of the intern's having exposure to a range of clergy, other than just the mentoring priest.

Just as in the rotating team of clergy model, the smaller congregation would have to provide housing and a car.

9. Share clergy with a Lutheran congregation

Episcopal and Lutheran clergy have been able to serve in each other's congregations since the turn of this century, when the Called to Common Mission agreement between the two denominations was adopted. Thus an Episcopal congregation and a Lutheran congregation, each of which cannot afford full-time clergy, can call an Episcopal priest or a Lutheran pastor to serve part-time in each.

The Episcopal Diocese of Hawai'i has a good relationship with the Lutheran clergy here, who constitute the Hukilau Conference of the Pacifica Synod of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America.

Examples

The Diocese and the Synod first entered into a shared ministry together in 2004, when St. Philip's, Maili, and Maluhia Lutheran, Waianae, jointly called the Rev. Karen Perkins, a Lutheran pastor. She serves half-time in each congregation.

In addition, as already described above, Joy of Christ Lutheran Church has been worshipping at St. Timothy's, Aiea, in their own worship service, for several years. Now both congregations, as well as St. George's, share the Revs. Mike and Becky Tinnon as their priests and pastors.

Applications to Specific Congregations

To consider how any given congregation or region could move to some specific model of shared ministry requires considering logistics, personalities, theologies, and geography. For example, the model of shared ministry being implemented on the Windward side of O'ahu would likely not work on the Big Island, simply because of the much greater distance between the congregations on the island of Hawai'i. Some regions, such as Maui, are already in conversation about how they can implement shared ministry; in their case, perhaps the various models outlined above might spark their creativity in applying one or more of these to ministry on Maui.

Nevertheless, below I propose how the above models of shared ministry might be applied in specific situations in the Diocese. For some churches, I have not suggested that they participate in shared ministry; in each of these situations, I will explain why. Note that these are suggestions and not directives! I personally do not have the authority to tell a congregation how they should construct their ministry.

First, however, I suggest that several congregations in the Diocese be considered "anchor" congregations. They might serve as the central congregation of a consortium, with the Rector being essentially the Regional Dean. Or they might be one in which the Diocese helps to support an Associate Rector, who would then serve part-time at another congregation as the Priest-in-Charge. The congregations that I propose be considered "anchor" congregations (because essentially they already are) are the following:

- St. Michael and All Angels, Lihue, Kaua'i
- Good Shepherd, Wailuku, Maui
- St. Elizabeth's, Honolulu (Palama)
- Cathedral of St. Andrew, Honolulu
- St. Paul's, Honolulu
- St. Clement's, Honolulu (Makiki)
- Epiphany, Honolulu (Kaimuki), and/or St. Mark's, Honolulu (Kawahulu)
- St. Christopher's, Kailua, O'ahu

I should also add that I have tried to work out shared ministry scenarios that allow for clergy compensated at full salary. It is always conceivable that a bivocational or otherwise part-time priest can be found for any particular position that cannot or has no need to pay at full salary. Finding such priests, however, requires an intentional effort to train such priests and/or "God's dropping someone into our lap," as does occasionally happen.

Big Island

Shared ministry on the Big Island is made difficult by the much greater distances between towns than elsewhere in the Islands. It is hard, for example, for me to think of how Holy Apostles, Hilo, could be included in shared ministry with another congregation because of the distance and quality of the road to any other congregation. The nearest congregation is St. James, Waimea, which is about 80 minutes away. Holy Apostles and its Rector could, however, cooperate with the other congregations in various ventures and in “swapping pulpits” upon occasion, as I understand is already being discussed. Ironically, the Big Island has in the past been one of the regions that has had the greatest degree of cooperation and collegiality between congregations and between clergy.

Christ Church, Kealahou, and St. Jude's, Ocean View:

The priest of Christ Church could have oversight of St. Jude's. St. Jude's fits in scenario #6 above (a congregation led by licensed laity, with occasional supply): they have strong lay leadership and could recruit people to be trained and licensed as Worship Leaders and perhaps as a Pastoral Leader.

St. James, Waimea (Kamuela); St. Augustine's, Kapa'au; and St. Columba's, Paauilo:

St. Columba's already is a preaching station under the oversight of St. James. Some kind of shared ministry has often been suggested between St. James and St. Augustine's, and has been often resisted. The distance between the two is about 23 miles, over a mountainous road subject to fog, or 32 miles by the coast. To travel back and forth constantly between the two congregations has struck many people as very tiring. St. Augustine's has a vicarage, newly remodeled, and two Sunday services, morning and evening, for different portions of the congregation.

