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Abstract

Current trends indicate the Anglican Church of Canada is declining in members, with many parish churches facing the possibility of closure. Despite this reality, there are thousands of lay people across the country staying involved and providing leadership in parish churches of all sizes. This thesis seeks to explore the dynamics of parish church leadership from the point of view of lay leaders who must face the ongoing challenges required in maintaining viable parish churches during uncertain times. The particular focus is on lay leaders who recently participated in a multiyear parish renewal program as mandated by their diocesan Bishop. The Ministry Assessment Process (MAP) brought together lay and ordained leaders from seven North Vancouver parish churches and required them to work together to create a Ministry Plan which was intended to increase effectiveness in ministry and use scarce resources more efficiently. Despite several years of often difficult and challenging work, the results were disappointing for most of these leaders. Yet, the lay leaders in particular chose to remain engaged in a process that was entirely voluntary in nature – any of them could have left at any time. Why did they stay?
The thesis seeks answers to this question by using this recent experience as a case study. A Focus Group of representative lay church leaders was assembled and invited to reflect on their experience in leadership, using MAP as a common point of reference. The data, generated by a multifaceted engagement process involving questionnaires, interviews and group conversation, is contextualized using historical, sociological and theological methodologies. An ecclesiological hermeneutic is developed and applied to provide a framework for qualitative analysis.

Conclusions about the nature of parish churches, the demands of leadership, and the priority of mission are offered, along with some preliminary recommendations which may be of some benefit for the Church.
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Chapter 1 Ministry Context

This study asks the question of lay church leaders, “Why do they stay?” Implied in the question is the matter of choice; many volunteer lay leaders choose to stay involved with their church communities, even when this commitment leads to enormous amounts of personal frustration and stress. This study seeks to explore the nature of this commitment through an investigation of this question with a small group of lay church leaders who have the unique shared experience of engaging in a multiyear, multi-parish church renewal initiative. Using this common experience as a frame of reference, this study will seek to demonstrate that lay leaders tend towards an operative model of the church identified by Dulles as “Mystical Communion.” This is in contrast to church judicatories and paid clergy leaders, who tend toward an operative model Dulles identifies as “Institutional.” While these models are not necessarily incompatible, the lack of awareness of contrasting operative models of the church can lead to unnecessary conflict, frustration, and missed opportunities for congregational growth and vitality. In addition, this study will provide an analysis of the dynamics of change and argue that the Anglican Church is called to renewal as a “Mission-shaped Church” which will require a commitment to adaptive change on the part of all leaders, lay and ordained.

In this chapter I will provide a brief overview of my personal experience as a priest engaged in small church ministry. I will introduce the Anglican churches of North Vancouver, providing some contextual information by way of explaining the Ministry Assessment Process and the results it achieved. The dynamics of “change” will be addressed. This will set the stage for the exploration of the thesis question: “Why do they stay? Lay church leaders and the demands of institutional change.”

1.1 Personal Background

I am an Anglican priest who has served in three small parish congregations since 1997. The first parish was the Church of Cleopas, Kamloops B.C. in the Diocese of Cariboo. It had approximately 75 families on the membership roll and had an average Sunday attendance of about 50. I served as Deacon-in-charge and then as Incumbent priest from 1997 to 2002. The next was St. Monica, West Vancouver in the Diocese of New Westminster. It was similar in size
to Cleopas, and also included a small congregation on Bowen Island, a short ferry trip from Horseshoe Bay. I served there from 2002 to 2007.

Sadly, both the Church of Cleopas and St Monica have been closed in the last few years, despite the efforts of me and my successors to grow healthy and sustainable parish ministry. The Cleopas property in Kamloops was sold, with the remaining members joining one of the two other Anglican churches in Kamloops. At the time of writing, the St Monica building is rented by an Evangelical congregation, and the property is for sale. Some former members now attend a neighbouring Anglican Church.

The current church I serve is St Agnes in North Vancouver. In membership it is similar in size to both Cleopas and St Monica. An endowment fund worth over $600,000 provides a financial cushion for any budgetary shortfalls. I have served as the Rector of St Agnes since May 1, 2011.

St Agnes is one of five Anglican parish churches which comprise the Deanery of North Vancouver. Until 2011, there were seven churches in the deanery, but since then two have been closed and the properties sold. The five remaining churches have been cooperating in the creation and implementation of a common deanery Ministry Plan. This planning process predates my arrival at St Agnes by some four years. The Ministry Assessment Process (MAP), initiated by the diocese, was begun in 2007 and a Ministry Plan was created in 2010. (Appendix C) When I was appointed on May 1, 2011, the bishop at the time instructed me to work closely with my deanery clergy colleagues and to assist in the implementation of the Ministry Plan.

1.2 The Anglican Churches in North Vancouver

North Vancouver is comprised of two municipalities, the City of North Vancouver (CNV) and the District of North Vancouver (DNV), with a combined population of 135,000. It lies to the north of the City of Vancouver, across the Burrard Inlet. The majority Mother Language is English (66% CNV, 74% DNV), with Persian the next largest percentage at between 5 and 7%. (Wikipedia 2015) Other languages include Tagalog, Korean, Spanish, German, Cantonese and French. The centrally located City includes high density residential areas and the industrial harbour area, while the surrounding District is primarily residential with single family homes but with high density pockets, including the Lynn Valley neighbourhood to the north-east. The area is relatively prosperous, with the median income of City residents at $59,373 and in the District
$87,332. This compares with the District of West Vancouver at $84,345 and Metro Vancouver at $56,113. (CNV 2015)

At the turn of the 20th century Europeans began to settle the unceded Coast Salish First Nations territory north of the Burrard Inlet. As the population grew, sustained by the economic growth propelled by logging and shipping, churches began to be built. The first church in North Vancouver was a Roman Catholic mission church. The next, being the first Anglican church, was St John the Evangelist in 1899. By the end of the next decade St Clement (1908), St Martin (1910) and St Agnes (1910) were established. The population increase following WW II led to the establishment of St Catherine (1948), St Simon (1949) and St Richard (1950).

Plate 1: Map of North Vancouver Churches until 2010

(Source: Google Maps)

For each of these churches, the 1950s represented the high water mark of church attendance and membership. For example, St Catherine’s, serving the growing residential neighbourhoods of Capilano and Highlands, boasted a Sunday school of 1000 children. This pattern is familiar in
many parts of Canada, as churches benefited from the post-war influx of immigrants with Anglican backgrounds from Great Britain and Commonwealth countries. (Stackhouse 2013)

Since that era, the membership in each of the North Vancouver churches has declined, although some, such as St Agnes, experienced a period of growth in the early 1980s coinciding with the Cursillo renewal movement. In 2002, the Synod of the Diocese of New Westminster approved the blessing of same-gender relationships after a consultation process taking place over several years. This precipitated the vehement protests of a minority of clergy and their congregants, including those of St Simon. In 2004, the priest and congregation of St Simon “left” the diocese when the priest informed the Bishop that he was now under the authority of a Bishop from another jurisdiction. By the next year the congregation agreed to leave the building, but retained the church’s name. This group still offers Sunday services in a local school gym as “St Simon’s Church, North Vancouver” and operates as a member of the Anglican Mission in the Americas. In 2007, the Bishop of New Westminster appointed a new priest, and the congregation requested the he allow the name be changed to St Clare-in-the-Cove, after St Clare of Assisi. Unfortunately, after several years of hard work by a small, committed congregation, St Clare was closed in 2012 and the building sold to a Baptist congregation the following year.

The controversy about same-gender blessings was also divisive in other congregations. St Agnes lost several members who used this issue as a reason to leave. St Martin lost its priest, who abruptly resigned, and nearly half its members chose to attend another church that meets in a local school gym. The crisis was so great the Bishop had to invoke his canonical authority in order to appoint new Wardens and trustees.

While the controversy over the blessing of same-gender relationships has had an impact on church membership, a greater factor is the changing demographic profile of North Vancouver. While in the 1950s these churches could count on a steady influx of immigrants from Britain and the Commonwealth with an Anglican background to provide new members, by the end of the century this was no longer the case. The following table tracks attendance figures for these churches over the last three decades:
As the chart indicates, since 1985 the overall attendance has dropped, and the overall trend is downward. This trend is not unique to North Vancouver, but is similar to what has happened to all Christian denominations across Canada over the last three or four decades. (Bibby 2012)

With five (formerly seven) churches found within a relatively small geographical area comprising North Vancouver, many recognize that change is needed to rectify the situation. For many, the solution to the problem is obvious: either increase the number of members of each church or decrease the number of churches and consolidate the membership into fewer congregations. The trend over the last three decades has been a general decrease in active church membership, so expecting an increase in numbers appears to be naïve if not foolish. The diocesan Archdeacon stated this case in clear, stark language: “one does not have to be a social geographer or urban planner to know that what we have presently is not what we need; I think cooler heads would be willing to say we need two, maybe three, churches to serve the population and mission we’re about (in North Vancouver).” (Fenton 2012) It should be a straightforward, if not easy, technical fix. Simply reduce the number of churches to achieve a structure that is financially sustainable and allows for sustainable ministry. This was the issue the Ministry Assessment Process (MAP) was expected to address.
1.3 Ministry Assessment Process

The Ministry Assessment Process (MAP) was a tool developed by the Diocese of New Westminster synod office staff to assist parishes with ministry planning and congregational development. It featured work books for parish councils, facilitated consultations with congregations, demographic research for regions and parishes, and coaching assistance from staff and volunteers. Its purpose was to help parishes assess their mission and ministries and to plan for the future with a view toward financial self-sufficiency. Between 2007 and 2013 approximately thirty five, or half, the parishes of the diocese participated in MAP.

In 2007, the Bishop determined it would be appropriate for the seven churches in North Vancouver to do MAP together. The intention was to encourage the lay and ordained leaders to work together to create a common regional Ministry Plan. In this way it was anticipated that the issue of the financial viability of the churches would be addressed and resolved. The Bishop’s “mandate questions” invited discussion on four main areas: serving the needs of the local community, Anglican identity, renewing Anglican faith, and sharing resources. (Appendix C: Ministry Plan, 12)

The process began in the fall of 2008 with each parish conducting a parish study using materials provided by the synod office. Then regional meetings were held, attended by lay representatives (first one per church, then two as the meetings progressed) from each of the seven churches, and the priest of each parish. Two Deacons also participated, and during this time one lay leader was ordained a vocational Deacon and continued his participation in this new role after ordination.

Meetings were facilitated by diocesan staff. In January and March of 2010 two larger deanery-wide meetings were held, and these were followed by intensive planning meetings in the spring facilitated by a local United Church minister, brought in as an objective facilitator. A final Ministry Plan was completed on July 15, 2010. (Appendix C) This plan was submitted to Diocesan Council for approval, and subsequently at the Vestry meetings of the individual parish churches. A Ministry Implementation Team was formed to begin the implementation of the plan. The focus of this group was to obtain funding from the diocese to support the hiring of additional staff (two clergy and four lay) required by the plan. The implementation of the ministry plan was then the responsibility of a newly constituted Regional Council which included two representatives of each church and their clergy. This group began to meet in March 2011.
Although the formal Ministry Assessment Process was concluded in 2010, Regional Council meetings were still referred to as “MAP meetings” for some time afterward.

The plan included thirteen specific recommendations, including,

- the development of “a new model of shared ministry;”
- that parishes be grouped according to three main geographical areas;
- that “new ministries” be created and funded through the “release of assets” made available as a result of the sale of redundant church properties.

Curiously, neither conventional strategies for congregational development nor more recent ‘fresh expression’ or ‘missional’ approaches are evident in the final recommendations of the Ministry Plan. A more detailed analysis of the strengths and weaknesses of the Ministry Plan is provided in Chapter 2.

By 2013, three properties, St Richard, St Clare and the St Clare rectory, were put on the market. Although some thought there would be a significant windfall from the sale of these lands, with the expectation that they would be attractive to developers and therefore sold at a premium, the market value of the two church properties was restricted by the fact that they were zoned as “public assembly” land. The North Vancouver municipalities (both City and District) want to protect “public assembly” land that has been designated for schools, hospitals and churches and are reluctant to change the zoning to allow for commercial or residential development.

One property, St Richard’s, sold fairly quickly to a Muslim congregation which then built a mosque on the original foundation. The St Clare rectory sold quickly, as it was a residential property. The church building and property was sold to a local Baptist congregation, but only after being on the market for over a year. All funds from the sale of these assets are held by the diocese. Some funds from the sale of St Richard’s have been used to subsidize two clergy positions in the deanery. The promise of “releasing assets for ministry” through the sale of real estate proved to be rather limited in scope.

One key issue the Ministry Plan seeks to address is the question of financial viability. The intention of the plan is to seek out ways in which the five churches can cooperate, especially in
the common use of what are known as “resources for ministry” which are otherwise known as revenue and buildings. Some feel the issue that needs to be addressed is the question of the buildings; they believe there are too many, that they are too old and in need of costly repairs, and that these costs are preventing ministry from happening. Others look at the budgets of the churches and note that personnel costs account for 70% of expenses and wonder if the problem is an overabundance of paid clergy, musicians and support staff. This is an ongoing conversation with no easy answers.

In early 2013, in light of a deficit budget, the Vestry of St Catherine’s, the largest of the five both in members and size of building, passed a resolution calling for the church to immediately pursue merger opportunities with other Anglican, Lutheran or possibly United congregations. Surprisingly, even with the largest membership of the churches, the anxiety felt by its member seems the most acute. This action reveals the impatience felt by many with the slow pace of change achieved by MAP and the implementation of the Ministry Plan. For these people especially, the MAP process and regional Ministry Plan have not provided a solution to the question of financial sustainability and long term viability.

1.4 The Dynamics of Change in North Vancouver

Given that many small parish churches in Canada have been forced to close, and that more will likely be forced to close, one would expect the imperative ‘to change or die’ might motivate these communities to embrace ‘change’ however that might look. If there are clearly too many churches and not enough people, why is it so difficult to solve this problem? One prominent diocesan official made it known on several occasions that the church should follow the lead of the retail sector. Small, inefficient businesses were giving way to much larger, big-box operations. Surely the Church could follow this model by combining many small churches into one large one to create efficiencies and maximize impact. Yet, such appeals generally fall on deaf ears. It sometimes seems that small churches find it preferable to die rather than change. What accounts for this dynamic of resistance to change, especially in small churches?

1.5 The Small member church

In considering contemporary small-member churches, many draw on the work of American anthropologist Robert Redfield, who used the term “folk society” to describe small, primitive
societies in contrast with modern, industrialized society. Redfield defined a folk society as being “small, isolated, non-literate, and homogeneous, with a strong sense of group solidarity” (Redfield 1947, 297). While not an accurate description of a parish church per se, the notion provides an ideal typical model as a tool to think about the dynamics of a small-member church. Perhaps an overarching or unifying theme might be one of family. “The folk society is a familiar society,” claimed Redfield (301). Moreover, it is a society with a vested interest in maintaining the status quo that actively resists change (303).

In relation to the issue of change, the folk society ideal type can shed light on the small-member church. It seems to most observers that small churches are resistant to change. When evaluated according to criteria that values efficiencies and economies of scale, small churches seem a quaint anachronism, an old fashioned model of ministry that needs to be set aside in order to embrace new, more economical and efficient ways of being the church. David Ray names this institutional bias in favor of bigger and therefore better churches as “sizeism”: “Influenced by elements of sizeism, denominations still pressure smaller churches to close because they are considered inefficient without looking to see if they are faithful and effective or have the potential to be so” (Ray 2003, xxii). In focusing on deficits of membership and finances, what is often overlooked is an appreciation of how resilient small churches are in the face of change. In Chapters 4 and 5 we will attempt to gain insight into the reasons for resilience as we focus on the leaders of small church communities.

1.6 Change and the Anglican Church of Canada

Although an outside observer might not notice it, small-member churches, at least in the Anglican Church of Canada, have experienced an impressive, even relentless series of changes over the last several decades. We can note the following significant developments which have occurred during the past five decades:

- the remarriage of divorced persons in the late 1960’s;
- the ordination of women to the priesthood in the mid 1970’s;
- liturgical renewal in the 1970’s and the introduction of the Book of Alternative Services in 1985;
• the impact of feminism and the use of inclusive language in the 1980’s and 90’s;
• the emergence of the Prayer Book Society of Canada, and the defense of “orthodox Anglicanism” in the 1980’s;
• the issue of homosexuality and the blessing of same sex partnerships in the 2000’s;
• LGBTQ advocacy and the open ordination of clergy in same sex relationships in the 2010’s;
• the eco-justice movement beginning in the 1960’s and continuing with urgency today;
• the Indian Residential Schools litigation and subsequent healing and reconciliation process from the 1990’s to the present day;
• the current debate on changing the Marriage Canon to allow for the marriage in church of persons of the same gender.

This list is by no means exhaustive, and there will be regional and diocesan variations across the country, but the overall trend is clear: the only constant is reaction to change. Not all of these issues are firmly resolved, but each has been or is in play in the life of the church. All Anglican churches, large or small, have been affected by many, if not all, of these changes that have been driven largely by factors and actors internal to the church.

1.7 Change in Canada and the World

Externally driven factors include changes to immigration patterns and demographics, resulting in the decline in the number of Anglicans in relation to the rest of the population. (Bibby, 2012) Rural church communities are affected by the shift of the population from small towns to more densely populated urban areas. Changing social patterns, beliefs and practices related to families, such as marriage, baptism and funerals, mean that fewer people seek out the local church for rituals marking life transitions. A recent Environics summary of recent census data revealed:

In 2011, 67% of the total population reported affiliation with a Christian denomination, down from 77% in 2001 . . . in contrast, 24% reported no religious affiliation—up from 16% in 2001. The impact of recent immigration was reflected in the growing population reporting a
non-Christian religion, accounting for close to 10% of the total population. Slightly over one million identified themselves as Muslim—3.2% of the population. Significant numbers of Canadians reported other larger, non-Christian religious affiliations, including Hindu (498,000), Sikh (455,000), Buddhist (367,000) and Jewish (330,000). (Norris 2014)

Clearly, the Canadian population is changing at a rapid pace, and this will have a continuing impact on not just Anglican but all Christian congregations of all sizes in the years ahead.

Looking at the issue of change from a global perspective, sociologist Anthony Giddens observes:

Our age is not more dangerous -- not more risky -- than those of earlier generations, but the balance of risks and dangers has shifted. We live in a world where hazards created by ourselves are as, or more, threatening than those that come from the outside. Some of these are genuinely catastrophic, such as global ecological risk, nuclear proliferation or the meltdown of the world economy. Others affect us as individuals much more directly, for instance those involved in diet, medicine or even marriage. (Giddens 2002, 34)

The reality of change is not confined to Anglicans, or Canadians. The whole world is a changing and often dangerous place.

Ray provides some helpful observations on the enduring strengths of small churches even in the context of our heavily technologized modern world:

At their best and most faithful, what does a smaller church offer the bigger, high-tech world? Smaller churches offer high touch. They offer a place of belonging to those who feel like refugees. They offer community to those who feel isolated and estranged. They offer an opportunity to make a difference to those who feel superfluous. In a world full of sickness, they offer healing and wholeness. In a world imploding in its own complexity, they offer a simple place where people feel like they’ve arrived where they ought to be. They are a God-given response to this world’s greatest needs. (Ray, 61)

Pappas calls this quality the “redemptive presence in society” of the small church. (Pappas 1998, 7) This may help explain the fact that so many people have remained loyal to and active in their churches, despite significant changes over several decades.
1.8 Change in North Vancouver

Change is hard for people, not simply because they resist things being different or unfamiliar. In their insightful work on the nature of leadership, Heifetz and Linsky point out that “people do not resist change per se... people resist loss” (Heifetz and Linsky 2002, 11).

The process of managing change is a process of managing loss: “People must face the challenge of adapting to a tough reality, and the adaptation requires giving up an important value or a current way of life. Leadership becomes dangerous, then, when it must confront people with loss” (13). Providing a framework for effective leaders who can manage loss through adaptive change is the premise of their work on leadership.