Currently both St. James and St. Augustine's have priests-in-charge to help the congregations discern what shape their ministry will take in the future. The Priest-in-Charge at St. James, the Rev. David Stout, could be called as the Rector. The priest at St. Augustine's is a retired priest, the Rev. Heather Mueller, and could not. So essentially, for both congregations, their options are open.

Two models are possibilities in this situation, both of which involve the priest at St. James having oversight of St. Augustine's. One is the rotating clergy model. St. Augustine's essentially tried used this to a certain degree during its recent interim time, which lasted about 18 months. The church has a furnished vicarage, is in a lovely location, and has strong lay leadership. The other possibility is to be a teaching congregation, with a seminarian who is mentored by the priest at St. James.

Other of the models could also conceivably apply here. A clergy couple could serve these congregations. Or one of the congregations could raise up someone to be a bivocational priest.

Kaua'i

Currently on the island of Kaua'i, St. Michael's, Lihue, has a Rector, the Rev. Bill Miller, and Christ Memorial, Kilauea, has a half-salaried Vicar, the Rev. Robin Taylor. All Saints is about to be vacant and is questioning whether they can afford a full-time priest. The Episcopal Church on West Kauai receives a subsidy from the diocesan budget and has been vacant since June 2011. A retired priest from the Mainland is serving a three-month stint there, essentially as an interim who is helping the congregation figure out what comes next. All Saints and West Kauai have houses.

Demographical differences make determining a shared ministry model on Kaua'i somewhat difficult. Because of the makeup of the congregations, St. Michael's and Christ Memorial fit together best, and All Saints and West Kauai. Geography, however, would suggest a different pairing. In addition, even though distances are relatively short, the prevailing mindset is that they are far, so people resist traveling to different parts of the island.

St. Michael's is one of those congregations that is in transition to a larger size and could benefit from having an Associate. Thus model #1 could conceivably work here, with a part-time Associate serving as a part-time Priest-in-Charge of either West Kauai or Christ Memorial. I would suggest West Kauai, if it were the right person.

All Saints and Christ Memorial do have a shared history to some extent: Lay Readers from All Saints used to travel to Christ Memorial to lead services. With some adjustment in service times, and with strong lay and administrative support, it is conceivable that one priest could serve both congregations. All Saints has an administrator who works half-time for the church and half-time for All Saints Preschool.

Another possibility is that three priests, and perhaps an intern, could serve all four congregations. This would require a greater degree of cooperation among the congregations than probably exists at present.

Finally, the congregations might consider some combined administrative support. Conceivably, with some streamlining of operations, one administrator could serve the three smaller congregations, working one day each week at each of West Kauai and Christ Memorial, and three days a week at All Saints.

Maui

The current situation on Maui is that Good Shepherd, Wailuku, and Holy Innocents, Lahaina, each have Rectors; Trinity by-the-Sea, Kihei, has a full-time Priest-in-Charge; and St. John's, Kula, is in transition with a three-quarter-time Interim. The congregations have been discussing trying some model of shared ministry, sparked by St. John's realization that they cannot truly afford a full-time priest. Trinity and Holy Innocents also have had difficulties paying full-time compensation.

St. John's and Holy Innocents both have houses. Currently no church on Maui receives a subsidy. Maui also is blessed with a number of retired but still fairly active priests, as well as the Chaplain of Seabury Hall, a private Episcopal school in Makawao. Distance does play a role, as the distance from Lahaina to Kula is 42 miles.

Maui seems like one of the easier regions for implementing shared ministry. One possibility in the short-term is Good Shepherd retaining its own priest and the other three congregations sharing two priests, who live in the rectories at Holy Innocents and St. John's. On Sundays, rather than one of the priests serving two congregations, I would suggest that the retired clergy and Seabury Hall's Chaplain pitch in to serve the third congregation that Sunday. This would involve working out a rotating schedule for Sunday services. Ideally, the Rector at Good Shepherd would also become part of the rotation.

The more difficult part may be figuring out who is "in charge" of each of the congregations. With two priests and three congregations, it essentially means one priest being in charge of two congregations and one priest being in charge of the other. Another possibility is to use a Regional Dean who is "in charge" of all three. This would require a great deal of communication, cooperation, and lack of ego.