One key distinction they make that is essential to understanding the nature of change is the difference between technical problems and adaptive challenges. Technical problems “have known solutions that can be implemented by current know-how” (Heifetz, Grashow and Linsky 2009, 19). Adaptive challenges require making substantive changes. Solving technical problems tends to reinforce the status quo. In solving technical problems people rely on those areas of expertise where they feel most competent when faced with the challenge of managing change. In contrast, “adaptive challenges can only be addressed through changes in people’s priorities, beliefs, habits, and loyalties” (19). Problems arise when adaptive challenges are treated as technical problems.

A simple but effective metaphor would be the sense of urgency people might have felt to rearrange the deckchairs on the Titanic while it sank. “People often try to avoid the dangers, either consciously or subconsciously, by treating an adaptive challenge as if it were a technical one” (Heifetz and Linsky 2002, 14). People know how to rearrange deck chairs, but they don’t know what to do when the ship is sinking.

Adaptive change comes from understanding the limitations of technical fixes which do not address the underlying problem or real issue. It takes a sense of perspective to recognize an adaptive challenge – a bird’s eye view. An effective adaptive leader will go up to the bridge and observe that the ship is indeed sinking, and then go back on deck to direct people away from the deck chairs and toward organizing the life boats instead. A technical solution might keep people busy, but an adaptive change will ensure they survive.
Of course adaptive leadership is not always that easy or straightforward: “adaptive work creates risk, conflict and instability . . . leadership requires disturbing people – but at a rate they can absorb” (Heifetz and Linsky 2002, 20). More importantly, “leadership . . . requires not only the reverence for the pains of change and recognition of the manifestations of danger, but also the skills to respond” (48). Or, to use church language, adaptive leadership requires extraordinary and creative pastoral sensitivity.

How might the distinction between technical solutions and adaptive challenges help to address the issues faced by the churches in the North Vancouver? The following chart documents the key recommendations of the 2010 Ministry Plan and assesses them according to Technical response or Adaptive change:

**Table 2. 2010 Ministry Plan Evaluation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2010 Ministry Plan Recommendation</th>
<th>Status Report</th>
<th>Technical response or Adaptive change?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. A new model of shared ministry be initiated in North Vancouver which will establish, enable and provide for the sharing of lay and ordained ministry expertise throughout the Deanery, while maintaining an identifiable, on-going relationship between particular clergy and worshipping communities to engage in pastoral care, worship and ongoing responsibility.</td>
<td>The current five parishes (St Agnes, St Catherine, St Clement, St John, St Martin) each have a Vicar (3/4 time) or Rector (full time). The priests meet regularly and share some common programming such as Lenten studies, book groups and retreat leadership. The model is &quot;new&quot; in the sense there is far more cooperation among the deanery clergy compared with other deaneries. But it is not a &quot;new model&quot; for parish leadership as each priest retains primary responsibilities for their respective parishes. Non-stipendiary deacons perform valuable roles in liturgy and program, but their activities are not &quot;new&quot; compared to what they were doing prior to the Ministry plan or compared with other deacons in the diocese.</td>
<td>The current &quot;ministry team&quot; model is a modification of a traditional parish/deanery configuration and in this sense is a technical response and not adaptive change.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. The North Vancouver worshipping communities be grouped according to the following geographic areas: Lynn/Seymour: St Agnes, St Clare, St Clement; Lonsdale: St John, St Martin; Capilano: St Catherine, St Richard.</td>
<td>St Clare was closed in 2012 and the property sold in 2013. St Richard was closed and sold in 2011. Shared programs among the five remaining parishes have not been organized according to the three geographical areas as originally proposed.</td>
<td>Organizing the deanery according to geographic areas has proven to be impractical. This was a technical response that failed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Pastoral care, worship and ongoing responsibility for St Clare be shared by the people of St Clare and the incumbents and communities of St Agnes and St Clement effective September 1st and until the canonical process is completed.</td>
<td>The canonical process rendered this short term recommendation moot once appointments were made in 2011/12 and St Clare was closed.</td>
<td>A technical response to a short term problem.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. The Diocese start a canonical process for shared ordained appointments at St Clare, St Clement, St John and St Agnes...</td>
<td>Process has been completed with Rectors appointed to St Agnes and St Clement and Vicars appointed to both St John and St Martin.</td>
<td>A technical response to a short term staffing problem.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. In Phase One, a new regional position be created for a half-time Children and Youth Coordinator...</td>
<td>A Youth Ministry Coordinator was hired in the fall of 2013 to the spring of 2014, when he resigned. A new hire started in October 2014 and will continue until the end of 2015. The focus is on providing a range of regional activities to attract and engage youth. Programming has been sporadic due to the interruption in staffing.</td>
<td>The program is a regional variation of a more typical youth group program of a program-size church. Technical response, not adaptive change.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. A Deanery curacy position be created...</td>
<td>This was created in July 2012 and lasted until June 2014 with funding from deanery churches and the diocese for a part-time position.</td>
<td>While all churches benefited from the work of the curate, this was primarily for her benefit as a stepping stone from the transitional deaconate to vocational priestly ministry elsewhere in the diocese. Technical response, not adaptive change.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. The role of deacons be reviewed by the Diocese to reflect new models of shared ministry.</td>
<td>This is direction to &quot;the Diocese&quot; which to date has not been responded to or acted on.</td>
<td>While deacons can no doubt play an active role as the church engages in adaptive change, a review of their roles by &quot;the Diocese&quot; is not likely to be the catalyst for change. Technical, not adaptive.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Professionally qualified advice be sought to give the Deanery directions and options and priorities for the existing parish properties.</td>
<td>At least two reports have been generated on this issue which have generated discussion but no identifiable results</td>
<td>Technical response, not adaptive change.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Sale of the St Clare rectory</td>
<td>Sold in 2010</td>
<td>Sold by the Diocese in part to recoup the subsidy provided to St Clare for start-up costs. Technical response, not adaptive change.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Consider the sale of St Richard and St Clare as well as the rectories of St Martin and St Catherine.</td>
<td>St Richard sold in 2011, St Clare in 2013. No plans to sell the rectories.</td>
<td>An assumption made by the creators of the Ministry Plan was that the monies generated from the sale of deanery properties were be held by and controlled by the deanery. In fact, the diocese controls these assets. Some diocesan funding is subsidizing clergy staff positions in the deanery. Technical response, not adaptive change.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Retire the debt owed by St Clare and St John to the diocese.</td>
<td>The St Clare debt was cleared with the sale of the rectory in 2011. The St John debt has been managed through a successful parish financial appeal in 2012.</td>
<td>Technical response, not adaptive change.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. For the purposes of continuity, consideration be given to the extension of the interim priests-in-charge at St John and St Clement, until the completion of the canonical process.</td>
<td>The canonical process was completed in 2012 with the appointment of priest-in-charge in both parishes. Each priest also has deanery responsibilities and receives a diocesan provided subsidy to maintain full time salaries.</td>
<td>Technical response, not adaptive change.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Assessing the thirteen recommendations in terms of technical response versus adaptive change is helpful because it identifies how challenging the prospect of adaptive change truly is. The plan focused on many technical adjustments and has not addressed significant areas of adaptive change. Perhaps the Ministry Plan fell into the trap where “often, organizations will try to treat adaptive issues as technical ones in order to diffuse them” (Heifetz and Linsky 2002, 59).

### 1.9 Balcony perspective

Heifetz and Linsky (2002, 53) describe a process of “getting on the balcony” to observe what is happening to an organization facing change. This balcony perspective allows leaders to imagine themselves temporarily above the action in order to make conclusions and ask strategic questions. First, the balcony perspective helps leaders distinguish between technical fixes and adaptive challenges. The chart above is an example of this type of evaluation with regard to the Anglican churches in North Vancouver.

Second, the balcony perspective invites leaders to “find out where people are at” (Heifetz and Linsky 2002, 55) In other words, to pay attention to how people are currently behaving in their current context. With regard to the North Vancouver deanery, a cursory balcony perspective will offer the following observations:

#### 1.9.1 People prefer to attend their own church.

When people in North Vancouver are given the choice of attending their own church or partnering with another church, they will choose the place that is most familiar. While many people are willing to attend special services such as a common Ash Wednesday service, a Lenten study program, or the annual all-deanery church service, the primary allegiance of parishioners is to their own church. While this may seem obvious, it is also a source of great frustration for those leaders who feel it imperative that people commit themselves to a common deanery identity and show a willingness to leave behind their parochial parish affiliation. For these leaders, a barrier to progress is the stubborn insistence of many in holding on to their parish allegiance.
1.9.2 The bond of local community is more important than the demands of the institutional church.

Even though the church as an institution is making demands of its members to “change” in order to achieve “sustainability,” most church members seem indifferent to these pleas. However, when asked to contribute their “time, talent and treasure” to support their home church or an outreach opportunity, the response tends to be spontaneous and surprisingly generous. Does this speak to selfishness and parochialism or is it an indicator of a great strength of community?

1.9.3 The demands of parish ministry keeps priests focused primarily on their own parishes.

Even though the hope and intention of the Ministry Plan was to develop a “new model of ministry” especially as it relates to the clergy, the North Vancouver clergy are not noticeably different in how they spend their days compared with their colleagues in the rest of the diocese. While clergy each have some “deanery responsibilities,” these are not so different from similar responsibilities other clergy take on as members of committees, task groups and projects that are focused outside the parish. Parish ministry is a demanding and time consuming vocation, no matter the size of the community served. “New models” of ministry that lead to adaptive change must therefore take into account the demands of ordained ministry.

The balcony perspective suggests that adaptive change will be achieved only as a result of a deeper understanding of what motivates people in parishes. Despite the evidence of decline in members, each church in North Vancouver has a core group of leaders who are passionate about their church and committed to its success, however measured.

1.10 Concluding remarks

As we have seen, the dynamics of “change” can take many forms and create extraordinary demands on people in leadership. Despite the many challenges in the face of change, lay leaders have not abandoned their churches in North Vancouver, but continue to try to find ways forward that will ensure their churches will survive. What accounts for this resilience; why do they stay?

In the next chapter the Action-in-Ministry research project developed for this thesis will be described. In Chapter 3 we will explore a theological rationale (ecclesiology) for the parish church and develop an interpretative framework. In Chapter 4 we will explore “where people are
at” by listening with great attentiveness to the voices of ten lay leaders as they reflect on their experience of the Ministry Assessment Process. Chapter 5 will provide a systematic analysis of the preceding chapters in order to answer the thesis question. In this way this study intends to demonstrate that the models of the Church provided by Dulles provide a hermeneutical framework for understanding the underlying assumptions and values held by lay leaders. These assumptions and values gravitate toward the model of the Church Dulles identifies as “Mystical Communion.” This is in contrast to the bias toward the Institutional model embedded in the MAP process. This analysis of operative models helps explain the motivations of lay leaders and the reasons why they stay in voluntary positions of leadership. In addition, this study will argue that adaptive change is necessary if the Anglican Church of Canada is to more fully realize its proper role as a Mission-shaped Church.
Chapter 2 Thesis Project (Action-in-Ministry) Description

In this chapter, I will explain my interest in the experience of lay leaders who participated in the Ministry Assessment Process, and provide a rationale and description of the Action-in-Ministry project that forms the core research for this thesis.

2.1 The limitations of the Ministry Assessment process

Despite the hundreds of hours devoted to discussion, planning and program implementation, the key issues MAP was designed to address remain unresolved. With hindsight, we can recognize that the original goal of encouraging seven parish churches to come to an agreement that reduces costs, rationalizes resources, and achieves financial self-sufficiency was overly ambitious, as the process was not an effective strategy for coming to such an agreement.

Throughout the MAP process, including the implementation of the Ministry Plan, lay leaders from the five churches have devoted themselves to countless hours of meetings. Since 2011, I have heard anecdotes from members of all the churches who, at different times and usually in private, have mentioned to me how difficult they found these meetings. Many thought they had to protect the interests of their church against the demands of others. Some felt the clergy were forcing an agenda of amalgamation and change. Others felt the Bishop and synod office staff were more interested in the value of the land as salable property than in the welfare of the church members. One Warden told me a typical reaction to a MAP meeting was to be unable to sleep properly for several days following. Some clergy participants confided to me that they found the MAP process exhausting.

It is interesting to note there are no clergy who remain in the same position they had at the beginning of the MAP process. Indeed, between 2007 and 2015, thirteen priests have served in various capacities among the North Vancouver Churches, some as part-time interims, some as part-time Vicars, and some as full time Rectors. The change in clergy underscores that it is the ongoing participation of lay leaders that has remained constant.

Some lay leaders engaged in active participation in the MAP process, and then took a break while they handed over the task to someone else. What I have observed is that these people did not simply abandon a stressful experience and not return, but would, in many cases, return to the
‘fray’ after a year or two. The particular focus of this study is on the lay people who participated as parish leaders through the MAP process. Despite the stress and challenges, they remained faithful to their calling to be leaders in the church. Perhaps contrary to expectation, these leaders were not moved to abandon the process or leave their churches. This study seeks to explore why these lay leaders stayed with such a demanding process.

2.2 Thesis Question: “Why do they Stay?”

This study seeks to explore a deeper understanding of why lay leaders of small churches choose to remain in positions of leadership despite the often-stressful challenges of institutional change. Using the shared experience of participation in the Ministry Assessment Process (MAP) as a case study, this paper will seek to demonstrate that lay leaders tend towards an operative model of the church identified by Dulles as “Mystical Communion.” This contrasts with church judicatories and paid clergy leaders, who tend toward an operative model Dulles identifies as “Institutional.” We will argue that church leaders stay in leadership positions out of a sense of loyalty to their primary community, which is the parish church. This sense of loyalty to the parish church can be interpreted by judicatories and clergy negatively as resistance to change. This study will suggest that this loyalty to community is not necessarily a negative thing and can be more positively understood as a source of strength rather than weakness.

2.3 Project Description

The specific steps in the thesis project are enumerated in the Thesis Proposal (Appendix A) and the Ethics Approval Protocol (Appendix B). As these documents describe the steps leading up to the Action-in-Ministry, the following will provide a detailed account of how the planned intervention was actually implemented, how the data was collected and sorted, and some of the key decisions I made in compiling and interpreting the data.

The Doctor of Ministry research paradigm is the Qualitative Research Method. Rather than assembling large amounts of objective data to perform quantitative research, the qualitative approach seeks ‘quality’ of interaction with human subjects and is akin to ethnography. (Sensing 2011) Grounded Theory method provides the researcher with a set of conceptual tools which provide “systematic, yet flexible guidelines for collecting and analysing qualitative data to
construct theories from the data themselves.” (Charmaz 2014) This study utilized data collection and coding practices consistent with Grounded Theory.

2.3.1 Recruiting the Focus Group members

The North Vancouver MAP became, for my purposes, a case study in the dynamics of change as experienced by lay leaders. As noted in the previous chapter, while much was accomplished as a result of the MAP process in North Vancouver, the key issues of mission and financial sustainability were not resolved, resulting in a great deal of frustration and disappointment. In order to address the question of ‘why lay leaders stay?’ through the challenging process that was MAP, it was first necessary to assemble a group of qualified lay leaders who could speak knowledgeably about MAP as they experienced it.

The process of recruitment involved first specifying the optimum number of participants. There were initially seven churches involved with MAP, so two persons from each would yield a group of fourteen. Given that each person would be asked to participate in a Focus Group session, complete a personal questionnaire, and then be interviewed, this seemed more than enough numbers to generate a significant amount of data. To reduce the impact of my bias on the selection of candidates, I requested my clergy colleagues nominate up to four people from each of the seven churches in order that I might find two people willing and able to participate. The letter is included in Appendix A.

In response I received a total of twenty-eight candidates. I contacted the candidates in the order that I received them. As I confirmed participation of each I allowed for a maximum of two from each church. The challenge was to find people who were available during the time I had budgeted to conduct the study during June and July 2015. As it worked out, two people were available from three of the churches, and one was available from four of the churches, for a total of ten participants. As every church was represented by at least one person, I deemed ten members sufficient for the Focus Group.

Focus Group members assembled for about three and a half hours on June 20 in a meeting room at a North Vancouver church. With their permission, the proceedings were recorded using a digital audio recorder. A camera was also used in an attempt to make a video, but the video material was not usable because the camera was set incorrectly. Fortunately, the audio recording
was successful. Following the session, the audio recording was transcribed, yielding some 18,000 words. The transcriptions were formatted for ease of coding. The coding process is described with more detail below.

Each Focus Group member was requested to complete a written questionnaire. The questions included factual information such as age and parish affiliation, as well as reflective questions such as “How would you describe your experience in the MAP process?” and “What gives you hope?” The text of the questionnaire is found in both Appendices A and B. Each participant completed the questionnaire. The results were incorporated into a standard format for ease of coding.

Finally, each participant agreed to be interviewed by me. The object of the interview was to explore statements made in the Focus Group sessions or in the personal questionnaire to ‘go deeper’ in an attempt to shed light on their personal experiences and offer an opportunity to reflect on their own motivations for participating in the MAP process. The interviews were recorded and took place in private settings. Some interviews took place in a church meeting room, others at the home of the participants. One took place on the telephone because the participant was in another city. Interview times ranged from 30 minutes to two hours, depending entirely on how much the participant wanted to say. Each interview was transcribed and formatted for coding.

2.3.2 Coding

The coding method used was the verbatim method known as “In Vivo.” This method is particularly appropriate for studies which “prioritize and honour the participant’s voice.” (Saldana 2013) It takes the words used by the participants themselves as terms of reference by which to organize and categorize the data.

The Focus Group sessions, questionnaire responses, and personal interviews were transcribed using MS Word. Documents were formatted in landscape orientation with the “Track Changes” setting used to allow for notes to be added in a separate column. The Focus Group material was transcribed as three separate documents, so this source is identified as FG1, FG2, and FG3. The personal interviews are identified as I1 through I10, one for each of the 10 participants, and the Questionnaire responses are identified in similar fashion as Q1 through Q10. Each paragraph was
numbered, and each discrete idea within the paragraph was identified using the paragraph number. For example, (I1,1) represents the first paragraph of the interview with participant #1. On several occasions a paragraph contained more than one idea, so these were coded using Roman numerals, so would be represented as (I1,1i). Each idea was given a label based on the content of the idea itself.

In another example, the statement, “we’re learning how much of a challenge it is to recruit people to church in this time and place,” was coded as (I7,2ii) and labelled “Challenge.” “I7” means it came from the interview with participant #7, “2” refers to the second paragraph, and “ii” refers to the second idea expressed in the second paragraph. It was labelled “Challenge” because it reflected one of the challenges of leadership the participant was discussing.

Each coded idea was then recorded manually on a separate 4” x 6” index card, and the cards were sorted and grouped according to their labels. The initial sorting of data cards yielded this table of 611 data cards grouped according to 23 labels:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 3. Initial Sorting of Data Cards</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bishop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clergy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Closing churches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diocese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finances</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The second round of sorting involved identifying general categories and sub-categories in order to bring the material into sharper focus. In this case the In Vivo card titles were grouped according to common topics. This process yielded the results on the following page:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MAP historical context</th>
<th>20</th>
<th>Roxburgh/Neighbourhood</th>
<th>12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MAP context</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Self-description</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAP mandate</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>611</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Stories</td>
<td>Involvement</td>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td>MAP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Church the centre</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Parish leader</td>
<td>Discouraged 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grandmother's name</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Warden 9</td>
<td>Supported 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transformed</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Invited 4</td>
<td>Benefits 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marriage Project</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Burn out 4</td>
<td>Loyalty 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In my DNA</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Little job 2</td>
<td>Ending/leaving 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baby-sitting Time</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>32 Reflections 7</td>
<td>Vision 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nurse</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Burn out 6</td>
<td>Positive 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strange creature</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Personal cost 6</td>
<td>Rumour 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idealist</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Buildings 5</td>
<td>Mandate 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>48</td>
<td>Conflict 4</td>
<td>Money 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Challenging issues</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Put-downs 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Stressful 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unqualified</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>166</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hopes</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This chart served as an organizing principle for preparing the summary of the material which became Chapter 4. The process of writing Chapter 4 involved faithfully summarizing what was said by selecting the best example or most representative set of statements on a particular subject and using the actual words of participants whenever possible. I do not claim this process was ‘objective’ because the categories for organizing the material reflect my research interests. However, in the editorial choices I made I attempted to be as faithful as possible to what I understood to be the original intention of the participants themselves. The chart also gave me the idea of preparing personal profiles of each participant. I had not originally planned to take this approach, but on reflection I realized that the data presented an excellent opportunity to try to represent each participant in a sympathetic light, highlighting the unique personal story of each participant.

The original plan for a “reality check” involved meeting with the group once again in person and sharing my preliminary thoughts of the data. This plan had to be changed because the participants had disbursed and were not available to meet together. Instead, a draft personal summary for each participant was sent to them via email. I also sent the “Second Category Sort” chart, above. I asked for any feedback or comments on this material they might wish to share with me. The responses received were all positive, with some providing clarifying factual information. One requested I omit some of the medical details of the health issue described in her profile, which, of course, I did in the current version. Another provided an update on a community program mentioned in her profile. While interesting, the additional material was not germane to this study, so I did not incorporate it. In an effort to keep the identity of the participants confidential, I identify them in this study by random biblical names while maintaining their gender.

In order to “close the loop” and offer a final opportunity for comments and feedback from the Focus Group members, I circulated a memo which summarized the study, its results and conclusions (see section 4). I asked them if I had answered the question of “why do they stay?” in a manner consistent with their experience. Seven of the ten responded within the allotted timeframe, all in the affirmative.

As I began to develop my interpretation of the Chapter 4 material, I was attempting to frame an analysis based on the two biblical categories of koinonia and ekklesia, suggesting that the loyalty
to community was more important than membership in an institution. I noticed that when people spoke about institutional structures they referred to “The Church,” but when they referred to their own communities they spoke of “my church.” However, this line of reasoning was too limited in focus. A colleague recommended Dulles’s Models of the Church which I found to be particularly helpful as a more comprehensive hermeneutic, as I describe as follows in Chapter 3.
Chapter 3 Theology

The tensions in the life of the church described in Chapter 1 are not unique to the Anglican parish churches in North Vancouver. Indeed, the tension between the church as movement verses the church as an institution are evident from the very foundation of the Christian Church.

This chapter seeks to explore a theological rationale for the parish church. We will examine the biblical and historical origins of the Christian communities first known as *ekklesia*, exploring the tension between the church as a movement of the Spirit, and the church as a formal institution. Then we will encounter the foundational Anglican wisdom of Richard Hooker’s ecclesiology, leading us to a sacramental theology of ministry. We will then engage in dialogue with contemporary theologians about the importance of mission, and conclude with a discussion of the models of the church as provided by Dulles. This exploration of ecclesiology will provide us with a set of hermeneutical tools with which to examine the focus group material in Chapter 4.

3.1 Church

The term “church” comes from the Greek *ekklesia* (meaning “called together” from *kaleo* “to call” and *ek* “out of”) which the first century Christians adopted to describe the kinds of communities they were forming. In the Septuagint, *ekklesia* is one of the words used to translate the Hebrew word (*gahal*) for the assembly of the Israelites who had gathered for a sacred purpose. The other is synagogue: “since Jews in the first century used (synagogue), the first Greek-speaking Christians selected (*ekklesia*) in order to show that their roots lay in the (Hebrew Scriptures)” while also denoting a separate identity. (Achtemeier 1996, 183)

Moreover, in the first century Greco-Roman context, *ekklesia* were voluntary associations formed to advance the interests of their members. For example, members of a common trade such as blacksmiths or jewelers might meet regularly as *ekklesia* to discuss issues of mutual concern. *Ekklesia* could also refer to political gatherings, when public assemblies gathered for the good of the community. Such meetings would also serve a social function, as people would gather in someone’s home to share a meal while they discussed business. In this way, “in gathering as associations or clubs, in regarding each other as a kind of family, in meeting in households, in sharing meals, Christians were making use of a widespread pattern in Greco-Roman society.” (Lathrop 2012, 12)
In adapting the form and using the term *ekklesia*, the first Christians made specific theological claims about the nature of their communities. As church historian Walter H. Wagner notes:

> when Christians applied the term *ekklesia* to themselves, they did more than seize on a term with extensive Greco-Roman and Jewish pedigrees; they made theological claims. The most obvious claim was that Christian communities, separately and as a whole, were not sectarians assembled to deliberate on their own issues, or even synagogues of people who believed that Jesus was the Messiah. Instead, they claimed to be the *ekklesia* of the Lord, the called-out people chosen to be saved through Jesus, to serve God in this age, and to live eternally in the kingdom that is coming – or might already be here – in Christ. The contents, contrasts, and nuances of that claim were debated among Christians, but the assertion held. (Wagner 1994, 20)

Contemporary churches, both large and small, retain this identity as *ekklesia*. They are not merely social clubs or social service agencies, although many might resemble those types of institutions. What makes a community a “church” instead of a “club” is its identity as being an “Ekklesia of the Lord”, a community which gathers in the name of Jesus Christ.

The Gospel According Matthew is known as the “ecclesiastical Gospel” because it is the only one to use the word *ekklesia*. (Mays 1988, 971-2) The word is first uttered by Jesus in relation to Peter, the ‘rock’ on which Jesus will build his church. (Matt 16:18) Following this, the word appears several times in chapter eighteen when Jesus is giving instructions to the disciples:

> If another member of the *ekklesia* sins against you, go and point out the fault when the two of you are alone. If the member listens to you, you have regained that one. (18:15)

> If the member refuses to listen to them, tell it to the *ekklesia*; and if the offender refuses to listen even to the *ekklesia*, let such a one be to you as a Gentile and a tax collector. (18:17)

> Then Peter came and said to him, “Lord, if another member of the *ekklesia* sins against me, how often should I forgive? As many as seven times?” (18:21)

In each instance the word *ekklesia* is used in the context of addressing conflict within a particular Christian community. These references suggest that one of the original social functions of the church was to provide a formal mechanism to manage conflict.
This pattern is also encountered in the account of Ananias and Sapphira (Acts 5), who secretly held back proceeds from the sale of their property and then lied to Peter about it. First Ananias and then Sapphira are struck down and killed, presumably by God as punishment. As a result, “great fear seized the whole ekklesia . . .” and the term ekklesia appears for the first time in Luke/Acts. (Acts 5:11) The use of ekklesia in this context suggests the term was used to refer to a community in which members were accountable before God for their actions. That fear is the first emotion associated with ekklesia also suggests that membership in the Ekklesia of the Lord was not something to be taken lightly, but was a consequential personal commitment.

In contrast to ekklesia, the other word often used in the New Testament to describe the Jesus community is koinonia. In Acts, the newly baptized are portrayed as participating in a Spirit-led movement where “they devoted themselves to the apostles’ teaching and fellowship (koinonia), to the breaking of bread and the prayers.” (Acts 2:42) The commitment to the koina, or commonwealth, was indeed a transformational commitment to the whole community: “Now the whole group of those who believed were of one heart and soul, and no one claimed private ownership of any possessions, but everything they owned was held in common.” (Acts 4:32) The deception of Ananias and Sapphira seriously undermined this new communal ethic, which perhaps explains why their punishment was so severe.

St Paul also uses koinonia with reference to “sharing in the blood of Christ” in the Eucharist (1 Cor 10:16) sharing in suffering the suffering of Christ (Phil 2:1; 3:10), and sharing in fellowship with the Holy Spirit (2 Cor 13:13). Koinonia speaks to the rich quality of relationship the followers of Jesus shared with each other and with the risen Christ. If ekklesia is the formal nature of the new community, koinonia is its content and heart. When it comes to a full understanding of what we mean by “church”, koinonia and ekklesia are two sides of the same coin. Or, mixing metaphors, they are heart and head, essential parts of the body. The movement characterized as koinonia needs ekklesia, form and structure, if it is to be effective over time; ekklesia needs koinonia if it is to thrive in mission.

Keeping koinonia in proper balance with ekklesia proved to be too difficult a challenge for the early church. The movement characterized by the radical koina of commonwealth gave way to the institutional requirements for ekklesia: order, stability and sustainability. As Bosch notes, in this way the early church “ceased to be a movement and turned into an institution.” (Bosch 51)
He observes that, as an institution, the church becomes anxious and guards boundaries, whereas as a movement it is prepared to take risks and cross boundaries. (51) He explains,

> Our main point of censure should therefore not be that the movement became an institution but that, when this happened, it also lost much of its verve. Its white-hot convictions, poured into the hearts of the first adherents, cooled down and became crystallized codes, solidified institutions, and petrified dogmas. The prophet became a priest of the establishment, charisma became office, and love became routine. The horizon was no longer the world but the boundaries of the local parish. The impetuous missionary torrent of earlier years was tamed into a still-flowing rivulet and eventually into a stationary pond. (53–4)

Thus, the alienation of *koinonia* from *ekklesia* resulted in the institutionalization of a dynamic movement.

### 3.2 Contemporary Critics

For contemporary Christians, the tension between the church-as-it-is and the church-as-it-ought-to-be is no less problematic. For many, the word “church” has little to do with vital and life-giving faith in Jesus Christ but is synonymous with an anachronistic “institution” that seems primarily concerned with its own survival, is resistant to change and is irredeemably stuck in the past.

Contemporary Christian apologists such as Diana Butler Bass and Harvey Cox want to appeal to the majority of the population in North America for whom Christianity has lost its appeal. These writers recognize that people of the twenty-first century have little tolerance for the church as an institution. They are not likely to respond positively to demands for institutional loyalty and the attendant commitments of time and money. Rather, contemporary people are far more responsive to an invitation to become involved in a dynamic movement of faith that is actively engaged in making the world a better place. These writers assert that if the church can rediscover its roots as a dynamic and creative movement, and shed its unnecessary institutional encumbrances, there may be hope for the future of Christianity. If the church clings to its antiquated, hierarchical and authoritarian forms of authority and the dogmas rooted in the past, these writers believe, Christianity will die.
3.2.1 Harvey Cox

Using very broad strokes, Cox paints a historical picture of Christianity in terms of three great “ages”. The first three centuries, beginning with Jesus and his disciples and continuing until the Emperor Constantine, comprise the Age of Faith. Here Christianity was a dynamic movement of the common people, responsive to the needs of the people: “to be a Christian meant to live in (Jesus’) Spirit, embrace his hope, and to follow him in the work that he had begun.” (Cox 2009, 5) This age all but ended with Constantine:

The turning point came when Emperor Constantine the Great (d. 387 CE) made his adroit decision to commandeer Christianity to bolster his ambitions for the empire. . . (He) imposed a muscular leadership over the churches, appointing and dismissing bishops, paying salaries, funding buildings, and distributing largesse. . . For Christianity it proved to be a disaster: its enthronement actually degraded it. . . Christianity became imperial” (Cox 2009, 5-6)

So began the Age of Belief, when “faith” in Jesus was replaced with “belief” in dogmas formulated by the Church. For Cox, a life lived in faith is authentic, whereas a life of belief in dogmas leads to complacency: “We can believe something to be true without it making much difference to us, but we can place our faith only in something that is vital for the way we live.” (Cox 2009, 3)

Only now do “we stand on the threshold of a new chapter in the Christian story” he calls the Age of the Spirit. (Cox 2009, 8) In the contemporary rapid spread of Christianity in the non-western world such as Asia and Africa, Cox observes “movements that accent spiritual experience, discipleship, and hope; pay scant attention to the creeds, and flourish without hierarchies.” (Cox 2009, 8) Cox’s analysis is intended to be polemical rather than scholarly. He wants to generate discussion and debate to address the clear decline of Christianity in North American society. He ignores the nearly-constant conflicts of pre-Constantine Christianity and he sees the institution of the church as inimical to the full emergence of the Age of the Spirit.

3.2.2 Diana Butler Bass

In a similar way, Diana Bass asserts that true Christianity will thrive only after it sheds its identity as a “religion.” In Christianity After Religion, she contrasts a “spiritually vital faith” with the stale, atavistic dogma of the church as “institutional religion.” Her thesis is that authentic
Christianity is experiencing a “great reversal” in emphasis. Whereas the old paradigm began with “believing” in doctrines, which led to proper “behavior” in the church and society, and culminated in “belonging,” the new era begins with belonging, continues with behaving, and only after some time culminates in believing. In her view, “in the biblical pattern of faith, believing comes last.” (Bass 2012, 209).

The first step of belonging finds its model with the first followers of Jesus: “Christianity did not begin with a confession. It began with an invitation into friendship, into creating a new community, into forming relationships based on love and service.” (Bass 2012, 205) By emulating the first Christians, contemporary followers of Jesus will encounter a living faith that will lead to transformation:

They healed people, offered hospitality, prayed together, challenged traditional practices and rituals, ministered to the sick, comforted the grieving, fasted, and forgave. These actions induced wonder, gave them courage, empowered hope, and opened up a new vision of God. By doing these things together, they began to see differently.” (Bass 2012, 207)

The ability to “see differently” is, for Bass, synonymous with the emergence of belief. Belief results from the culmination of belonging to the Christian community and behaving as a faithful Christian by participating in acts of loving service:

From the calling of Abraham and Sarah through the great prophets and heroes of Israel, to Jesus and the early church, those who walked with faith started by following, by becoming part of God’s community, by enacting the practices of God’s way, and finally by recognizing and proclaiming the glory of God.” (Bass 2012, 209)

For Bass, this approach to contemporary Christian faith is part of what she perceives to be a “Great Awakening” led by the Spirit. She believes “it is up to us to move with the Spirit instead of against it, to participate in making our world more humane, just and loving.” (Bass 2012, 269)

Implied in her critique of contemporary Christianity is that the existing institutional church is one of the primary impediments to the work of the Spirit. For Bass, Christianity has been coopted by the idea of being a “religion” rather than a living faith: “In modern times, religion became indistinguishable from systematizing ideas about God, religious institutions, and human beings; it categorized, organized, objectified, and divided people into exclusive worlds of right versus
wrong, true versus false, ‘us’ versus ‘them.’” (Bass 2012, 97) Because of this, she shares with Cox a deep pessimism that the institutional church has anything positive to offer. She suggests the Church can be helpful only if it gets out of the way.

Is “the Church” an anachronism with no future in the life of Christianity? Worse, might it be the main impediment to the emergence of a new Age of the Spirit or a Great Awakening? For those of us who toil within confines of the institution known as the Anglican Church, these writers pose significant questions about the nature and function of the church.

3.2.3 The “Missional” Church Movement

Another approach which has emerged during the past decade is the “missional church movement.” In *The Missional Leader: Equipping Your Church to Reach a Changing World*, Alan J. Roxburgh and Fred Romanuk provide an authoritative guide to this approach. As they describe it, the missional church is both contextual and incarnational. Contextual in that it urges leaders to focus on a broad understanding of mission as it relates to a specific context or, more specifically, a neighbourhood. It is incarnational in that mission is understood to be lived out by communities of people who are engaged in Gospel-based activities:

> Mission is not a project or a budget, or a one-off event somewhere; it’s not even about sending missionaries. A missional church is a community of God’s people who live into the imagination that they are, by their very nature, God’s missionary people living as a demonstration of what God plans to do in and for all of creation in Jesus Christ. (Roxburgh & Romanuk 2006, xv)

The missional approach promises the transformation of churches which find themselves stuck in trying to maintain familiar but failing church programs, buildings and structures. It offers engagement, creative ministry and new community expressions of what it means to be the church in the twenty-first century.

Roxburgh and Romanuk identify three distinct but related “leadership zones.” The Emergent zone is the realm of the effective missional leader. Dialogue, reflection on scripture, and imaginative action characterize this zone. The Performative zone is the legacy of the 20th century focus on leadership styles which rely on mission statements, goals, and strategic plans. The Reactive zone is essentially the crisis response zone, when conflict in communities shapes
the decision-making process. The preferred zone is the Emergent zone. The challenge is that within every congregation all three zones shape the life of the community. The effective missional leader strives “to cultivate an emergent zone culture within congregations.” (59)

The Missional Change Model is the “framework for navigating these new waters” of change, with the caution that “we can’t assume that we know the destination before getting there.” (81) This word of caution will be a disappointment for those hoping to use the “missional” method to increase church membership, because that is clearly not the focus.

The Missional Change Model involves a process to be implemented over an extended period of time in congregations. It begins with simple Awareness. People in the congregation are invited to engage in conversations about their hopes and fears for their church. It serves a therapeutic purpose: “until people can put their feelings into words and be heard, they are held captive by unarticulated anxiety.” (87)

Next is Understanding, a process of ongoing conversation to allow people to bring together feelings and thoughts and to ask new questions about the life of their community. The focus is not on solutions and new proposals but on ongoing deep conversation: “Awareness and understanding are like gestation and birth. There must be a long time period for life to be formed… the leader is like a midwife assisting a birth process that must follow its own mysterious ways.” (94)

The Awareness and Understanding steps typically take between six and twelve months.

The Evaluation step shifts the conversation to the broader context in which the congregation finds itself. How can the congregation get to know their neighbourhood in a more dynamic way? What are some opportunities for mission? Some risk is involved, however:

What is required from leaders in this phase is clearly and frequently communicating that the congregation is not going to choose wholesale change but is going to learn how to develop a missional future by taking small, significant steps. People have to be reassured that much of their congregational life will remain fairly familiar, and there will be no structural and organizational changes. (96)
Experimentation follows, when risks are taken in new missional activities. The key here is that change is “adaptive,” not “tactical.” That is, it is a genuine response to a community need, and not a strategy to create new members or to pursue church growth for its own sake. The change is incremental, as lasting missional transformation “cannot be done by large-scale plans imposed on people. It is done by initiating all manner of experiments around the edges where people are given permission to try out what they are learning.” (101)

Finally, Commitment involves embracing the missional change – a new activity that serves the wider community – as an ongoing part of the congregation’s ministry and life. They recommend that the process of missional change begin with only a small portion of the community – the ten to fifteen percent who are open to innovation. “An attempt to innovate missional culture in a congregation that tries to begin with universal agreement (usually around some unknown and ill-defined concept) is headed for failure from the start.” (103)

Clearly, the leadership style required for the missional approach must be both sensitive to people’s needs and assertive in taking constructive risks. The process of change requires many conversations and constant negotiation as people in the congregation learn to live between the old familiar and trusted ways and the new, unfamiliar, missional approach. Leaders must be able to bridge the gap. The second half of the book seeks to provide some direction for missional leaders.

A comprehensive program is outlined for missional leaders as they prepare to lead missional congregations. A key step is the “360 Degree Feedback Process” (185) which involves a willingness on the part of the leader to invite from fifteen to twenty-five leaders and peers to participate in a survey evaluating his or her leadership style. For most clergy, this would be a daunting prospect. The advantage of doing the survey, assuming it is competently managed, is that it provides the missional leader with an inventory of strengths to build on and weaknesses to address. The second key element is to work as part of a Pastor/Leader Team comprised of missional leaders from other, local missional congregations. The advantage is being part of a team is that “teams discover the power of working with and for one another in forming new leadership capacities and addressing the real-life challenges each leader confronts in a specific congregation.” (187)
This scenario poses a ‘chicken and egg’ dilemma for the neophyte missional leader. What if she is the first of her peers to take up the missional challenge and has no peer group to either assess her skills or provide guidance or support? Another shortcoming of the missional approach is its apparent lack of a strong sacramental theology. While it is incarnational in focusing on real people in specific neighbourhoods, it understands congregations primarily in functional, rather than sacramental terms. In the following sections we will argue for a more fulsome sacramental theology of mission.

3.3 Historical considerations

Does the history of the church, or the Anglican tradition, offer any valuable insights in the nature of the church? Are there historical insights or elements of a positive Anglican ecclesiology (theology of the church) that might address these concerns?

Cox, Bass and Bosch each in their own way present the pre-Constantine era as a golden age when the nascent church was a Spirit-led movement unencumbered by the demands of the Institution. This critique of the post-Constantine church has its origins in the Reformation, as we shall see, below. In the meantime, a brief historical excurses will provide some insight into the vitality of first three centuries of the Church.