Over time, it seems best if all four congregations were considered one congregational unit, with four worship sites. In that case, a Regional Dean could have oversight, with several assisting priests.

Moloka'i

Working out a form of shared ministry on Moloka'i is difficult to conceive: Grace Church is the only Episcopal church on Moloka'i. Some have suggested that Grace Church have regular supply by a priest who lives on another island; however, even if a priest were to travel there on a regular basis, the flights are in a small plane, not always on time, and can be expensive. Moloka'i suffers economically, and Grace Church receives a substantial subsidy from the diocesan budget (about \$48,000 per year).

In addition, Moloka'i is remote, with few amenities on the island, and finding a priest willing to live there can be difficult. Spouses of priests may have difficulty finding employment.

On the other hand, it is a beautiful place with enthusiastic and faithful parishioners. For someone who does not care about having the so-called "amenities" of larger towns and cities, but prefers living in a close-knit community where the priest can truly become part of the people, it may be ideal.

I still believe, as I said when Grace was last in transition in its priestly leadership two years ago, that "this one can be solved only through prayer." In other words, it ideally needs someone who prefers the lifestyle it offers. We do not find such people through the regular deployment procedures. We need God to drop someone into our lap.

The only other option I see is to raise up someone locally to serve as a priest there, or at least to raise up a Pastoral Leader and Worship Leaders and to have occasional supply priests celebrate the Eucharist (preferably the same priest or two would serve on a rotating basis so as to establish a relationship with the congregation).

O'ahu

I will list each congregation separately below, in more or less geographical order, beginning in the east and going around the island.

The churches in East Honolulu have been cooperating in some respects for several years, by holding joint Advent and Lenten classes. Its clergy also meet regularly.

Holy Nativity:

This is one of the congregations that I suggest retain its own priest. It is a fairly complex system, with a large physical plant and a K-6 school. The priest there is unlikely to be able to devote time elsewhere, yet the congregation is not large enough to be able to have both a Rector and a part-time Associate.

St. Mark's:

This is another congregation that may most justifiably retain its own full-time priest, this time by reason of churchmanship. St. Mark's is the only Anglo-Catholic congregation in the Diocese, and has Eucharist services daily. Nevertheless, it could cooperate with other churches in sharing an administrator.

Good Samaritan, Honolulu (Palolo Valley), and St. Mary's, Honolulu (Moiliili):

Good Samaritan has determined that they can afford a priest one-third time. They currently are using supply. St. Mary's has had a full-time priest, who is about to leave, but the church struggles to pay full-time. They have a rectory.

I would suggest one of several options:

- The two congregations share one priest, two-thirds-time at St. Mary's and one-third-time at Good Samaritan.
- The two congregations form a consortium with Epiphany. The Rector of Epiphany would have oversight of all three congregations, with another priest serving in the rotation and perhaps having functional oversight of St. Mary's.

Epiphany, Honolulu (Kaimuki):

See above. In addition, I note that Epiphany has an administrator, who could perhaps assist in the administration of Good Samaritan.

St. Clement's, Honolulu (Makiki):

This congregation should retain its own Rector, though perhaps its Associate could serve part-time in another congregation or assist in a consortium.

St. Paul's, Honolulu:

Retain its Vicar, and call an Associate who would serve part-time as the priest-in-charge of St. Stephen's, Wahiawa. St. Paul's has already begun offering services at St. Stephen's, because of the large Filipino population in Central O'ahu.

Cathedral of St. Andrew, Honolulu:

The Cathedral ideally should have an Associate in addition to its Dean, although the new Dean is making creative use of retired and other nonparochial clergy to supplement the leadership. One could also argue that diocesan clergy should help out at the Cathedral if asked, since the Cathedral is the Diocese's church, more than any other church.

Nevertheless, if the Cathedral were to participate in shared ministry with another congregation, I see three possibilities, two of which involve having a part-time Associate who is also part-time in another congregation:

- St. Luke's, Honolulu, which is a small, historically Korean congregation close to the Cathedral geographically. However, we are about to have among us a priest from Korea who will serve as a missionary through June 2014 to help us determine if there is the possibility of a Korean-language ministry for the Diocese here.