Originating with the Last Supper Jesus shared with the apostles before his crucifixion, table fellowship was a primary activity of the earliest ekkllesial communities. As Lathrop notes, “the early Christian movement seems to have come into existence and to have continued to spread as a meal fellowship . . . sharing food was . . . one of the authentic ways of remembering Jesus and continuing his eschatological proclamation.” (Lathrop 2012, 40-41) When it comes to sharing food around a table, there are some practical issues to be resolved. Food preparation requires a kitchen. Food consumption requires a dining area. As Krautheimer observes, “Since the core of the service was a meal, the given place of the meeting would be the dining room. And as the congregations were recruited by and large from the lower and middle classes, their houses would have been typical cheap houses.” (Krautheimer 1985, 24)

During the initial house church stage, from 50-150 CE, Linton observes there were three main forms of common dwellings. An insula was an apartment building comprising a four or five
story structure housing several families and built around a central courtyard. Most *insula* were of poor construction and housed people from the poorest strata of society. Others were of a higher quality and held a mix of people: “The lower floors contained larger apartments for upper- or middle-class renters, and the upper floors contained small cubicles of about 10 square meters . . . that contained slaves and freedmen.” (Linton 2005, 235)

The space to meet for table fellowship was limited in a typical insula to a small group of no more than twenty people meeting in one of the ground floor shops. (Jewett, 24-5, citing Murphy-O’Connor) This would have been an ideal size for the activities of meal fellowship, listening to the scriptures read aloud, offering prayer and song in worship, and other communal liturgical activities. With several *ekklesia* meeting in close proximity, it may not have been deemed necessary to meet in larger groups, except for special occasions, such as the welcoming the local bishop or receiving a traveling preacher, such as St. Paul.

The archeological findings at the Dura-Europas provide evidence of the size and nature of a ‘typical’ house church of this era. A room that could accommodate about thirty people was modified in order to double its capacity to sixty. (Lane Fox 1987, 269) Other evidence suggests larger gathering spaces were available. Balch cautions against underestimating the size of church gatherings. There is also evidence for the use of larger, free standing house structures (*domus*): “the size of many Christian assemblies may indeed have been small, but Pompeian *domus* could have accommodated far greater numbers than 40 persons.” (Balch 2004, 41) The evidence suggests that the majority of *ekklesia* were small communities comprising as many as sixty individuals. Larger communities required larger meeting spaces which were simply not readily available to most communities.

That the early church was comprised primarily of small communities of between 40 and 60 assembled members may be a key reason for its strength, resilience and vitality. Malcom Gladwell’s *The Tipping Point* (Gladwell 2000) provides a framework for understanding how the small size of the first churches may have been a key factor in their success.

Gladwell is interested in how ideas spread in societies, using the medical model of an epidemic to explain social movements and the spread of new ideas. Drawing on the scholarship of sociologists and social psychologists, including Mark Granovetter, R. Song, Thomas Schelling,
Jonathan Crane, and others, Gladwell develops the thesis that “ideas… and behaviors spread just like viruses do.” (Gladwell 2000, 7)

For Gladwell, three characteristics of medical epidemics also apply to what he calls ‘social epidemics’: “one, contagiousness; two, the fact that little causes can have big effects; and three, that change happens not gradually but at one dramatic moment … the Tipping Point.” (Gladwell 2000, 9)

Certainly the growth of early Christianity exhibited signs of contagiousness. Even if Acts provides an idealized account of the initial growth of the movement, clearly it spread in a rapid and unexpected way. As for “little causes,” the life and death of an obscure Jewish rabbi named Jesus has had a demonstrable “big effect” on human history. How one defines the “tipping point” in Christianity may be more troublesome. Is it the resurrection of Jesus? the conversion of Paul? the Edict of Milan? the conversion of Constantine? We could probably argue for the merits of each event. For the sake of this essay we will assume the Edict of Milan represents the “tipping point” in the history of Christianity, as there is no denying that by 313 CE Christianity had grown from being an unnoticed cult to the verge of becoming the official religion of the Empire.

In order for a nascent movement to become a full blown social epidemic, Gladwell identifies three essential sources of change he calls “the Law of the Few, the Stickiness Factor, and the Power of Context” (Gladwell 2000, 19)

The Law of the Few refers to the significant leaders of a social movement including Connectors, “people with a special gift for bringing the world together” (Gladwell 2000, 38); Mavens from the Yiddish for “one who accumulates knowledge”; and “Salesmen” who have gifts of persuasion. (Gladwell 2000, 70) Both Peter and Paul, as portrayed in the Book of Acts, could qualify as any of these leadership types. Certainly Paul, who strove to be “all things to all people” between the Jewish and the Gentile worlds understood his role to have many dimensions:

For though I am free with respect to all, I have made myself a slave to all, so that I might win more of them. To the Jews I became as a Jew, in order to win Jews. To those under the law I became as one under the law (though I myself am not under the law) so that I might win those under the law. To those outside the law I became as one outside the law (though I am
not free from God’s law but am under Christ’s law) so that I might win those outside the law. To the weak I became weak, so that I might win the weak. I have become all things to all people, so that I might by any means save some. I do it all for the sake of the gospel, so that I may share in its blessings. (1 Cor 9: 19-23)

In this way Paul was an outstanding Connector of Jews and Gentiles, a Maven with theological knowledge, and a Salesman of the message of the Gospel.

“Stickiness” refers to the power of the message to be proclaimed, remembered, and to make a difference in people’s lives. The early church practice of proclaiming that ‘Jesus is Risen’ and celebrating the presence of the Risen One in a sacred meal may have been sufficiently “sticky” as a surprising and memorable social message. The behaviour of Christians as they rejected common forms of public piety in favour of ethical social conduct and the provision of tangible assistance to members and strangers may well have had a “sticky” impact.

Gladwell notes that social behavior depends on and to a great extent is determined by social context. He uses the example of crime in a modern city. Studies have demonstrated that crime is more likely to occur in a poorly lit, graffiti marked and garbage strewn subway station than in a station that is clean, well-lit and graffiti free. Both positive and negative social behaviours can be encouraged by the social context of the behavior.

The power of Context worked in favour of the Christians in several ways. The original Jewish context of the faith provided it with a model in the synagogue and a foundational narrative in the Hebrew Scriptures. Jesus himself was a Jew, as were the first apostles. The loss of the Temple in the year 70 was a crisis that hastened the demise of the Jerusalem church while at the same time retroactively endorsed Jesus’ critique of the Temple as a source of divine authority and favour. (Mark 12: 35-13:2) While the Christian community in Jerusalem declined, the Gospel spread throughout the Greco-Roman world, finding in the ekklesia a familiar and innocuous model for community gatherings. In this way, the early church behaved like a ‘non-ethnic’ ethnic group in the way that it attracted migrants and the poor to urban neighbourhoods, providing a sense of social cohesion, identity and mutual support.

One particularly interesting observation Gladwell makes is that human beings seem to have a natural capacity to manage social relationships with a finite number of people. The research
conducted by social anthropologist Robin Dunbar suggests this number is one hundred and fifty. This has consequences for the way social epidemics spread: “If we want groups to serve as incubators for contagious messages . . . we have to keep groups below the 150 Tipping Point.” He explains that, “above that point, there begin to be structural impediments to the ability of the group to agree and act with one voice.” (Gladwell 2000, 182)

The physical limitations of typical house churches through the first three centuries kept Christian *ekklesia* small, typically between 30 and 60 people, depending on the size of the meeting space. Several groups would be supervised by a local bishop. It is quite conceivable that a typical bishop would be responsible for a handful of communities totaling no more than 150. Lane Fox notes that, in contrast to Gibbon’s population estimate of 50,000 Christian in Rome, an account of the bishop of Rome in 251 CE listed 154 ministers, and more than 1500 widows and poor supported by the church. (Lane Fox 1987, 268) The ratio of ministers to recipients of assistance is commensurate with the rule of 150, although presumably there would be many more adherents not counted among the ‘widows and the poor’.

As the church attracted more followers and spread out to establish new house churches,

> The Rule of 150 says that congregants of a rapidly expanding church, or the members of a social club, or anyone in a group activity banking on the epidemic spread of shared ideals needs to be particularly cognizant of the perils of bigness. Crossing the 150 line is a small change that can make a big difference. (Gladwell 2000, 182)

Seen in this way, the limitations of the size of buildings that accommodated house churches was an important determining factor in the strength of the church and source of its growth. *Ekklesia* were prevented from growing too big, thus avoiding the “perils of bigness.”

### 3.4 Hooker’s Ecclesiology

A different perspective on the tensions inherent in the church as both a movement and an institution can be found in the ecclesiology of Anglican Divine Richard Hooker. The debate about the true nature and function of the Church is not unique to the first or twenty-first centuries. In the sixteenth century, Martin Luther’s critique of the Catholic Church was the first phase in what became the Protestant Reformation. Luther’s critique gave way to more radical reforms advocated by John Calvin and other reformers in Europe. The Church of England
participated in the Reformation in its own way, beginning with the schism advanced by Henry VIII, the reforms of theology and practice instituted by his son, Edward VI, the attempted restoration to Catholicism under Mary I, culminating with the compromise known as the Elizabethan Settlement under Elizabeth I.

The Elizabethan Settlement sought to provide stability and order in the Church of England following a period of traumatic change, violence, persecution of dissenting views, and uncertainty. Elizabeth sought to maintain the integrity of the structures of the Church while retaining the reforms that had been introduced under Edward. She favoured an inclusive, comprehensive approach that would include a broad spectrum of theological perspectives and welcome Catholics, Lutherans and Calvinists. As St. Paul had advised a nascent Christian community long before: “Welcome those who are weak in faith, but not for the purpose of quarrelling over opinions. Some believe in eating anything, while the weak eat only vegetables. Those who eat must not despise those who abstain, and those who abstain must not pass judgement on those who eat; for God has welcomed them.” (Romans 14.1-3)

Writing during the latter part of the sixteenth century, Richard Hooker provided a systematic theological rationale for the Elizabethan Settlement in *Of the Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity*. In this dense and closely argued treatise, Hooker accepted and endorsed the reforms the Church had adopted in its theology and practice, but he also saw value in maintaining the historical continuity with the Church through the ages, including recognizing a theological continuity with the historic Catholic Church. In this way Hooker is often recognized as the first theologian of the ‘middle way’ of Anglicanism, by holding in creative tension both the Reformed and Catholic character of the Church.

Hooker’s strategy in developing his theology of Anglican comprehensiveness made use of the distinction between the “Mystical” and “Visible” church. He affirmed the unity of the Church as the Body of Christ “inasmuch as the parts thereof are some in heaven already with Christ, and the rest that are on earth . . .” (Hooker 1993, 3.2) The church ‘in heaven’ he called the Mystical church, and the earthly part the Visible church. To the Mystical church belong God’s “everlasting promises of love, mercy, and blessedness.” To the Visible church is the unity “by reason of that one Lord whose servants they all profess themselves, that one faith which they all acknowledge, that one Baptism wherewith they are all initiated.” (3.3) The Mystical and Visible
are not separate entities but are two aspects of the same Church, like two poles on a continuum, held in tension in the life of the Church. The Mystical church includes all whom God accepts as true and faithful Christians who form the blessed company of the righteous, but only God can know with certainty who these people are. The Visible church is the one seen and heard on earth. It is through the Visible church that “every particular Christian” can encounter the “essence of Christianity.” Hooker scholar Kenneth Locke summarizes the relationship between the Mystical and Visible church in this way: “while only the members of the mystical church possess the graces and virtues that set them apart from others, it is through the Visible Church’s outward profession that God’s salvation is offered to the rest of humanity” (Locke, 48)

For Hooker, faith is both a subjective reality on the part of the person who embraces faith in Christ, and an objective, sacramental reality brought about through the action of the Church. “Our naming of Jesus Christ the Lord is not enough to prove us Christians, unless we also embrace that faith, which Christ hath published into the world.” It is through “the door of Baptism” that we are admitted to the Visible Church. (3.5-6) As Locke notes, for Hooker:

visible signs and actions played an important role in Church life. Through their participation in God’s glory, these signs and actions are also to further Christian spiritual growth . . . together with the sermon and the scriptures, visible signs and ceremonies are good sources for the edification of the Christian people. (Locke 2009, 51)

As God acts through these visible signs and ceremonies, Locke identifies a “strong incarnational bent” in Hooker’s theology.

Hooker’s understanding of the church as being both a Mystical and a Visible reality helps to hold together the church as both movement in time and space and an institution subject to reform. Hooker sees a central role for the church in proclaiming God’s salvation for all humanity, a missional perspective consistent with both Bosch and Duraisingh, as will be discussed below. Hooker is also sacramental in his theology, for it is through the sacrament of baptism that the believer enters into the life of the church and the work of God’s mission.

3.5 Sacramental Theology

James White provides a simple but helpful definition of the sacraments as “meaningful actions . . . which make God’s love visible.” (White 1990, 165) The dominical sacraments of Baptism
and Eucharist are the meaningful actions through which the sacramental community of the Church is formed and sustained.

Following White, sacramental theology begins with the understanding that it is God who acts in the sacraments. (White 1990, 188) The ‘meaningful actions’ of baptism and eucharist are not simply public performances enacted for the sake of the participants. They are truly sacred events which reveal the mystērion of God:

As the New Testament uses the term, (mystērion) refers to the secret thoughts of God, which transcend human reason and therefore must be revealed to those whom God wishes these secrets to reach. . . The basic insight in the use of this term for those sign-acts which we call sacraments is that mystērion implies acts in which God is disclosed to us. (White, 1990, 171)

This self-disclosure of God is primarily an act of self-giving. God takes the initiative in revealing Godself. This is most fully revealed in the person of Jesus Christ:

In Jesus Christ, God showed us the fullness of divine love. But we need to be shown this divine love again and again. In the sacraments, God continues in present visibility what God has already done in self-giving in the historical visibility of Jesus Christ. (White 1990, 189).

This sacramental remembering (anamnesis) is most fully experienced in the church, a sacramental community where “God’s self-giving as love is made visible through relationships of love within community.” (White, 1990, 190) This is the quality of community known as koinonia.

3.5.1 Baptism

Jesus’ ministry begins with his baptism by John. Following this example, those who seek to follow Christ also begin their ministry with baptism. As we noted above, Hooker understood baptism is the ‘door’ through which one enters the life, ministry and mission of the church.

Baptism is both personal and corporate. It is personal because baptism is transformative; once baptized, a person belongs to Christ, branded “as Christ’s own forever.” (BAS 160) It is corporate because the newly baptized becomes a member of the Church, the Body of Christ. As The Book of Alternative Services explains it, “baptism is the sign of new life in Christ. Baptism
unites Christ with his people. That union is both individual and corporate . . . Christians are not just baptized individuals; they are a new humanity.” (BAS 146)

As members of this “new humanity,” the newly baptized make specific promises framed by the following questions, to which they reply “I will, with God’s help:”

- Will you continue in the apostle’s teaching and fellowship, in the breaking of bread, and in the prayers?
- Will you persevere in resisting evil and, whenever you fall into sin, repent and turn to the Lord?
- Will you proclaim by word and example the good news of God in Christ?
- Will you seek and serve Christ in all persons, loving your neighbour as yourself?
- Will you strive for justice and peace among all people, and respect the dignity of every human being?
- Will you strive to safeguard the integrity of God’s creation, and respect, sustain and renew the life of the Earth? (BAS 159)

Commitments are made by the newly baptized, but no baptized person is alone in fulfilling these commitments. Indeed, these commitments are supported by the community of the baptized – the church. In a very practical sense, a church is a community of the baptized whose members support each other in living out their baptismal commitments.

3.5.2 Eucharist

If baptism is the sacrament of belonging to the church and a commission for mission, the Eucharist is the sacrament for the building up and nurture of the community of the baptized. White notes the Jewish origins of the Eucharistic meal:

From Judaism. . . comes a profound understanding of each meal as a sacred event. The most common of human social activities became for Judaism an opportunity for praising and thanking God as well as forming a bond of unity between partakers. Far from being simply
physical necessity, the meal became a means of encountering God as provider, host and companion (White 1990, 168).

In this light we see that St Paul draws on the Jewish tradition of the sacred meal even as he describes a uniquely Christian expression of it in the earliest written account of the eucharist:

For I received from the Lord what I also handed on to you, that the Lord Jesus on the night when he was betrayed took a loaf of bread, and when he had given thanks, he broke it and said, “This is my body that is for you. Do this in remembrance of me.” In the same way he took the cup also, after supper, saying, “This cup is the new covenant in my blood. Do this, as often as you drink it, in remembrance of me.” For as often as you eat this bread and drink the cup, you proclaim the Lord’s death until he comes. (1 Corinthians 11:23-25)

Here we see that the basic elements of the eucharist are very simple: thanksgiving, remembering, eating and drinking. These are the same elements we continue to use today as the community (the koinonia) gathers weekly for this sacred meal.

Of course, it is more than “just” a meal. As noted in the World Council of Church’s document, Baptism, Eucharist, and Ministry:

The eucharist opens up the vision of the divine rule which has been promised as the final renewal of creation, and is a foretaste of it. Signs of this renewal are present in the world wherever the grace of God is manifest and human beings work for justice, love and peace. The eucharist is the feast at which the Church gives thanks to God for these signs and joyfully celebrates and anticipates the coming of the Kingdom of Christ.” (BEM, 13)

As a sacramental act, the eucharist unites the community of the baptized in one common ministry as followers and disciples of Jesus Christ. It is a source of spiritual nurture and sustenance for the journey of discipleship. It makes possible the sacramental character of personal discipleship as the baptized seek to be expressions of God’s love made visible in the world. Perhaps most importantly, it is the spiritual wellspring that supports the work of mission.
3.5.3 Ministry of the Baptized

The relationship between baptism, community and ordered ministry is captured in Michael Peer’s explanation of the church as “the household of the baptized.” He begins with the baptismal covenant which:

- calls for a community of witness, gathering to learn, to pray, to share the hospitality of the Lord’s table. It calls for clear thinking and self-knowledge in response to sin - our own as well as that of others. It calls us to membership in a people that bears witness to God’s story and God’s way, made known in Jesus. It calls for discernment of Christ in all persons, as St Benedict charged his monks to remind themselves every time they opened a door to a stranger. And it would lead us to ways of peace, justice and the dignity of every person. The drama within which this covenant is set is nothing less than the re-founding of our lives. This is the drama, not of a sect or a cult, but of a people. That is itself held within a liturgy of undefended love and the cost of that love, reminds us that this people does not lay claim to or defend a space of its own, but lives by the truth that the world is a single household to be made fit and hospitable for all God’s children.” (Peers 2003, 8)

As a member of this ‘new people,’ each baptized person has an important role to play in the mission of the church. The role of the laity is not to support those in ordained ministry; it is the other way around. Ordained persons are to fulfill their role in equipping the whole household for the work of mission and ministry.

All ministry, lay and ordained, is based on the holistic and integrated model provided by Jesus Christ. Certain aspects of Jesus’ ministry are given a particular focus in ordered ministry; in this way they ‘refract’ the ministry of Christ:

- Our orders refract the ministry of Jesus - his servanthood is the servanthood to which all the baptized are called, refracted through, but never exclusively possessed by, those who serve in the order of deacons. His self-giving is the self-giving to which all the baptized are called, refracted through, but never exclusively possessed by, those who serve in the order of presbyters (priests). And the hospitality of his table fellowship is the hospitality to which all the baptized are called, refracted through, but never exclusively possessed by, those who serve in the order of bishops. (Peers 2003, 11)
This theology of refracted ministry is another way of affirming the “Apostolate of the Laity” as explained by Bosch. He observes that in the post war context of the last century, both Protestant and Catholic churches “discovered again that apostolicity was an attribute of the entire church and that the ordained ministry could be understood only as existing within the community of faith.” (Bosch 2011, 482) In affirming the shared apostolicity of the entire community of the baptized, it becomes clear that

The priesthood of the ordained ministry is to enable, not to remove, the priesthood of the whole church. The clergy are not prior to or independent of or over against the church; rather, with the rest of God’s people, they are the church, sent into the world.” (Peers 2003, 485)

Peers’s view is consistent with Bosch’s: “the work of the church is not completed when the bishop, priest, deacon or communion minister places the Body of Christ in the hands of a Christian, but when that Christian carries the Body of Christ into the world in acts of servanthood, self-giving, and hospitality.” (Peers 2003, 11)

This is indeed the work of the mission of the church, shared by all the members of the church.

3.5.4 Mission

While parish church communities may be surprisingly resilient, is mere survival in the face of change a laudable achievement? If there is strength in resiliency, then what is it for? What is the purpose of the parish church?

If the parish church is for anything, surely it is to serve God’s mission. The Book of Alternative Services contains this prayer for the mission of the church:

Draw your Church together, O Lord, into one great company of disciples, together following Our Lord Jesus Christ into every walk of life, together serving him in his mission to the world, and together witnessing to his love on every continent and island. We ask this in his name and for his sake. (BAS 676, emphasis added)

The movement of the prayer is outward: the Church is described as ‘one great company of disciples’ which follows Jesus into the world to witness to his love. It is not a prayer that invites a debate about issues such as ‘there are too many buildings and not enough people.’ The Mission
prayer calls the church to be a people sent “together” as a unified community (used four times for emphasis) into the world.

David Bosch’s exploration of mission is particularly valuable as we consider the implications of a church focused on mission. Because it originates with God, “ultimately, mission remains undefinable; it should never be incarcerated in the narrow confines of our predilections. The most we can hope for is to formulate some approximations of what mission is all about.” (Bosch 2011, 9)

Therefore, he begins with what he calls an “interim definition” of mission which he summarizes in some thirteen points. (Bosch 2011, 9-11) That it requires thirteen points to formulate a provisional definition indicates the somewhat inchoate nature of the term. Without enumerating each of the points, it will be sufficient to offer some highlights. He affirms that “the Christian faith. . . is intrinsically missionary.” (9) By this he means that that God’s salvific will and plan of salvation is universal: “in New Testament terms, it regards the ‘reign on God’ which has come in Jesus Christ as intended for ‘all humanity.’ This dimension . . . is not an optional extra: Christianity is missionary by its very nature, or it denies its very raison détre.” (9) Bosch continues to explain that mission is both God’s “yes” to the world, but also God’s “no.” In engaging with issues of injustice, oppression, poverty, discrimination and violence, the church is affirming God’s “yes” in mission. In resisting becoming completely identified with a specific social cause or political movement, the church affirms God’s “no” to the world by maintaining both critical distance and a separate identity. (10-11)

Ultimately, mission belongs to God, and the church has a role to play in fulfilling God’s mission. The Missio Dei is

God’s self-revelation as the One who loves the world, God’s involvement in and with the world, the nature and activity of God, which embraces both the church and the world, and in which the church is privileged to participate. Missio Dei enunciates the good news that God is a God-for-people. (Bosch 2011, 9)

While the Church has an important role to play in the Missio Dei, it is a means to achieve God’s mission, and not an end in itself.
This theology of mission has practical implications for the parish church which are specific and concrete:

The missionary dimension of a local church’s life manifests itself, among other ways, when it is truly a worshipping community; it is able to welcome outsiders and make them feel at home; it is a church in which the pastor does not have the monopoly and the members are not mere objects of pastoral care; its members are equipped for their calling in society; it is structurally pliable and innovative; and it does not defend the privileges of a select group. (Bosch 2011, 382)

This understanding of the missionary church involves a double focus. The first is on God when the community gathers for worship and prayer. The second is on the world, to engage and challenge it: “The church gathers to praise God, to enjoy fellowship and receive spiritual sustenance; and disperses to serve God wherever its members are. It is called to hold in ‘redemptive tension’ its dual orientation.” (Bosch 2011, 395)

One of the challenges of focusing on mission is the tendency of some churches to rely on an overabundance of outreach programs the church offers the wider community. Christopher Duraisingh calls this phenomena “agenda anxiety.” It occurs when there is “an acute sense of obligation to do something, somewhere, to someone.” (Duraisingh 2010, 12) This program oriented approach fits well with the typical bias toward larger, program-size churches. Duraisingh identifies the problem this way:

The greater the number of programs that a congregation runs in its neighbourhood or elsewhere, the more successful it considers itself to be . . . the problem is that these projects, shaped by a few enthusiasts, have little or no impact upon the core of being of the church, or all that goes on in the church, including its worship or Christian nurture, for example. (Duraisingh 2010, 12)

He notes that this programmatic approach to mission is often accompanied by notions of the church participating in “building up” or “extending” the Kingdom, language which, he points out, is not biblically based. (Duraisingh 2010, 12) This reveals an “ecclesio-centrism” in the traditional Missio Dei praxis, especially in the west, where the welfare of the church, rather than the world, has been understood to be central to God’s mission.
Instead, Duraisingh suggests we take the path pioneered by Asian theologians such as C.S. Song, for whom the “starting point for God’s mission is not the church but rather God’s creation.” (Duraisingh 2010, 20) In this understanding, mission is expressed as *Concursus Dei*, or divine accompaniment: “at the base of *Concursus Dei* is a vision of God’s unceasing accompaniment with creation, calling and evoking its participation in God-movement as God leads it patiently and persuasively, both in judgement and grace, to its future in God’s future.” (20)

In contrast to the *Missio Dei* tradition, which relies on the Great Commission (Matt 28:19) as its warrant, the *Concursus Dei* approach takes its biblical warrant from Acts 1:8: “you will receive power when the Holy Spirit has come upon you; and you will be my witnesses in Jerusalem, in all Judea and Samaria, and to the ends of the earth.” In allowing the Spirit to lead the church into the world, God reveals that mission “takes place in unheard of places and through the agencies of unexpected people.” (Duraisingh 2010, 11) In this way the church can be open to the transformation from a church-shaped mission (the *Missio Dei* paradigm) to a mission-shaped church (the *Concursus Dei* paradigm).

Duraisingh’s distinction between ‘church-shaped mission’ and ‘mission-shaped church’ bears interesting and instructive similarities with the Heifetz-Linsky distinction between ‘technical challenge’ and ‘adaptive change’ we saw in chapter two. Church-based mission puts the church at the centre of God’s mission. The assumption that the church is central to God’s plan leads to the tendency to preserve and protect the institution of the Church. When change is required, technical solutions are the default mode of operations because they are the least threatening to the stability of the institution. On the other hand, the mission-shaped church is an ideal rarely glimpsed because it requires a willingness to risk adaptive change. The focus of change is not the church itself but on the transformative work of mission God is accomplishing in the world. As the mission-shaped church engages in God’s transforming mission, we can anticipate that the form of the church will change in accordance with its renewed function as an agent of God’s transforming mission.

The following table attempts to provide a synthesis of the two approaches:
Table 4: Church-shaped Mission / Mission-shaped Church

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Church-shaped Mission (Technical solutions)</th>
<th>Mission-shaped Church (Adaptive challenges)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Focus on buildings, infrastructure, programs</td>
<td>• Focus on people, community, relationships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Strategic planning and SMART goals</td>
<td>• ‘Contained’ experimental initiatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Projects done by committee</td>
<td>• Willingness to risk and learn from failure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Governance a priority</td>
<td>• Stewardship by generosity, sharing &amp; self-giving</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Financial self-sufficiency the true measure of success</td>
<td>• Making investments in people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Stewardship by consolidation, efficiencies, controlling expenses</td>
<td>• Culture of risk and encouragement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Permission-seeking culture</td>
<td>• Priority of baptismal ministry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Clergy staffing, funding formulas a key priority</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The table is not meant to suggest an either/or choice between one paradigm and the other. Rather, it suggests that the “church in mission” must measure its institutional interests against its calling to be engaged in and for the world God loves. To be sure, there are practical institutional requirements that need to be met, including budgets, planning processes, and systems for accountability. As important as these are, the church-as-institution is not an end-in-itself, no matter how important its work. At its best and most faithful, the church is a means to God’s missional ends. When the church risks adaptive change it is more likely to resemble the mission-shaped church.

3.5.5 Five Marks of Mission

The Five Marks of Mission were developed over several years by the Anglican Consultative Council (ACC) and endorsed by the General Synod of the Anglican Church of Canada (ACoC) in 2010 as part of its Vision 2019 strategic plan: “the Marks of Mission are an invitation to the whole church, a challenge and an opportunity to ground our common life and ministry in mission – in what God is doing in and for the world.” (ACoC 2010) The Marks of Mission were used as a
guide for the General Synod visioning process, and continue to be used as a programmatic framework in many dioceses and parishes throughout the Anglican Church of Canada.

Rooted in the baptismal covenant (BAS, 158-9), the Marks provide a comprehensive vision for mission:

- To proclaim the Good News of the Kingdom;
- To teach, baptize and nurture new believers;
- To respond to human need by loving service;
- To seek to transform unjust structures of society, to challenge violence of every kind and to pursue peace and reconciliation;
- To strive to safeguard the integrity of creation and sustain and renew the life of the earth.

The advantage of using the Marks of Mission as a resource for a mission-shaped church is that it has already been articulated by a credible Anglican source (the Anglican Consultative Council) and endorsed by the General Synod of the Anglican Church of Canada. It is readily available for all Anglican churches to use as a guide should they choose to make the adaptive commitment to becoming mission-shaped churches.

### 3.6 Models of the Church

As we have seen, the tension between the Church as a movement and institution is attested to in scripture and has precipitated an ongoing theological debate ever since. The contemporary focus on mission in many ways seeks to recover the movement from the institution, as if there are two distinct and contradictory modes of the Church. In Hooker’s ecclesiology, we are presented with a model that holds the Mystical and the Visible aspects together, mediated by the sacramental action of the Church. In this model we see the strength of the Anglican charism for comprehensiveness, seeking to find unity of purpose in the contrasting realities of the Church.

The five models of the Church as originally presented by Avery Dulles may serve a useful purpose as we seek a functional model of the Church that holds in tension koinonia with ekklesia, movement with institution. Dulles offers five models of the church as a way of exploring various ecclesiologies, especially those which were coming into prominence in Roman
Catholic theological discourse during and immediately following Vatican II. These models are not exclusively Roman Catholic, as indeed Dulles incorporates the work of several Protestant theologians, including Karl Barth and Dietrich Bonhoeffer. He proposes five models of the Church: Institution, Mystical Communion, Sacrament, Herald, and Servant.

3.6.1 Institutional Model

The Institutional Model “defines the Church primarily in terms of its physical structures, especially the rights and powers of its officers.” (Dulles 1987, 34) This is perhaps the common sense model of the Church in the sense that things like buildings, or people like clergy and bishops are often the first images which spring to mind when the word “church” is mentioned. In this model “success is statistically measurable: how many baptisms have been performed, how many persons have entered the Church, how many continue to come regularly to Church and receive the sacraments?” (Dulles 1987, 42) The strength of this model is that it recognizes the institutional reality of the church. The weakness is that it can all too easily lead to institutionalism, when the institution itself becomes its own reason for being. This development is a “deformation” of the true Church. (Dulles 1987, 35) Moreover, “it could easily substitute the official Church for God, and this would lead to a form of idolatry.” (194)

Dulles’s Institutional Model bears some resemblance with our discussion earlier about *ekklesia* and *koinonia*, and the tension between the church as institution and the church as social movement.

3.6.2 Mystical Communion Model

The Mystical Communion Model finds its focus not in the institution but in the people. In particular, the model considers the Church in terms of a primary group analogous to a family or household. “This type of ecclesiology has a . . . basis in the biblical notion of communion (*koinonia*) as found in the book of Acts and in the Pauline descriptions of the church as the body of Christ” (Dulles 1987, 58) The Church as a particular and intimate community known as the “Body of Christ” or the “People of God” acknowledges the “value of informal, spontaneous, interpersonal relationships with the Church (and) does much to restore the warm and vital interrelationships so central to the New Testament vision of the Church.” (Dulles 1987, 59) This model allows for the “spontaneous initiatives aroused by the Holy Spirit” which often acts “without prior consultation with the hierarchy.” (Dulles 1987, 59) While the strength of the
model is its focus on the bonds of love that unite people in community, one weakness is it can lead to an “unhealthy divinization of the church.” (Dulles 1987, 55) It can also beg the question of mission, as the “motivation for mission is left obscure.” (Dulles 1987, 60)

3.6.3 Sacrament Model

The Church as Sacrament Model relies on a particular view of the term “sacrament.” For Dulles, “a sacrament is a socially constituted or communal symbol of the presence of grace coming to fulfilment.” This includes the dominical sacraments of Baptism and Eucharist, as well as the Church itself: “the Church becomes an actual event of grace when it appears most concretely as a sacrament – that is, in the actions of the Church as such whereby (people) are bound together in grace by a visible expression.” (Dulles 1987, 69)

The strength of this model is that it moves beyond sterile institutionalism and focuses on the Church as an instrument and expression of Grace. The Church is truly Church when Grace abounds, especially in the liturgy: “the more widely and intensively the faithful participate in this corporate action of the Church, the more the Church achieves itself.” (69) The weakness of the Model is that, if carried to excess, it “can induce an attitude of narcissistic aestheticism that is not easily reconcilable with a full Christian commitment to social and ethical values.” (Dulles 1987, 75)

3.6.4 Herald Model

The Church as Herald Model owes much to work of the mid-twentieth century Protestant theologian Karl Barth, with its emphasis on the proclamation of the Word of God. When the Word is proclaimed to receptive ears, the Church is present. When the Church summons people to listen, the Word is proclaimed. The role of the Church is to proclaim the Word of God for the benefit of a world in desperate need of its redemptive force. The Church does not bring God’s Kingdom, only God can do that, but the Church is “devoted entirely to its service.” (Dulles 1987, 79)

The Word proclaimed results in people responding in faith and forming communities where Christ is present: “Jesus in the midst of a community gathered in his name, according to this ecclesiology, is the very definition of the Church.” (Dulles 1987, 83) Roman Catholic theologian Hans Kung, building on the work of Barth and others, “finds that the biblical term *ekklesia*
means those summoned by a Herald, those who have been called out (*ek-kletoi*)” (Dulles 1987, 78) Quoting directly from Kung:

*Ekklesia*, like “congregation,” means both the actual process of congregating and the congregated community itself: the former should not be overlooked. And *ekklesia* is not something that is formed and founded once and for all and remains unchanged; it becomes an *ekklesia* by the fact of a repeated concrete event, people coming together and congregating, in particular congregating for the purpose of worshiping God. The concrete congregation is the actual manifestation, the representation, indeed the realization of the New Testament community. (Kung, 1968)

Understood this way, as a community called out and formed by the Word, “the church is regarded as complete in a single congregation.” (Dulles 1987, 83) The model affirms the vitality of Word centred communities. Its weakness is a tendency toward the isolation of congregationalism. And, with its emphasis on preaching to the world, it may suffer from a lack of willingness to be in dialogue with the world. (Dulles 1987, 88)

### 3.6.5 Servant Model

In contrast with the first four models, the Church as Servant Model reorients the relationship of the Church to the world. Where the Institutional, Community, Sacramental and Herald models see the Church as having a “privileged position . . . with respect to the world.” The Servant church seeks to engage with the world. (Dulles 1987, 89) This engagement is described in terms of “secular-dialogic” method: “secular, because the Church takes the world as a properly theological focus, and seeks to discern the signs of the times; dialogic, because it seeks to operate on the frontier between the contemporary world and the Christian tradition. . . .” (92) The ethic is one of simplicity and service. Dulles uses an extended quote from Bonhoeffer as a forceful example of the implications of this model:

> The Church is the Church only when it exists for others. To make a start it should give away all its property to those in need. The clergy must live solely on the free-will offerings of their congregations, or possibly engage in some secular calling. The Church must share in the secular problems of ordinary human life, not dominating, but helping and serving. (Bonhoeffer 1967)
Indeed, Dulles summarizes this approach as, “the Church’s mission, in the perspective of this theology, is not primarily to gain new recruits for its own ranks, but rather to be of help to all men, wherever they are” (Dulles 1987, 97) The focus on mission is consistent with our earlier discussion of the Missio of God in all its complexity. The strength of this model is its potential for great vitality of diakonia or service in the world. The near hostility to the institutional requirements of church buildings and paid clergy can make this model the antithesis of the Institutional Model.

For Dulles, the five models are meant to be used as a hermeneutic tool to identify the defining themes, strengths and weakness of a variety of ecclesologies in a systematic way. He does not argue that any one model is “best,” although he cautions against using the Institutional model as primary, because “of their very nature… institutions are subordinate to persons, structures are subordinate to life.” (Dulles 1987, 198) Indeed, “taken in isolation, each of the ecclesiological types could lead to serious imbalances and distortions.” (194) The models are meant to complement each other, not to compete against each other.

In interpreting the Focus Group summary it will be helpful to have an interpretive frame of reference to assess the data. The five models of the church as outlined by Dulles are helpful because they provide us with a hermeneutical tool. In Chapter Four, we will examine the implicit or explicit operative model or models of the church as revealed in the Focus Group material. This will help to illuminate some of the salient issues in attempting to answer the question, “why do they stay?”
Chapter 4 The Focus Group

This chapter seeks to provide a detailed account of the MAP experience from the perspective of the Focus Group members. It seeks to offer a “thick description” (Geertz 1973) by summarizing the data from the three sources described in the previous chapter and by using the subjects’ own words and phrases whenever possible. We will begin with a brief personal profile of each Focus Group participant, followed by a detailed summary of the issues, concerns and judgements made by these participants. This chapter seeks to be “objective” in the sense that the overt act of interpretation is kept to a minimum. Interpretation and analysis will be the focus of Chapter Five. Of course, as a white, male, middle class priest in my 50’s, my biases will inevitable play a role in how this material is presented. Despite these limitations, every attempt has been made to accurately represent the views of Focus Group participants.

4.1 Personal Stories

In the focus group sessions and questionnaire responses, members of the focus group revealed aspects of their personal stories about how they got involved in their church. In order to gain a deeper insight into the motivations of each participant, follow-up questions were asked in the personal interviews to elicit additional information. Some provided great detail with little prompting, and others responded to open-ended follow-up questions I had prepared based on the comments they had made earlier in the group or the answers they provided in the questionnaire. Not all the study group members provided comprehensive biographical details of their church involvement, but several provided moving accounts of their personal journey.

In presenting these stories I have assigned to each a biblical name on a random basis and changed minor details in order to maintain the confidentiality of the participants. Although the names of the North Vancouver churches involved are known, I have not explicitly identified the church to which each participant belongs.

Certainly I anticipate that the participants themselves will recognize their stories, as will people who know them well. The intention on my part is not to invite people to guess the true identity of the participants, but to present these profiles in an effort to understand their passions and motivations.
4.2 Mary: “Church at the centre”

Mary grew up in Newfoundland, where, she said, “the Church is the centre of the community.” (I5, 24) She attended an Anglican school and was immersed in the Anglican liturgy. This formative experience gave her a grounding in the Christian faith which has sustained her throughout her life. As a young adult she moved to a medium size city in Ontario where she belonged to a young people’s group at the local Anglican cathedral. She met the man who would become her husband, also a cradle Anglican. (I5, 30)

Shortly after, Mary moved to British Columbia, living in some small northern communities before finally settling in North Vancouver. In every city or town the family attended the local Anglican Church. When they arrived in North Vancouver, they attended the closest Anglican Church for several years. However, when her children became old enough for Confirmation, there was no program available. One day she happened to encounter the priest of another local Anglican church whom she knew from her home town in Newfoundland. He said his church was offering a Confirmation program and her children were welcome to attend.

Consequently, “we moved to (the other church) for Confirmation classes because they had one. It also helped that the priest was actually from the same community I grew up in.” (I5, 31i) Her children became involved in the church programs and her son was a server. Eventually, they changed their membership from one church to the other because of their children: “your kids kind of rule the day when they’re at that age – you go where everyone’s comfortable.” (I5, 33)

Now retired from her professional career in commercial banking, Mary reflected on the importance of her faith: “it was important when I was working in a busy career with lots of demands with people from all over the world; it kept me focused, it kept me balanced.” (I5, 115)

Retirement from her career has provided Mary with the time to devote to church outreach projects. For the last five years she has spearheaded a program helping new immigrants to Canada. She obtained grant funding and a partnership with a local university to provide English language training for adults. This involvement has been both demanding and rewarding: “There are times when I feel I really should take a break from this, but you see value, you see people becoming connected to the neighbourhood, to the community.” (I5, 105ii) She sees herself
continuing with neighbourhood engagement projects, not because it generates new members for the church, but because it has a positive impact on the wider community.