- St. John's by-the-Sea, Kaneohe (Kahaluu), which is a small congregation on the Windward side that is historically and consciously Hawaiian. St. John's is currently cooperating in the Windward Regional Ministry, as described above. The Cathedral could have a local priest who will serve especially at the 8:00 Hawaiian service, in cooperation with the Dean, then go across the mountain to the St. John's service. One disadvantage of this arrangement, however, is that it splits the Cathedral congregation in two, a recurring issue, and it means that the Associate is not available for the larger 10:30 service at the Cathedral.
- The third possibility is for the Cathedral's Associate to serve part-time in some other paid diocesan role, if there were one available.

St. Peter's, Honolulu:

St. Peter's has a full-time Rector and a Lay Associate for Family Ministries, who coordinates the campus ministry at the MacCray Center at the University of Hawaii–Manoa. I would suggest simply that St. Peter's retain its Rector. Conceivably its administrator could help in the administration of another congregation.

St. Luke's, Honolulu:

See above under the Cathedral.

St. Elizabeth's, Honolulu (Palama):

Retain the current ministry. One of the priests already helps in another congregation by flying to West Kauai once a month to celebrate a Eucharist service in Ilocano.

St. Timothy's, Aiea, and St. George's, Honolulu (Pearl Harbor):

Retain the current shared ministry arrangement with one another and with Joy of Christ Lutheran.

St. Philip's, Maili:

This congregation has been in a shared ministry arrangement with Maluhia Lutheran, Waianae, for the past seven years. It has received a substantial subsidy from the diocesan budget to help support this arrangement. The subsidy for 2012, however, was cut by more than a third.

The two congregations say that they like to work together. Possibilities for this congregation are to ordain someone locally, who might be a bivocational priest, or to have an Associate in another congregation (perhaps St. Elizabeth's) serve as the priest-in-charge.

St. Nicholas, Kapolei:

St. Nicholas is the most recent diocesan church plant, in the rapidly growing area of West O'ahu. Geographically it is the closest congregation to St. Philip's, above, but the congregations are vastly different in style and demographics. Thus a shared ministry between these two congregations does not seem likely.

It seems advisable for the foreseeable future to let St. Nicholas retain its full-time Vicar as its own. St. Nicholas could, however, and has been, cooperating with other congregations in West O'ahu in various activities.

St. Stephen's, Wahiawa:

See above under St. Paul's.

Windward Region:

As described above, four congregations on the Windward side of O'ahu began a shared ministry as a consortium of churches in February 2012. Three clergy, and soon four with the addition of a transitional deacon, rotate among four congregations: St. John's by-the-Sea, Kane'ohe (Kahalu'u); Kane'ohe Episcopal Mission (formerly Calvary), Kane'ohe; Emmanuel, Kailua; and St. Matthew's, Waimanalo. The Rector of St. Christopher's, Kailua, participates in the weekly clergy group, and all of the congregations, including St. Christopher's, are beginning to cooperate in regional activities.

Holy Cross, Malaekahana, which is a preaching station, is also part of the Windward region. Currently they use Worship Leaders to conduct Morning Prayer, and a priest was suggested to them to celebrate the Eucharist once a month. The people at Holy Cross need to be officially tied to a congregation on the Windward side so that someone has oversight.

An additional change that seems advisable is to consolidate the administration of the various congregations so that one administrator is responsible for the entire consortium.

Administrators:

In the General Principles section of this report, I suggested centralizing and streamlining administrative tasks. Some of the congregations on O'ahu have administrators; some have none. I am not sure how full- or part-time the various administrators are. I do know that the following congregations have administrators: Holy Nativity, Epiphany, St. Clement's, St. Mary's, St. Peter's, St. Elizabeth's, St. Timothy's, St. George's, Kane'ohe Episcopal Mission, St. Christopher's, and Emmanuel. Probably some of them have their hands full as it is. I wonder, however, if some of them could help with the administration of a smaller congregation, whether in their current office or by traveling to the other church.

Training

As I prepared this report on shared ministry, I kept detecting one underlying theme: the need for training. Sharing ministry among congregations and clergy may well require several roles that we have not used before now, or not to any great degree, such as the roles of Worship Leader and Pastoral Leader. We need to institute regular and thorough training for these and other roles.