4.3 Ruth: “These people believe like I do”

Ruth retired several years ago after a career as a nurse and senior health care administrator. She grew up attending an Anglican church in Vancouver. “We’ve always gone to church; you asked why I did things – some of them are learned. My Mum always had gone to church, so there’s that.” (I9, 37i)

When her children were growing up she lived in a rural suburb of Vancouver and attended a consortium of four Anglican churches which shared three clergy. When her children grew up, she moved to North Vancouver. For several years she did not attend any church regularly. Then one day she noticed the sign for the local church. “It was the same name as my maternal grandmother, so I thought I would like to go.” (Q9, 1)

Ruth came one Sunday and discovered “it was a warm church to come into; people were nice. I went to coffee and they talked to you.” After a few weeks, the priest invited her to join the Altar Guild. “I got doing things, so it feels fine, it feels happy.” (I9, 38)

During the course of our interview, it became clear Ruth had been thinking about some negative experiences with clergy over the years. She shared the story of the time she sought out her priest for guidance after she had had an unexpected experience while praying: “In the bathtub I’m praying and the language isn’t the same. I talked to the priest one day after church. I’m pretty casual about this. I thought he was going to swallow his tongue!”

From the description of her experience it is likely Ruth was experiencing glossolalia or singing in tongues. This is attested to in the New Testament and was also a feature of the Charismatic Movement which had an impact on the Anglican Churches in North Vancouver in the late 1970s and early 1980s. Her priest was less than helpful in helping her understand her experience: “it’s pretty beautiful, it’s quite lovely; but my priest thinks I’m cavorting with the devil or something, so I shut it down pretty much in my life.” (I9, 23)

Other stories of how other male priests who had disappointed or hurt her emotionally were shared, but not recorded during the interview, at her request. When I asked if she would like to
report these incidents to ecclesial authorities such as the Bishop, she said no, citing the fact that these events had happened years ago and the priests are now retired.

These negative experiences with clergy are important to note because they have not prevented Ruth from participating in leadership in the church. Indeed, it is the quality of her experience as a member of the church community which transcends the limitations of particular clergy. For Ruth, the important thing is the community: “these people all believe like I do, so that’s kind of awesome. That’s why I come here.” (I9, 40)

4.4 Lydia: “My life was transformed”

Lydia had some connection to the Anglican Church through childhood family experiences but for most of her adult life had no involvement with any church. Then one day, “we were walking by one Sunday morning headed for a couple of hours of ramble and there was someone standing on the doorstep and the doors (of the church) were open. I walked up and said, ‘Hi, we’ve always been interested in finding out more about this community.’ The person at the door said, ‘Come on in.’ ” (I3, 2)

It was not until the next Sunday that Lydia attended the service, and she enjoyed the experience. In this small church she felt she had “an affinity for many of the people; it was small and intimate in the sanctuary.” (I3, 6i)

The church Lydia discovered on her Sunday ramble had recently been vacated by the resident congregation which, under the leadership of their priest, decided to break off relations with the Diocese of New Westminster because of its policy in favour of the blessing of same-sex relationships. The Bishop then appointed a new priest with a mandate to build a new congregation from scratch. Lydia became involved in this fledgling community at an early stage in its development.

With a professional background in community development, Lydia appreciated that the little church was trying to become more engaged with the local community. With precarious finances, the members of the church were open to creative partnerships with local community groups. The small church building quickly became a cultural hub with a weekly folk music coffee house.
As Lydia explained, her church involvement brought together two important dimensions: “As someone who is really at heart a community person, social justice is the most important to me, but I found that the worship experience is also extremely important.” (I3, 32) Indeed, “the whole experience of worship was very transforming.” (I3, ii)

One of the reasons the liturgical experience was particularly meaningful for Lydia was it offered the opportunity to engage in theological reflection: “I’d never had the experience before of working so closely with a priest. We had a practice of theological reflection . . . every six weeks or so it would be my turn.” (I3, 10i) It was her experience of spiritual growth which she describes as transformational: “My life had been transformed by my engagement with the community. I had in a sense found my spiritual centre.” (Q3, 1v)

Unfortunately, the newly planted church did not take root. After five years the community came to a close and the building was sold. There was an attempt by the members to keep meeting in a local United Church, but this did not lead to anything. Lydia reached retirement age and moved away from the neighbourhood. She no longer attends any church, but has not discounted the possibility. Still, she misses church: “I do miss the unique Anglican form of worship and the love and connection I felt with my community during the Eucharist and the mystery and wonder of spiritual seeking with a group of fellow seekers.” (Q3, 9ii)

### 4.5 Peter: Marriage Project

The Christian faith has been a part of Peter’s life since before he was born: “My grandparents were faithful committed Anglicans – my grandfather ran the Sunday school in Prince George for 15 years.” (I7, 23) When he was a university student he encountered a dynamic young Catholic priest. As a result, “I became a Roman Catholic. We were married in the Catholic Church. It was when I realized that if I remained an observant Catholic my mother-in-law would stop talking to me . . . we found our way to the Anglican Church.” (I7, 24)

The parish church he joined supported a program called the Marriage Project. This was a lay led marriage preparation program made available for couples seeking to get married in an Anglican Church. Couples from churches throughout the diocese would attend. Peter and his wife provided leadership in the program for many years: “The Marriage Project ministry was a good
one. It gave us an exposure to a fairly focused kind of outreach ministry where you thought you were doing something for the community, trying to help.” (I7, 26)

Through his church involvement Peter was also invited to participate in an adult faith formation program called the *Cursillo* movement. This was a positive experience and helped him “to appreciate that our community extended beyond our parish boundaries.” (Q7, 5i) His involvement beyond his parish was further extended when he was invited to join the Diocesan Program Committee. This was during the time of great interest in the issue of human sexuality. He participated in the debates on the blessing of same-sex partnerships, and came to know many members of Integrity, an advocacy group which called for the full inclusion of homosexual persons in the life of the church. (Q7, 5iii)

Peter feels his church involvement has been very positive: “I’ve benefitted in all sorts of ways from my involvement with the church – that’s a given at this point in my life.” (I7, 36) But while he is passionate about his involvement in the Anglican Church, this is tempered by a deep skepticism about its future. He is a leading proponent of the ‘too many buildings, not enough people’ school of thought. (I7, 2i) On several occasions he expressed deep disappointment that the MAP process had not resolved the issue of sustainability for his church. An engineer by profession, Peter is a practical man who seeks practical solutions to problems. Yet, despite his disappointments, he remains a loyal member of his parish church.

4.6 Martha: “It’s in my DNA”

Martha’s church involvement is embedded in the life of her family:

My great-grandparents helped to build the very first church in North Vancouver. My grandfather was instrumental in building the hall, the sacristy is named after my grandmother, my mother was a warden, she was also the secretary for a while, and they named the elevator after her because she was passionate about getting an elevator in there but she died before they could. (I1, 3)

For Martha, the Anglican Church is “in my DNA.” (I1,7)

As a child she attended church with her family, but in her teenage years stopped going. She was in her twenties when she came back to church. “My Mom was going, so I started going to the
eight o’clock service because it was quick, like fast food.” (I1, 17i) Soon, she was invited to lead the intercessions: “somebody was going out of town. They said ‘we need someone to do the prayers.’ I’ve been doing the prayers ever since, it’s like 27 years.” (I1, 17ii)

Martha also sings in the church choir, but finds she yearns for more modern, upbeat music. A few years ago she joined the choir at a local Pentecostal Church because it offered music she liked. “It was fun to go to a church where it was rock and roll, it was pop music, it was ‘let’s have some energy.’

Unfortunately, the upbeat music was accompanied by a theology of intolerance with regard to human sexuality. “I couldn’t wrap myself around the people being asked to leave the church because they had sex before marriage or because it was discovered they were homosexual. Having people preach about the evils of homosexuality – no, no, no.” (I1, 95)

As a single parent with two teenage children, Martha must choose how she spends her time with some care. Church involvement is a priority, and she has spent hundreds of hours in leadership, particular with the North Vancouver Ministry Assessment Process: “It took a lot of my time, it took a lot of hope and positive energy, and going into every meeting just, ‘we’re going to move forward with this, we’re going to . . . transform the doubters into believers, we can do something positive here.’ And we did.” (I1, 35)

4.7 Silas: “Babysitting time”

Silas is the youngest member of the focus group by at least a decade. In his early thirty’s, Silas is a computer professional, and his wife is a management consultant. They have two young children. In this respect they are the ideal couple most churches yearn for – a young family!

Silas has strong ties to his church: “I’ve been going to my church since I was 2 or 3 years old. I’ve been going there forever; I was a server growing up, a youth group leader through my 20s, and I still go there.” (I6, 16)

Most importantly, the church is Silas’s community: “A lot of it is really liking the people who have seen me grow up over the years. Community -- that’s a big thing. And God and serving Him as well. What ties us to our church is the people we’ve known for 30 years.” (I6, 34)
Silas and his wife both have a high degree of commitment to their church. This is illustrated by the fact that “for some reason when my youngest was born my wife was on parish council as well as me, so we’d use our babysitting time to both go to a meeting.” (I6, 52)

However, as young members of a church with mostly elderly members, they long for a church with a high quality Sunday school program, but resent the expectation that they should be the ones to provide it. As working professionals, they simply do not have the time or energy to organize a Sunday school program on their own. At this point in his family’s life, Christian formation is a priority: “Sunday school was a big part of church for me growing up, and I want my kids to have the same experience.” (I6, 28) They are currently considering looking at other churches with a Sunday school program.

4.8 Phoebe: “Try to give hope”

Phoebe is a nurse educator at a major teaching hospital in Vancouver who is responsible for student nurse training as well as on-going professional development training for current nurses. She also volunteers with the hospital foundation in their fundraising efforts to build a new hospital building. Despite a busy and demanding professional life, Phoebe has served two terms (2004-09 & 2012-15) as a Warden of her church and continues to serve on the Parish Council.

Phoebe belongs to the same church she attended as a child and where her parents are still active parishioners after some 50 years. As a young adult she moved away for school and got married, but moved back to North Vancouver just before her children were born. ”When my oldest daughter was old enough I went on parish council and she could do some childcare for me at home.” (I8, 2) Three generations of family members currently attend church together.

During her initial term as Warden she had to negotiate the transition of clergy. The first priest opposed the blessing of same sex couples then being proposed by Synod. During her incumbency the priest had sought out “Alternative Episcopal Oversight” as allowed by the Bishop at that time. The priest felt alienated from the diocese and was reluctant to participate in the regional MAP program. When she left there was a period of about 10 months before a new priest was appointed. Phoebe felt like she was alone and unsupported:

When we didn’t have a priest no other churches knew about it or really cared about we were going through. I felt very siloed in what we were doing and the struggles we went though.
(The synod office) gave me very little, I kind of had to do all the work, I didn’t find there was a lot of communication between the diocese and my church, the onus was all on us to do everything. (I8, 22, 24)

In contrast, Phoebe always felt supported by her church community. (I8, 22) As a leader in her church she felt motivated to “give back to the community that’s always given to me.” (I8, 28)

Her church involvement has had a positive influence on her work life. For Phoebe, nursing is her ministry. As she works with families of sick children, “my church life has helped me in that I’m able to understand, have empathy and try to give hope where they might not see hope.” (I8, 12)

4.9 Sarah: “I would like to see this strange creature”

In her late seventies, Sarah was the oldest participant in the focus group. She was the Warden responsible for attending to all the details involved in closing one of the two North Vancouver churches. She had been a member of that church for over thirty years.

She began her involvement when she heard about a local church that had a new priest: “I read that a woman priest had been inducted in this little local church. I remember thinking I would like to see this strange creature.”

A short time later she called a taxi to pick her up. To her surprise the church was only a minute away by car. She entered the small church to see it was attended by about 24 people. What struck her was that “everyone was so intent on the sermon.” (I2, 10) After the service she was invited to join the social time: “one of the Wardens came up to me, ‘Can I get you a cup of coffee?’ He engaged me in conversation and I thought, this is very nice. As I walked home I stopped dead. I thought, I went to see this strange creature, a woman priest, but I didn’t even notice.” (I2, 11)

She decided to return. “Three Sundays later a group of fairly young newcomers turned to me and said, ‘you’ve been here three weeks now, you’d better put your name down – we’ve got all these jobs waiting for you.” (I2, 11)

Thus began a long term commitment to this small church. By the following year she had been appointed Priest’s Warden. During her over 30 years of service there were times when she had
considered leaving, but she kept with it. “I have this thing about loyalty.” Plus, she thought, “if I left who would do this job?” (I2, 11)

The final few months of being Warden were tremendously busy, and often times rewarding: “It was as if I was 25 again, I had a fabulous memory, picking things up, phoning the diocese (to ask), ‘what about this? what about that?’” (I2, 52) But this adrenaline fueled period of productivity took its toll on Sarah’s health: “I didn’t realize it at the time it had to do with the level of adrenaline. It’s not supposed to go on for a great length of time, which it did do. That’s what had happened to me.” (I2, 54)

As a result, surgery was required. Fortunately, Sarah recovered back to full health. She currently attends another Anglican church in North Vancouver where most of the members of her former church also attend. Her initial plan was to accompany them for a few weeks and move on to the Cathedral, but “after three weeks I thought I’m very comfortable here and there’s good music and there’s preaching, I’ve got it all.” (I2, 56)

4.10 Elizabeth: “I’m an idealist”

Elizabeth understands that if the church is to survive it must face the reality of change. “I know the church is changing and we can’t really comprehend what it will look like; it’s clear that we can’t continue on the way we are because people simply aren’t coming into the church.” (I10, 9)

Nevertheless, she remains an idealist and has hope for a church which makes a difference in the community. Community impact is more important than denominational identity: “I’m not quite sure whether us being Anglican is that essential to be in this neighbourhood; it could be United Church, it could be Lutheran.” (I10, 29)

During the MAP meetings in North Vancouver, Elizabeth had a unique perspective on the process because she worked at the synod office on a part time basis. “It really made me appreciate the dedication, the work and the thought that actually was going into this whole process, (as well as seeing) the hopes and dreams of the people at the synod office.” (I10, 17)

The threat of closure was real, but not frightening. In fact, the discussions generated innovative ideas about community outreach:
One idea we had was maybe if we did have to close our church we were very interested in women in transition who have gone from a shelter but not quite ready to move into their own apartment. If we could do something like that, transition housing. We’ve gone to talk to people and learnt what the needs were and we’ve gone to look at transition houses, so we did a lot of ground work for that sort of stuff. (I10, 31)

These discussions did not, in the end, lead to new initiatives, but it revealed to Elizabeth that the congregation was willing to see itself in a new way.

On several occasions during the focus group, in her questionnaire and in her interview, she mentioned her concern with volunteer burnout. She noticed people from her church seemed to find the MAP meetings frustrating, leading to no tangible results, and this effected people’s energy level and morale. She herself is now very selective as to how she spends her volunteer time with the church.

She offered this practical and personal example of how she manages to avoid burnout:

We had the experience of one lady in the Altar Guild who did it all and left the church because she just totally burned out. Nobody helped her, nobody cared and she left and it’s very sad. Nobody wants to see this again. I happen to be part of the Altar Guild -- I organize it. I love what I do -- setting up (for the liturgy) is like a spiritual practice. I don’t want to do the flowers and I’m not skilled with the linen. There are five or six other people and they each just do one little bit. One lady just does the linen, one person who just does all the hangings; that’s her thing and it works so much better because I don’t feel I’m on the spot all the time. I can relax because there are other people who take care of different aspects. I think if we can share it like that it’s better. (I10, 39)

Elizabeth is interested in working with people who have a common focus and a commitment to action: “If I’m with a group of people I’m far more energized; I think better, I get more engaged, I’m quicker to say that I’ll participate because I know I’m not going to burn out.” (I10, 9)
4.11 James: “I think we’re good”

Years ago, when James and his fiancé wanted to get married in an Anglican church, he discovered that a requirement was he had to be baptized. As a result, he was baptized and married in the same year, and thus began his Christian journey.

He was slowly drawn into leadership positions. “I didn’t jump up and say, ‘I want a job.’ Usually somebody asked.” (I4, 35) Before he retired, he was “involved with the building committee, (and) stewardship over the years, but it was always on a lesser amount of time because I was working . . . 6 or 7 days a week and 12 or 14 hours a day, but I’ve been involved with a lot of stuff over the years.” (I4, 33)

One of the distinctive things about James’s church was it took an early stand in favour of the blessing of same-sex relationships. It was one of seven churches in a diocese of 70 that voted to offer a service of blessing of same sex unions. This was before Canada’s marriage laws were changed to allow for same gender marriages. The downside to this decision was that a significant portion of the congregation left, taking their regular donations with them. “We lost $18,000 worth of annual revenue. We gave ourselves three years to get back on track or we would consider amalgamating.” (I4, 35, 39) James was heavily involved in the ad hoc committee that had formed to meet this challenge. Fortunately, the church met its financial goal and weathered the storm of controversy and division. James thinks one positive result is the people who left were generally dissatisfied complainers who had an excuse to leave. (I4, 47)

Another result was that James agreed to be a Warden. Shortly thereafter, their priest died of heart failure. James was plunged into crisis management as the church scrambled to deal with a difficult situation. During this time he received support from members of the congregation, the other local churches, and the Synod office staff.

For James, MAP was not a satisfying experience: “At times I found it threatening, frustrating, disrespectful, but mainly a long drawn out process. It drew key people from each parish and burned many of them out.” (Q4, 5) One contentious issue which coloured his experience was that his church was undergoing a clergy transition at the time. The priest of seven years, the one who followed the one who died, was retiring. The other MAP-involved clergy felt they had the right to interview the shortlisted candidates, because it was expected the new priest would be part of a
regional clergy “ministry team.” When the Bishop chose a more traditional “canonical process” that did not involve the clergy (but did involve two lay representatives from the region) James felt under attack from the unhappy clergy. (Q4, 4)

In 2014, James was inducted into the Order of the Diocese of New Westminster in a special annual ceremony honouring lay leaders in the diocese. James appreciated the gesture: “If you get a thank you, when you get the (ODNW) medal and that type of thing . . . I certainly get satisfaction out of being able to serve and be appreciated and do something that I enjoy doing.” (I4, 59)

Overall, as James continues as a Warden, he is hopeful about the future of his church: “I think we got a good probability of moving forward. We’ve got the plans and we haven’t seen a massive decline, so the commitment is certainly here. We just need to do some congregational development. I think we’re good.” (I4, 75)

4.12 Pathways to Leadership

The journey from ‘person in the pew’ to ‘person who takes on leadership’ often begins with a simple invitation: “I was asked to join Parish Council; I thought I’d do a little job.” (FG1, 15iv) Little jobs can escalate. For example, prior to his retirement, James had served on several formal and ad hoc committees at his church. (I4, 33) By the time of his retirement from his professional career he was very well qualified to be a Warden. With retirement came the flexibility of his schedule to be available for day time meetings with the priest, the other warden, volunteers, and office staff.