The Canons of The Episcopal Church specify seven licensed ministries for laity, as follows (Title III, Canon 4, Sections 3–9):

- Pastoral Leader: “authorized to exercise pastoral or administrative responsibility in a congregation under special circumstances, as defined by the Bishop”;
- Worship Leader: “regularly leads public worship”;
- Preacher: “authorized to preach”;
- Eucharistic Minister: “authorized to administer the Consecrated Elements at a Celebration of Holy Eucharist”;
- Eucharistic Visitor: “authorized to take the Consecrated Elements in a timely manner following a Celebration of Holy Eucharist to members of the congregation who, by reason of illness or infirmity, were unable to be present at the Celebration”;
- Catechist: “authorized to prepare persons for Baptism, Confirmation, Reception, and the Reaffirmation of Baptismal Vows”; and
- Evangelist: “a lay person who presents the good news of Jesus Christ in such a way that people are led to receive Christ as Savior and follow Christ as Lord in the fellowship of the Church. An Evangelist assists with the community’s ministry of evangelism in partnership with the Presbyter or other leader exercising oversight of the congregation, or as directed by the Bishop.”

In all these cases, unless different wording is given above, the layperson so authorized functions “under the direction of the Member of the Clergy or other leader exercising oversight of the congregation or other community of faith.” Two other exceptions are that the Eucharistic Minister (EM) and Eucharistic Visitor (EV) “normally act under the direction of a Deacon, if any”; in the absence of a Deacon, then they, too, serve “under the direction of the Member of Clergy or other leader exercising oversight....”

All of these licensed ministries—or as many of them as we choose to use—require training. We need to train deacons, and there is in the Diocese a desire for a method of

priestly formation that does not require people going away to seminary. In addition, we would do well to provide training for other ministries. In the past, or currently, we have offered on a diocesan level training for Christian formation teachers, such as in the Godly Play curriculum and for mentors in the Education for Ministry (EfM) program. Occasionally, we have had training days for lay leaders, when we offer a variety of workshops, such as for wardens, treasurers, EMs, EVs, and others.

The current state of training for licensed and ordained ministries is as follows:

The Commission on Ministry (COM) has set the guidelines and requirements for training EMs, EVs, Catechists, and Worship Leaders. No one has been licensed as a Catechist.

EMs are trained by Deacons of the Diocese or by the Deacon or Priest of the individual congregation. There is no standard curriculum, but there are certain expectations for knowledge and training.

EVs are trained by Deacons of the Diocese. The COM reasoned that because EVs have greater responsibility, in that they are going into people's homes and hospital rooms when people are vulnerable, there needs to be greater standardization of training. In addition, EVs are required

to have the Sexual Misconduct Prevention training and are not licensed unless they have completed this training. We have had various curricula through the years but so far have not settled on some definitive curriculum for EV training. A newly ordained Deacon with a background in education, the Rev. Rick Wirtz, began putting together an EV curriculum, but he died before he was able to complete it.

I have put together a program for training Worship Leaders to lead Morning and Evening Prayer. Generally, congregations have wanted to have Worship Leaders trained in order to meet an immediate need: usually that they are in an interim time between priests and are not able to find, or do not want to pay for, supply priests for every Sunday.

Implication

If we need more training programs, and more extensive training in some areas, then we will need to devote more of the diocesan budget to training. Already two months into 2012, a substantial part of the budget of the Commission on Ministry (formerly the Ministry Development budget) is devoted to training, but it may be stretched thin to cover all the opportunities that exist.

Assuming that more of the diocesan budget is devoted to training, whoever is setting the budget (the Bishop has said it will be the Chairs of the Commissions, a portion of the Diocesan Council, and the Bishop's staff) will need to determine just which training programs are necessary. In the past, various committees of the Diocese, or even certain individuals, have chosen diocesan training programs according to personal preference. Instead, training should be chosen according to what the Diocese as a whole and the congregations need.

We have had a training program for those called to the diaconate, called Na Imiloa, since October 2008. It has met almost monthly, except perhaps in the summer months, and has had an average of about eight members. Some people who were part of the original group have discerned they are not called to the diaconate and others have been nominated by their congregations and have joined the group in the years since 2008. Two people have been ordained from the group, Wirtz and the Rev. Peter Wu. The program, however, was not formalized in any way until August 2011. Even now, it should be improved, with a set curriculum and expectations.

We have not had training for any of the other licensed ministries. We have various people in discernment for the priesthood, or who have been nominated. Some of them are choosing to go to seminary (mostly younger people); others are people who already have a career and family for whom a local training program would be helpful.

I believe that the training programs we offer need to be more rigorous, with clear requirements and expectations. The temptation has been to be fairly lax about the requirements, in the theory that if we had more stringent requirements, people “will never agree to do all that; it’s too time-consuming and demanding.” The people we train, however, be they deacons, priests, or licensed laypeople, represent the Church and the Diocese (and Christ) in public settings. We should ensure that they know the duties expected of them and the background knowledge and skills that go with the role. This has been a nagging feeling in the back of my head, even as I have trained and licensed Worship Leaders, for example. When I visited the Church of Ireland in 2011 and met the Lay Readers in one diocese (more or less equivalent to our Worship Leaders), and saw the rigorous two-year curriculum they are required to complete, I decided that our training could be more rigorous than it has been.

Safe Church Trainings

On the subject of training, the Safe Church trainings are tangential but related, because they are required for leadership roles within our congregations and because they are funded by the diocesan budget. Thanks to the Standing Committee and others in the Diocese, we are getting to the point of having the Safeguarding God’s Children training program regularized. We now have trainers on each of the islands (though we will need at least one more on Kaua‘i), and we are beginning to offer regular trainings on each island. The Standing Committee set the requirement that a person has to take the in-person training initially and thereafter can renew the training each year online. A volunteer is inputting all the people who have taken the in-person training in 2010 and 2011 into the online program so that they can renew online.

We have had more difficulty regularizing the Sexual Misconduct Prevention training. Since about 2005, we have contracted with the Rev. Al Miles, through the Pacific Health Ministry, to provide periodic trainings; the intention has been to have two trainings a year on O'ahu and one per year on the Big Island, Maui, and Kaua'i. Miles's training is excellent (the evaluations, which I always read, are routinely quite positive). However, we regularly receive complaints, especially from people on Neighbor Islands, that they would like more opportunities for training; that once a year is not enough. The Church Pension Fund now has a two-part curriculum for preventing adult sexual misconduct, called Safeguarding God's People. It would probably be wise for us to recruit and train trainers for this program on each of the islands. We already have residing here at least two priests who were trainers in this program in other dioceses.

Proposed Training Program

I propose the following training programs for licensed lay ministries and for Deacons:

Eucharistic Ministers can continue to be trained by the Deacon or Priest of their congregation. EM training needs to involve local custom, and this is most properly taught by a leader of the congregation itself. We might offer a standard curriculum covering the basic knowledge (e.g., the history of the Eucharist) that the Deacon or Priest could use in the local training.

We still need a standard curriculum for training Eucharistic Visitors. I am told that the first part of Wirtz's curriculum, which covers the theological portions, is almost complete; it is a video and the various pieces need to be edited together. The second part was to cover the practical tasks of the EV. We need to check what has been completed and add to it whatever is necessary.

For other licensed ministries (I think we are most likely to use Pastoral Leaders and Worship Leaders), I propose that they join the Na Imiloa training. I suggest that we put together a two-year curriculum in which the three groups (Pastoral Leaders, Worship Leaders, and deacons-in-training) meet monthly for nine or ten months of the year. The group will meet all together in some months: for example, when the topic being covered is more academic or theoretical, such as the Bible, Episcopal Church history, or the theology of liturgy. In other months, the different groups may gather together for opening and closing worship and for lunch, but otherwise will split for at least part of the day into training specific to their roles and ministries, such as community ministry (for deacons-in-training) or congregational leadership (for Pastoral Leaders).

Congregations may object that if they need Worship Leaders, they need them immediately and cannot wait for two years. With this reality in mind, I propose that we

grant Worship Leaders provisional licenses of, perhaps, six months at a time, contingent upon their participation in the diocesan training group.

Beginning last August, as mentioned above, Na Imiloa has been following a more systematic approach to learning, but the program still needs to be fleshed out. I would be glad to complete this program, especially by combining it with training for the other two roles and by soliciting the assistance of educators who are members of the Commission on Ministry.

Joining the three groups together has some distinct advantages:

- The size of the group will be larger. At some meetings, the Na Imiloa group has been down to six people. An ideal group size for education and discussion is larger than this (generally about eight to fifteen; if the group became larger than about fifteen, it could break into smaller groups for discussions and other group activities).
- Since we need multiple training programs, combining them is more economical, for both financial and human resources.
- The focus of ministry for the three groups is different: the ministry of deacons is in the world, Worship Leaders focus on liturgy, and the concern of Pastoral Leaders is the leadership of the congregation. Whereas one might say that their training should therefore be separate, joining them together provides for cross-fertilization of thought and helps prevent entrenchment in one's own particular perspective on ministry.