Sarah described her journey to church leadership as a series of simple steps. As she described it above, she first arrived at the church as a visitor to see the “strange creature” of a woman priest in the early 1980s. She was welcomed and experienced genuine hospitality. She agreed to take on some simple jobs that needed doing. At the next Vestry she became a member of the Parish Council, and the following year she became a Warden, a position which she held for nearly thirty years. As she explained it, “I got dragged into church committee and then the following year I was asked to be a warden. It’s been going on 30 years.” (I2, 11ii)

Sarah’s story is unique to her, but it also reveals a common trend among the members of the focus group. The journey to leadership is typically a series of small steps. Rarely is anyone thrust
into responsibility without some kind of prior experience. Often it begins with simple competence. As Lydia explained, “I was the one who would send emails and write things down.” (FG2, 106(i))

In contrast, as a younger person entering into leadership, Silas felt he was “unprepared for what I was getting into.” (Q6, 8ii) This was because despite the fact he had been involved in his parish’s youth ministry program for some time, he had not been involved in the Parish Council or other formal leadership roles. (Q6, 6) When he became involved in the regional MAP-related meetings, this was how he described his experience: “I felt a little intimidated; I’m an anxious person. I knew hardly anybody so I didn’t help much. I was not prepared for the topics we were going to be dealing with.” (I6, 6)

In contrast, Martha’s lack of experience did not dampen her enthusiasm: “The chair needed someone who wasn’t clergy, someone who was open to possibilities.” She realized, “I can do that!” But then “I questioned myself as soon as my hand went up.” (I1, 76ii) Despite these initial reservations, Martha co-chaired MAP meetings for several years.

Phoebe is unique in that she was a Warden while employed in a full time professional career. She served two non-consecutive terms for a total of seven years as Warden helping her community manage clergy changes and other challenges. She feels this is enough: “I’ve retired from being a Warden (but) I’m still on parish council.” (I8, 2iii).

Sources of encouragement and support were far more likely to come from these leader’s own parish church communities. For example, when Phoebe was warden during a period of about six months when her church was without a priest, she felt “very supported” by her own community, despite a feeling that there was a lack of communication with the other churches and the synod office. (I8, 22) Indeed, she said, “I always felt very supported as a Warden” (I8, 22i)

4.13 Ministry Assessment Process

As discussed in Chapter 1, the Ministry Assessment Process (MAP) was a comprehensive planning tool originally designed by Synod office staff to help individual parish churches to identify opportunities for ministry in their community and to address issues of financial viability. In 2008 the Bishop invited the parishes which comprised the Deanery of North Vancouver to do the MAP process together, with the expectation that a regional ministry plan would be created.
Participation in the Ministry Assessment Process was required of all North Vancouver churches by the Bishop. As the future of the “Anglican presence” in North Vancouver was at stake, this required the attention of people in senior leadership. As one explained, “I was a Warden, part of the leadership group – it was a necessity to be involved.” (Q8, 1) Several cited being Warden as a reason for participating. Another explained, “(Our priest) attended all the meetings, (the other Warden) attended them all and I attended them all. At the next Warden’s meeting we would debrief.” (I4, 13i) For Martha, as a Warden: “It seemed completely natural for me to jump into the process and become part of the MAP team.” (Q3, 1iv)

Not everyone involved was a Warden. Silas describes his experience of being drawn into leadership as an uncomfortable experience. During a meeting of Parish Council, “(our priest) stared at me until I volunteered.” (Q6.1) Elizabeth came to be involved because the previous representative “went to a couple of meetings and became discouraged . . . I think he just asked me and said ‘will you take it over?’”(I10, 11) She initially thought it would be a commitment of short duration: “It was just going to be for the fall, we’re going to do a book study, have a couple of fellowship meetings, and that’s your involvement.” (I10, 11ii) Instead, it turned into a multi-year commitment. Indeed, it was not uncommon for participants to discover that “MAP was a weekly and daily commitment.” (Q3, 2i)

Despite the time commitment required of MAP representatives, focus group members either completed their term or stayed with the process from start to finish. Some were “involved from the initial stages to the final report.” (FG1, 12) Others were “involved from the start, then went when nobody else” from their church could go. (FFG1, 13) None of the focus group participants chose to abandon the process or leave their position before their term ended.

As we shall discover, the MAP process was often frustrating for a variety of reasons. The fact that people in leadership chose to stay and participate in a frustrating and challenging process is the key question of this research project. Two comments offer hints as to why people stayed. As Sarah explained, “I have this thing about loyalty; if I left who would do this job?” (I1, 11iii) A broader perspective is offered by Mary: “If you’ve invested quite a bit of time and thought, if you felt you could make a difference for the betterment of the church, I would be disappointed in myself to just walk away.” (I5, 105i) Mary articulated a common theme as a MAP participant:
“My primary discernment role became whether our parish could recover to an acceptable level of sustainability.” (Q5, 4ii)

The requirement to produce a final report added a sense of urgency to wrap things up. “We were at the point where we needed to do something – energy was running out, decisions needed to get made.” (FG1, 90i) In the spring of 2010 a facilitator was brought in as an objective outsider to help the group movement toward a conclusion. The task was clear, “we had to publish a report, we had a deadline, we had to come up with a vision.” (FG1, 91)

Lydia has a particular recollection of one of these final meetings, when, in the interest of expediting the process, the clergy and lay leaders were separated. “Up until then I felt we were motoring through” she explained. (FG1, 47) Then, unexpectedly, at least for her, “The clergy were divided from lay and went off into one room.” (FG1, 101i) This was “the defining moment in the meeting,” she explained, as clergy and laity “went into their own interest-based focus groups.” (Q3, 4i) For her, this was when “everything changed.” (FG1, 45ii)

When the two groups came back together, the result was unexpected. The clergy perspective was shared with the whole group. It presented a vision of ministry in the region where the existing parishes were grouped into three ‘hubs’ or ‘ministry centres.’ The three parishes on the eastern side of North Vancouver were grouped together, as were the two the centrally located parishes, and the two western parishes completed the trilogy.

Lydia was surprised:

The vision from the priests was that . . . the wealthier churches that were north of the highway would partner with the churches south of the highway. The first thing I said when I looked at it was, ‘all of the demographics we did, all of the work and the research looking at who are the people in these different areas, says that won’t work.’ They’re a totally different socioeconomic (groups); the demographics said this made no sense. (FG1, 105)

For Lydia, “the outcome was utterly bizarre” (FG1, 99ii)

Nevertheless, this recommendation formed part of the final Ministry Plan which is described by Martha as essentially a consensus statement: “the final presentation was an agreement of everybody. It was everything we could agree upon.” (I1, 68) As such, it fell short of her
expectations: “I think there was so much more that we wanted to do . . . so many lofty ideas” that were not included in the final report. (I1, 39ii) Peter was also disappointed: “MAP itself seemed like a good idea. I don’t see it as having gotten a hold of what the real critical issues are.” (I7, 46)

Despite the disappointing result, Elizabeth is philosophical: “there are no heroes and villains, winners or losers. We all did the best we could with integrity and commitment.” (Q10, 11i)

4.14 The Bishop as Authority Figure

The Bishop as an authority figure loomed large over the MAP process. While some were willing to “give the Bishop credit for trying to do something in the face of challenging things,” (FG1, 55ii) others were suspicious of his motives. Bishops in the Anglican Communion have an enormous amount of authority in a few key areas. While constrained by diocesan canons and policies set by the Synod, the bishop sets the tone and often determines priorities for the diocese. Their greatest source of real power in terms of influence on events and communities is the authority to appoint clergy. In the Diocese of New Westminster, the Bishop oversees the appointment process for clergy, and is the only person with the authority to appoint and licence clergy within the diocese. The Bishop also has final authority on the closure of churches. It was this fact that generated concern for many people involved in the MAP.

Many of the participants believed the Bishop had the intention to close churches and amalgamate communities in North Vancouver. Indeed, this process was already well underway with regard to St Richard’s, which was formally closed on December 31, 2009. The expectation that more churches were expected to close was a given. Some took the view that the Bishop wanted any decision about closures “to grow organically from within the conversations within the deanery.” (I8, 36i) Others felt the Bishop “wanted us to come to his conclusion” (Q1, 5). There was a range of opinion on what the Bishop expected of the process. On the one hand there were those who felt, “he never wanted to make a decision, he wanted it to come from the people.” (FG1, 123) On the other hand, the Bishop’s intentions were summed up as “figure it out or I will make a decision for you.” (FG1, 17i)

During the focus group discussion, the topic of the Bishop’s agenda came up several times. A meeting in which the Bishop shared a story of an innovative approach to ministry he had
encountered where several small marginal churches had combined to create a single viable church seemed to haunt the proceedings:

the Bishop introduced his idea of ‘maybe we need to close them all and open this worship centre that was this building with the Church here and the offices here and a chapel over here.’ Do you remember that? We’re going to shut everything down. That was from the Bishop. He did not think we were moving fast enough to make decisions. (FG1, 54)

Some heard this story as an example of what could happen when people were open to new possibilities: “it was a very good set up.” (FG1, 60i). But others, perhaps the majority, heard a threatening message of impending closures: the Bishop “had his agenda, focused on who he favored – his idea was to get rid of some churches.” (FG2, 88ii) This perceived threat tended to colour the proceedings and motivate participation. One heard the message, “the Bishop wanted to shut us down and said so.” (FG1, 103) Another expressed her concern this way: “it was clear that if the Bishop deigned to close a church we would be it; I think that laid the foundation for very intense involvement of (our church’s members)”. (I10, 23i)

This sense of threat from the Bishop was reinforced by encounters with diocesan staff. Elizabeth described being in a meeting where “it was clear it was all about money; even though we were a vibrant community, lack of finances would close us down.” (Q10, 4 ii) When she objected to this line of reasoning, she was told she did not understand and was “immature.” As a result, “it was very difficult to go back to work the next day” at the synod office. (FG1, 53iv)

Unfortunately, for some the frustration of working under the threat of closure took its toll. The Bishop became a lightning rod for anxiety: “I changed from thinking of him as an authority figure to thinking of him as a bad boss.” (FG2, 88i)

4.15 Buildings

Although not stated explicitly in the “Mandate Questions” posed by the bishop, the implicit and most pressing issue to be addressed by MAP in North Vancouver was whether or not seven churches could stay open. Some believed “we are over-churched on the North Shore.” (FG1, 19ii) The enormous effort to maintain seven churches meant “we were so engaged with keeping the enterprise afloat there is no time for mission or ministry.” (FG1, 61i)
The MAP meetings generated much talk, debate and thought about the nature and utility of church buildings. While there was an assumption that most people were stubbornly attached to their buildings, Focus Group leaders tended to be more flexible in their thinking. As a leader, Elizabeth “worked hard to reassure our congregation that finances weren’t the bottom line, and that we can let go of our building and still be the people of God, a community doing God’s work.” (Q10, 4i) This view was shared by others. For example, Mary shared her experience of a heated discussion with one of the clergy, who said to her “‘Your problem is you’re really attached to the building and not the ministry.’ I said you’re talking to the wrong person. I’m not attached to any building. I can go anywhere.” (I5, 55ii)

The focus became the number of church buildings: “It was obvious to me that we have too many buildings, and not enough people,” explained Elizabeth (Q10, 1i). This was a sentiment shared by many, including Peter: “I can’t, as a church leader, go to people and ask them to give more to keep supporting buildings that are a quarter full on Sundays; that’s just madness.” (I7, 46iii)

Some people saw the MAP as an opportunity to explore new ways for the churches to work together: “this is about how can we work together, not closing churches.” (FG1, 52i) Others held the view “it was about closing churches.” (FG1, 42i)

For Martha, the advantage of selling some church properties is that assets could be used to pay off debts and other building related expenses. “I know (one church) needed huge restorative work . . . all these things could be done . . . if we got rid of a couple of others.” (I1, 46) The question remained, which churches?

The tension around the threat of closing churches was “always in the background, there’d always be a comment every meeting about it.” (I6, 8ii) Consequently, “we were all looking to protect our parishes.” (I4, 57i) Others felt “we were on the chopping block because we were unsustainable. (FG2, 111i) For some it felt like a life or death struggle: “we were in a death match against (another church); one is going to live, one will die. (FG1, 106)

Protecting turf was not always motivating MAP participants. Some were willing to set parochialism aside to look at the bigger picture: “I went into it believing that (my church) has some plusses, but so do all the other parishes. If we have to reduce buildings (my church) could be one of the ones we have to let go,” said Martha. (I1, 45ii)
Others were less optimistic that closing churches and combining communities would actually work out. In Silas’s opinion, “I feel like a lot of people just wouldn’t go” to a different church. (I6, 36) James expressed the fear that when communities combine there is actually “a horrific reduction when you look at the givers – they are the elderly, and so financially I didn’t think it would be a wise thing.” (I4, 73) Lydia, seeing the value in her small church community, was not convinced that combining smaller communities into a larger one was the right thing: “a bigger church doesn’t work particularly well.” (FG1, 63iv)

Because of the emphasis on buildings and the threat of closure, rumours abounded in the various church communities. “A lot of people thought MAP would end up closing (their) church, we were pussyfooting around by not telling them the bad news.” (FG2, 111iii) In this way some leaders felt their church communities viewed them with some suspicion or even distrust. Looking back, some realized the emphasis on buildings came at a cost: with “all that focus on our building, we didn’t get to hear about any (other) issues.” (I5, 73i)

4.16 Money

In close proximity to the issue of buildings was the issue of money and finances. Buildings cost money for heat, light, maintenance and upkeep, and there did not seem to be enough money to pay for all of them. Some of the tension around money arose from the fact that of the seven churches, only one had a significant endowment fund, worth approximately five hundred thousand dollars. A major source of this endowment came from a parishioner who had at different times been a member of two of the North Vancouver churches. When he died, only one church received a legacy gift from the estate. This turn of events caused a history of tension between the two churches. “There was a huge animosity long before MAP started.” (FG1, 130i)

MAP included a financial audit of all the churches. Only one “had enough money to survive” (FG1, 117ii) because of this endowment fund. As with many other churches in the Diocese of New Westminster, the endowment funds were invested in a common Consolidated Trust Fund (CTF) administered for the diocese by a professional investment firm. For the members of the church which held the account, it seemed the other churches “were looking for an influx of CTF funds. It was, ‘when can we get our hands on that money . . . we’ll be able to do this, we’ll be able to do that.’” (I4, 5) Because of this interest, it felt like “we looked like a nice plump ripe pear tree ready to be plucked.” (I4, 13ii)
Others felt they “were in a (difficult) financial situation (but) our ministry was very good.” (FG1, 102ii) Another felt “we were under the gun because (our previous priest) with his big visions wanted to develop the property” but the diocese did not support the plan. (FG1, 102i)

4.17 Put-downs

Against this background of anxiety and uncertainty about buildings and money, it is perhaps not surprising that tensions would surface. The most notable times are when people felt insulted or put down. In one early MAP experience James describes how, “(our priest) asked a question and was rudely put down. At the next Warden’s meeting we discussed this and decided we should be part of this process so we would know what was happening.” (Q4, 1ii)

On another occasion, Ruth had talked about her experience of belonging to a consortium of four churches which shared three priests. Her contribution was not well received; “when I brought it up I felt like I had four heads.” (FG1, 42iii)

Others who had to report on MAP progress to their home church committee’s sometimes encountered hostility: “I went to our church committee and every time I got grilled . . . I’m not going to go through this hell.” (FG1, 132iii)

James recounts how in one particularly uncomfortable meeting, he and the other Warden of his church gave an update after consulting with the Bishop on the next steps to be taken to get a new priest for their church. It wasn’t what the group expected to hear. “The whole room went silent.” It seems the clergy expected to play an active role in the selection process, but the Bishop had not said anything about it. “Every one of the clergy pretty much called us liars,” said James. “That’s the first time I’ve seen the ugly side of the church.” (FG2, 83) As Ruth put it, “you go through a process, and then you get your head cut off.” (FG2, 87ii)

4.18 Lack of Support

While issues such as the challenge of finances or the management of aging and possibly redundant church buildings were significant ones with no easy answers, another source of frustration was a perception of a lack of support from the church hierarchy.

Lydia was especially critical of diocesan staff whom she felt were not up to the task at hand. “I found out about the church . . . it was a big problem; they don’t have the tools, the capacity” to
be effective. (FG2, 106vi) Phoebe reached a similar conclusion: “To encourage people to keep volunteering you need support from the main body. I didn’t feel at the time the diocese was really super supportive.” (I8, 24ii)

Lack of receptivity to new or creative ideas was encountered by several people. When Ruth shared her experience of belonging to a parish with team ministry “the response I got back from (the priest) was disconcerting to say the least. I felt mocked.” (Q9, 2) Lydia also experienced this frustration. She said diocesan leaders will say “we really value your church and the work you’re doing,” but, she concludes, “these are empty words.” (FG2, 79i) For Silas, the frustration came from the fact that “you do a lot of the foundation work and you don’t get to see it through.” (I6, 110)

Lack of clear results after a long process of discussion, brainstorming and planning was discouraging. As Lydia expressed it “we did heroic efforts and heroic measures because we were so invested in it. It would have been wonderful to be part of an actual transformation.” (I3, 24ii) She concluded that MAP, despite its promising beginnings, had become “a process to apply some band aids to something that wasn’t going to change that much . . . (how) depressing!” (I3,20)

4.19 Clergy

The focus of this study is on lay leaders, but lay leaders must work with and in many ways follow the lead of the clergy, in particular priests, who constitute the majority of the paid professionals of the church. As such, priests have more to lose in terms of livelihood than the volunteer lay leaders. Indeed, “one of the elephants in the room was, if we’re really talking about closing churches we are talking about clergy losing their jobs.” (FG1, 93)

Some perceived the clergy as the “voice of negativity” who were “shooting down every idea” because their “jobs were at risk.” Because of their self-interest, they were unable to “look out for what was best.” (Q1, 4)

Because of this, some felt the clergy impeded progress: “It’s a shame they weren’t posted somewhere else for a couple of years.” (FG2, 106ii) Another asked, “was it a solution to turn over all the clergy” as a way of clearing the way for fresh thinking? (FG1, 110)
In the midst of uncertainty, it was clear many lay leaders felt responsible for the welfare of the clergy. For example, Martha was concerned when she saw that one priest in particular was likely to lose her job. She went to the Bishop and said, “we’ve got openings of positions for these ministers who are facing possible closures, could we move (the clergy) around? The Bishop said, don’t worry about (the priest), she’s going to be fine.” (I1, 52)

The employment issue was further complicated by the fact that during the time of MAP there were several clergy personnel changes. Three priests retired either just before or after MAP began. One of the retired priests was reassigned to another church within the deanery as an interim. Another was given pastoral responsibility for two communities. Another was appointed a part-time interim and another (the researcher for this project) was appointed after the MAP Ministry Plan was completed and participated in its implementation. In this way, “there was a revolving door of leadership among clergy.” (Q8, 8i)

One priest who had been involved from the start and who proposed the “ministry hub” approach left unexpectedly during the implementation phase to take an interim position in a church in an adjacent city. When he left “it was a huge surprise because he was integral” to the planning process. (FG1, 111) In Elizabeth’s perspective: “It was discouraging to see one of the clergy, who was an integral part of the process, accept an appointment outside the region. I didn’t feel like we had 100% commitment from the clergy.” (Q10, 8iii)

Another dynamic was that some clergy were appointed as part-time or interim and were therefore formally known as “Priest-in-charge.” Only two of the original seven, then five churches had priests who were the “Incumbent.” One difference between the two designations is that typically a Priest-in-charge is a part-time appointed for a finite term, typically one to two years, while an Incumbent is a full-time appointment without a specified term. Some people viewed the difference in clergy status as “a big drawback” (FG1, 122i), because it seemed to underscore the insecurity of clergy jobs.