We will still need different options for local formation for the priesthood. These will likely involve a combination of study at home, perhaps with a local mentor; online classes through a seminary; and summer classes in a seminary in the United States, Canada, or New Zealand.

Discernment for Ministry

Before training, however, must come discernment. People should undertake ministries to which they are called—in other words, to which they are inclined by God-given gifts, and for which they show potential and have enthusiasm.

The Commission on Ministry sponsored a Discernment Day—a day-long workshop on what discernment is and how to do it—in January 2008. Another will be held on March 10, 2012, about two weeks away, as I write this. Such discernment days should be held annually. They should help individuals and congregations both understand what ministry is and the

different roles of laity and of the three orders of ordained ministry, and also methods for determining how an individual might be called to ministry.

I have started sketching out a proposal for regular discernment days, with follow-up sessions for those called to some form of ordained, and perhaps licensed, ministry in the Church. I would like to flesh out this proposal and complete it.

Conclusion

This report is already longer than I ever thought it would be when I started it. How any model of shared ministry will be implemented in any particular place ultimately will depend upon the will, the creativity, and the enthusiasm of the people of that place, both lay and clergy—or at least their willingness to try some new venture.

As I wrote this report, it struck me that moving to more shared ministry, both among congregations and in the Diocese as a whole, requires a greater amount of coordination than the current model. This need implies greater centralization, which is perhaps a dirty word for some but may be a necessary reality. In addition, it is not foreign to the DNA of this Diocese, since we used to be a missionary diocese with a great amount of centralization, within living memory of many in the Diocese.

Centralized coordination could take any (or all) of several different forms:

1. One form is the use of a Regional Dean: a priest, or maybe a layperson, who would oversee a region or a consortium of churches and be the liaison to the Office of the Bishop for that region or consortium. Several decades ago, such a person existed in the role of Archdeacon (different from the current Archdeacon, who helps the Bishop oversee the Deacons of the Diocese). The Regional Dean would be paid for their work, perhaps according to the level of their responsibility. Other dioceses that use shared ministry, by whatever name, often use ministry mentors in a region. These mentors, which could be lay or ordained, train people, visit congregations regularly, answer questions that arise, and basically have some measure of oversight of the congregations.⁶
2. Another form of centralization is adding another staff person in the Office of the Bishop, just to handle additional paperwork and accounting, if nothing else. We already do more such work for congregations than many other dioceses do (for example, by handling health and property insurance). We have added the clergy in the Windward Regional Ministry to the payroll. If more, or potentially all, clergy were added, that is additional work. Moreover, when the Windward Regional Ministry began, some of the congregations hoped that the Office of the Bishop would be taking care of *all* bookkeeping tasks, as it is harder to find individuals able and willing to do this work in congregations. It could be handled, as said before, by a regional administrator or bookkeeper.

⁶ These are the basic tasks, for example, mentioned in “Mentor Training in the Scottish Episcopal Church: A History of Developments,” by Anne Tomlinson.

3. Another possibility, rather than hiring additional staff who actually work in the Office of the Bishop, is to have forms of shared ministry in which parish priests also serve some other role in the Diocese. Perhaps they are trainers in some capacity, or conduct vestry retreats or Mutual Ministry Reviews, or serve as regional mentors. This still implies that the payroll is centralized; otherwise, one would have to work out a complicated system of reimbursement for services rendered, which involves additional paperwork, such as extra W-2's or Forms 1099. Having parish priests serve other roles in the diocese is the model I observed in the Church of Ireland. For example, one priest oversaw and taught the diocesan Lay Readers; another was the Director of Ordinands, overseeing those in the process of ordination. Clergy are paid monthly by the Church of Ireland itself, with the stipend set by the Church of Ireland, though the dioceses that are better off financially can choose to pay more.⁷

One issue I have not addressed, but that remains before us, is what a model of shared ministry implies for the requirements of ordained ministry. As we raise up people to be ordained, as deacons and as priests—or as we recruit people to move here from elsewhere to take leadership positions—what qualities, characteristics, and skills do we seek in them? If ordained ministry is a matter of character and being, and not so much of function, what character do we need our priests and deacons to have?

We have a number of options. What is clear is that the world and the Church are changing, and forms and structures we think have been in place for ages (even though they probably have not) may no longer work. The future is before us. What shall we do?

⁷ Email communication from the Rev. Barbara Fryday, parish priest and member of the finance committee in the Diocese of Cashel and Ossory, Church of Ireland, 31 August 2011.