James summarized the issue succinctly: “the clergy did as well as they could and it must have been as tough for them as us. We didn’t want to close our churches and they didn’t want to lose their jobs.” (Q4, 8)
In the midst of this uncertainty, one person wondered “how could they lay down a vision” when their continuing employment was uncertain? (FG1, 122ii)

The clergy were influential throughout MAP. Not only did clergy have a “huge influence” (FG1, 113) on MAP meetings, they were also key in how MAP meetings, decisions and plans were explained to their respective parishes. Phoebe observed that “depending on how clergy felt about the MAP process (they) really influenced the parish feeling” about MAP. In the case of her parish, the first priest involved in MAP “very much wanted the diocese to leave us alone and let us figure it out.” Peter thought this person “actively worked against MAP-related activities.” (Q7, 8) This was in contrast to the next priest who “had a good dialogue with the people in the diocese.” (I8, 38) Elizabeth concurred: “we were lucky enough to have (a priest) who supported the work of MAP in her preaching and pastoral care. Some clergy did not want to be part of the process.” (Q10, 8i)

In another parish, the dynamic was different. Silas observed that updates from MAP meetings came exclusively through their priest: “we only heard from our parish priest what was going on.” (Q6, 4ii) When the priest reported back to the Parish Council he tended to downplay any contentious issues, and “tended to minimize any problems.” When it came time for Silas to be more involved as his parish representative, he realized his priest “could have prepared me better.” (I6, 96) When he attended meetings as a parish representative he was surprised and alarmed: “(Our priest) had given me the impression that we’re not going to be closing buildings. I didn’t realize that this was going to be a main talking point.” (I6, 8i)

Individual encounters with clergy outside of MAP meetings also had an impact. Ruth recounted an experience with one of the male clergy, with whom she was alone one evening in the sacristy following a service. During a conversation to clarify expectations about cleaning up after a service just led by this particular cleric (he expected the Altar Guild to tidy up), suddenly, “He was obviously mad about something. He went on about the congregation and about the money. He was yelling at me.” (Q2, v) She felt very vulnerable because she felt his behavior was very aggressive. Fortunately, the tantrum ended and she was able to leave the room. “My interaction with him was very negative and scary. I felt his behavior was totally inappropriate.” (Q9, 8i) This coloured her direct involvement with MAP, and she chose to focus her energies on her congregation rather than the wider region.
Others had a more positive experience of the clergy. Lydia “experienced terrific clergy leadership (from two priests) who listened and were guided by our ideas, just as we were by theirs.” (Q3, 8) Another valued an interim who “came to the parish to listen; he didn’t know if the parish would survive. It was up to the parishioners to decide.” (FG1, 129i)

Conflict resolution was not always successful. Some felt the clergy should have been more skillful in managing conflicts. In particular, “I felt the Regional Dean should have had a stronger voice when things got heated and the priests were arguing.” (I6, 112) In one meeting tensions were high and one of the priests is reported to have said “I can’t handle this any longer.” The conclusion people reached was “we needed help.” (FG1, 90ii)

### 4.20 Top-down

Although for the most part the focus group participants were respectful of the clergy, when they made critical remarks they seldom identified the priest or deacon directly.

One critique of the overall leadership style of the clergy was that they had a tendency to impose their view from above. According to Lydia, “we had worked from the grass roots, (the clergy) came in and worked from the top down.” (FG1, 117iii) For example, it was “a vision of the priests that we should partner north-south.” (FG1, 105i) On another occasion a meeting went badly when a priest did not allow for full lay participation. “We were accustomed to listening to everybody,” Lydia said. When that did not happen, “the meeting was a disaster.” (FG2, 106iv)

In another contentious meeting with a different clergy leader, Lydia explained, “we received a lecture and it ticked off a few people. I just thought to myself, ‘what you don’t know could fill volumes.’” (I3, 24i)

Mary also found the leadership of the clergy problematic. She described the clergy as having a “non-transparent leadership role.” On the one hand it seemed clear to her that “the direction of the agenda” and the avoidance of some issues was influenced by the clergy, (Q5, 9i) but she also felt “I never knew what they were thinking.” (I5, 45i) This was because “the clergy were very quiet during our meetings.” (I5, 41)
In reflecting on this dynamic, Mary said, “My sense is it was probably difficult in a way for them. They are professional leaders of the parish, but I think they held back on their individual opinions of direction.” (I5, 43)

Not all comments about the clergy were negative. Many acknowledged that the clergy worked hard and provided encouragement and guidance. (Q2, 4) Peter, who could be very critical, said “I have a great admiration for the clergy because I don’t think (it’s) an easy job.” (I7, 38) Martha affirmed that the clergy “had insight and valuable information that we needed to be able to make decisions.” (I1, 6) She thought “the clergy did their best.” (I1, 64i)

### 4.21 Sources of Hope

One of the book study options during the early MAP process was to explore Alan Roxburgh’s writings on the “missional” church. For a brief time, Roxburgh had a close connection to one of the North Vancouver parishes; he lived in the neighbourhood and provided some pro bono consulting advice. Roxburgh had also been a featured presenter at a diocesan sponsored workshop on the missional church entitled “Moving Back into the Neighbourhood” in April, 2010. For many focus group members, Roxburgh’s approach was clearly influential.

“A big part of MAP was based on (Roxburgh’s) works,” Elizabeth noted, “it was a whole new way of getting out of your church and into your neighbourhood.” (FG1, 68) Another interjected, “Alan Roxburgh; that was exciting.” (FG1, 67)

For Lydia, “Roxburgh’s writings fit so well with our lived experience and drew us more deeply into the exploration of meaningfulness in our neighbourhoods.” (Q3, 1iii) His teachings challenged them to ask “who are the people in this neighbourhood and are we relevant to them?” (FG1, 63ii) This led to “entering into some of the most fascinating and interesting conversations with so many different people.” (FG1, 63i)

Roxburgh’s personal engagement in Mary’s church in particular led to a positive assessment of its ministry: “(Roxburgh) worked with our interim priest and we had multiple breakfast meetings. (He did a study) that came out with the fact that there was energy in the parish, that we had good ministries.” (I5, 10)
There was also a practical impact at Elizabeth’s church: “‘Getting Back into Your Neighbourhood’ was an excellent study, but it came and went. He had some ideas of going out and meeting your neighbours – our community garden is part of that.” (I10, 31ii)

In hindsight, Lydia observed “the (missional) vision was about being part of the neighbourhood, not necessarily getting people through the doors, but (asking) ‘what are the ways that we can offer gifts to this neighbourhood?’” (I3, 6ii) For example, at her church a labyrinth was painted on the parking lot. “I never would have thought about doing a labyrinth, and then it became a core part of our community. It was like a gift to the community.” (I3, 11i) In addition, “one of the things the community needed was more community space for musicians, so we started the music coffee house.” (I3, 11ii)

The positive feeling generated by the missional vision for parish ministry continues to inform a sense of hope for focus group members. As Phoebe explained, “I still don’t think we’ve figured out things with the ministry team yet, but I think generally people feel content that we’re staying in (our neighbourhood) and getting to know the neighbourhood.” (I8, 40i) The neighbourhood focus is shared by Mary: “I still feel the Anglican church certainly has a role to play in the neighbourhood, a strong role to play.” (I5, 94) More specifically, “it’s about meeting the needs of people living in this time and space.” (Q5, 10)

Reflecting on the results of the Ministry Assessment Process, some focus group members were pessimistic about the final results, agreeing that “there was so much more that could have been done.” (FG2, 31) Martha lamented that nothing came of the “huge push to do something with the property . . . to build something for the deanery that could be a rental space, office space, hospice, social work, youth drop-in, senior’s drop-in. There were so many ideas.” (I1, 41) Ruth was disappointed her positive experience of clergy team ministry wasn’t taken more seriously: “I didn’t see why it wouldn’t work here. Maybe . . . we don’t need five priests.” (I9, 31,33)

Significant issues of financial viability were not resolved. As James succinctly stated, “at some point parishes on the North Shore are going to drop – there are probably too many parishes.” Silas, who has young children in need of a Sunday school program, is “doubtful” about the future of his parish church. (I6, 74) Indeed, he feels “it would be foolish not to have concerns for the future.” (Q6, 9ii) The most pessimistic statements tended to come from Peter, who answered his
rhetorical question “can we create a church that will be of interest to people?” with the statement, “we have no young families, no Sunday school, no nothing.” (FG2, 57)

While some seemed to share a general skepticism about the future prospects of the church, others are more optimistic and hopeful. Elizabeth noted that at her church “this year we passed a balanced budget, which was the first in years.” This will allow her church to increase their priest’s salary from three-quarter time to full-time employment, at least for the next year. (I10, 25) She is also hopeful because the talk of amalgamating or combining churches has been dropped for now. “It came from the decision (that) we need an Anglican presence in (our neighbourhood). I’m not sure being Anglican is that essential, but people are reassured because we’re not talking about moving into one big church, we are staying.” (I10, 29)

Phoebe noticed that people’s attitudes about their church building had changed as a result of MAP:” I think the building is still important to some people, like my parents. Although it’s interesting they were able, in that period of time, to come to terms with ‘OK, we can look at something (different).’” (I8, 42) For the younger people, “the building isn’t important to them, it doesn’t matter - it’s all about the people in the building.” (I8, 40ii)

James, though skeptical that all five churches will prosper, is hopeful about his church. Again, feeling relief that amalgamation is not currently an issue, he likes the fact that “we are five distinctly different Anglican communities – our future is in our hands.” He feels positive about the prospects for his church: “the commitment is certainly here so we just need some congregational development.” (I4, 75)

Cooperation among the deanery churches is also noticed and appreciated. Phoebe has observed “there are wonderful people working hard to encourage ministry. There have been small steps toward shared ministry – this is good!” (Q8, 10) Silas has noticed “the youth program is doing well. I also really like how well the churches are working together. Inter-church activities and services are becoming well-established.” (Q6, 10) Mary agrees and sees “great opportunity and potential for parish growth and sustainability.” (Q5, 3)

More specific hopes for the future tend to focus on meeting specific needs. While Elizabeth rejoices that “we have young families still among us who find life and hope; God is always at work even when, perhaps especially, when things seem so dire.” (Q10, 10) Silas is very
concerned that a high quality Sunday school program be available for his children: “To have a good (Sunday school) program with only my kids in it wouldn’t be that beneficial . . . growth with families and a Sunday school that’s functional – those are my hopes for the church.” (I6, 72)

4.22 Overall Experience of MAP

As explained above, the Ministry Assessment Process in North Vancouver was driven by four main “mandate questions” (serving the needs of the local community, Anglican identity, renewing Anglican faith, sharing resources) alongside the question of impending church closures. MAP participants entered the process with a range of attitudes and points of view.

Some entered the process hoping for the best, and trusting in the process: “I went into MAP with an open mind, open heart. I really wanted everyone to succeed.” (FG1, 132ii) Another was willing to consider completely starting over in the region: “what if we could just wipe the slate clean, what would we do?” (I1, 48i)

There were hours devoted to ‘blue sky’ scenarios: “we spent a lot of time talking about doing store front ministries, getting rid of buildings, where we should have a presence in the community, say at the university, or maybe a coffee shop in Deep Cove.” (I5, 89)

These meetings, while sometimes resulting in stimulating brain storming, did not necessarily lead to concrete plans or actions. “Everybody (had) to be listened to, and so it went on and on.” (FG1, 60vi) Peter suggested “it’s like a rocking chair – it keeps you busy without getting anywhere.” (FG1, 62iii)

One person aptly described her experience as being both “exhausting and fulfilling.” (I1, 64ii) Exhausting because of the time commitment required: “we thought two years from the outset, not two years from when we finally got everything organized . . . by three years we were all very tired.” (I1, 62) After a while it became evident that “the focus was on meetings instead of action.” (FG2, 77) It was fulfilling because, despite the lack of tangible results, “in looking back I think there was a lot of value in it.” (I5, 45ii) Some realized that the local churches “are actually working together; they’re collaborating.” (I1, 39i) This has led to “a better working relationship with the other parishes in our deanery.” (Q4, 10) Consequently, “most of the churches have actually gotten stronger” (I1, 90i)
4.23 Concluding remarks

The Focus Group members provided invaluable reflections on their experience of MAP. While many felt the MAP failed to resolve key issues, for the most part they remain positive about the prospects for their churches. With the exception of Lydia, all remain active and valued members of their churches. In Chapter Five we will analyse and interpret the Focus Group material using Dulles’ Five Models of the Church to gain better insight into the dynamics of MAP and the motivations of these lay leaders.
Chapter 5 Analysis

In Chapter 1 we were introduced to the Anglican parish churches in North Vancouver, the Ministry Assessment Process and the resulting Ministry Plan. In Chapter 2 we explored the frustrations lay leaders experienced in the process, leading to the question, “why do they stay?” In Chapter 3 we developed a theological framework for our exploration leading to a hermeneutic based on Dulles’ Five Models of the Church. Chapter 4 provided a “thick description” of the experience of lay leaders based on the action-in-ministry strategy outlined in Chapter 2. In this chapter, we will attempt to integrate the preceding chapters by using Dulles’ models as an interpretive framework. This method allows us greater insight into the dynamics at play in the MAP process and helps to identify the reasons lay leaders are motivated to stay and not leave their churches despite the stresses they endure. We will then seek to examine the implications of the insights for the benefit of the wider Church, and offer some concluding comments.

5.1 Clarifying the Models

Using Dulles’ five models as a kind of interpretive lens or filter, we can evaluate the focus group data and related texts to tease out in a preliminary way the implicit models of the church that may be at work. Admittedly, none of the participants were asked directly about their preferred model of the church. Indeed, it was only after the action-in-ministry was complete that the use of these models came to the fore. Therefore, the use of these models is pragmatic and somewhat subjective of the part of the researcher. The intention is to use the models as a heuristic device to interpret and draw conclusions of the data in order to address the question of “why do they stay?” Further research specifically focusing on how models of the church inform the perspective of lay leaders could well lead to more definitive conclusions.

The “filtering” criteria to evaluate statements and attitudes are as follows

5.2 Institutional

- Is the emphasis on institutional survival?
- Is it based on an institutional need or agenda?
- Are buildings and budgets a priority?
- Is it based on the perceived authority of the Bishop or clergy?
• Is the efficient use of resources of primary concern?
• Are statistics used to determine value?
• Is group process more important than interpersonal relationships?

5.3 Mystical Communion
• Is it about loyalty to a primary group?
• Are people more important than buildings?
• Do interpersonal relationships outweigh issues of process or formal accountability?
• Is the intimacy of a small group valued more than joining a larger community?

5.4 Sacrament
• Is the liturgy of primary importance?
• Is the Eucharist celebrated with a sense of awe and mystery?
• Does baptism lead to ministry?
• Is the church valued for its own sake as a sacramental community?
• Are clergy especially valued for their role as a sacramental person?

5.5 Herald
• Is proclaiming the Word a priority?
• Does the church go ‘into the world’ to proclaim God’s reign?
• Does the congregation see itself as a ‘priesthood of all believers’?
• Is evangelism a priority?
• Is teaching the faith a priority?

5.6 Servant
• Is there a connection to the local neighbourhood?
• Is outreach and service demonstrated?
• Is there a commitment to advocacy and social justice?
• Is helping others valued more than recruiting new members?
5.7 Applying the Models

5.7.1 Mandate Questions

As mentioned in Chapter 1, the Bishop’s “Mandate Questions” invited discussion on four main areas: serving the needs of the local community, Anglican identity, renewing Anglican faith, and sharing resources. More specifically, a series of questions was asked in an effort to focus the conversation. For example, under the general heading “Serving Community: What is God calling us to do in North Vancouver?” were two subsections, “Focus on Community” and “Focus on Anglican Identity.” These in turn had subsections, “Where are we today?” “Looking at others?” and “Where do we want to be?” These in turn had their own subset of questions. In fact there are over thirty discrete “Mandate Questions.” (Appendix A)

The question of which churches will close and which will stay open is not asked directly. As we have seen in Chapter 4, the issue of the threat of church closures was a strong motivator for many of the MAP participants. For them, this was the “real” question to be addressed.

The series of Mandate questions were clearly designed to illicit thoughtful but specific answers into order to generate a workable plan of action. As we have already seen in Chapter 1, the Ministry Plan attempted to provide a comprehensive response to these questions, but the actual plan of action addressed only some of these questions. Chapter 4 captures the ambivalence of Focus Group members about the efficacy of the MAP project.

What model or models of Church are implicit in the Mandate Questions? Interestingly, the word “church” is assiduously avoided. It is used only once: “How does our church need to change to meet the needs of the community around us?” More commonly, we encounter the terms “Christian communities,” “Anglican presence” and “Anglican Community.” Presumably this is to encourage participants to think outside the confines of their parochial concerns to focus on the larger, regional picture.

The first mandate question is: “Serving Community: what is God calling us to do in North Vancouver?” The subset of questions invite an exploration of demographics and a curiosity about neighbourhoods. This leads in the direction of the Servant Model, with the wider community understood to be the primary focus of responsible action.
As we explore the other questions, a pattern begins to emerge:

- What models of Christian communities exist in other provinces, states or countries?
- What are other models of Anglican communities that exist in the world, the country, BC?
- What might constitute a lively expression of our Anglican roots for the 21st Century?
- What is good stewardship of the assets and resources we have been given?
- How can we become financially sustainable?

The servant focus is joined by a concern for Anglican identity and institutional sustainability. We have moved from asking what God wants to considering what the Church needs. To be sure, they may well end up being the same things, but clearly the Institutional Model informs the Mandate Questions in a significant way.

How is koinonia or Mystical Communion accounted for in these questions, if at all? Under the Anglican Identity subsection we are invited to consider these questions:

- What is an Anglican presence in North Vancouver?
- What is our presence (and) why do we want to continue?

The question of “presence” is rather vague, but perhaps we can surmise the intention was to ask about the value people place on an “Anglican presence” in their community. Perhaps a clearer question could have been “Why do you think a parish church is worth having in your neighbourhood?” A subsequent question could have been, “How many churches do we really need in North Vancouver?” As we have seen, these more pointed questions were not made explicit, but they were clearly the operative questions in the minds of many MAP participants. The advantage of making the issue explicit is that it could well have elicited helpful theological reflection on the nature of Christian community. Because the mandate questions only vaguely alluded to “Anglican presence,” a significant opportunity was missed in reflecting more directly on the church as Mystical Communion.

Is there evidence of the Church as Sacrament Model? Under the heading “Renewing our Anglican Faith” are these questions:
• How do we keep everyone actively engaged in ways that are meaningful and engaging to them?

• How strongly do we feel about traditional worship? Are we willing to change?

• How can we make our liturgies more open, accessible and welcoming?

These questions lead in the direction of, ‘how can we change the liturgy to make it more engaging and attractive?’ Here the liturgical life of the church is understood less as a sacramental expression of Grace than as potential a means of recruitment. There may be a sacramental dimension to the liturgy, but the implied agenda here is one of attracting new members and keeping existing members. In this context the Institutional Model overshadows the Sacramental.

Is the Gospel to be proclaimed in North Vancouver? How will the Word of God be shared, if at all? Surprisingly, the Mandate Questions do not address the issue of preaching, teaching or evangelization. The Herald model is notable for its complete absence.

The following table summarizes the operative models of the Church implicit in the Mandate Questions:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Institutional</th>
<th>Mystical Communion</th>
<th>Sacrament</th>
<th>Herald</th>
<th>Servant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Serving Our Community: What is God calling us to do in North Vancouver?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus on Anglican Identity: What is an Anglican presence in North Vancouver?</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renewing our Anglican Faith: What might constitute a lively expression of our Anglican roots for the 21st Century?</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharing Resources: What is good stewardship of the assets and resources we have been given?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We notice in the Mandate Questions an uneasy tension between the Servant Model and the Institution Model. Clear evidence for the Mystical Communion, Sacrament or Herald models is absent. As we noted in Chapter 3, the Servant Model and the Institutional Model are the least
compatible of the five models. The Servant Church looks outward, and is primarily focused on serving the mission of God in the world outside the church. The Institutional Model looks inward, placing a premium on issues of fiscal responsibly, the efficient use of resources, the role of clergy, and the future viability of the Church as an institution. The Institutional and Servant models are unhappy partners, pulling in opposite directions.

5.7.2 Personal Profiles

Using our template of Models for the Church we can examine the implied operative models at work for each of our Focus Group participants. Keeping in mind that the Focus Group participants were not asked to articulate their preferred Model(s) of the Church, this assessment is not intended to be comprehensive or definitive. Rather, it seeks to identify the implied models that can be identified in the short personal profiles as they appear in the Chapter 4.

Mary tells of growing up in Newfoundland, where the institution of the Church was embedded in the life of the town. In her travels to other Canadian cities, she was able to connect with an Anglican Church in each community. Mary benefited from the Anglican Church’s institutional ethic of supporting parish churches in large and small cities and towns across the country. Here we see evidence of the Institutional Model at its best. When she sought out the sacrament of Confirmation for her children, she was led to a community which welcomed her children and a priest who not only welcomed them but knew Mary from her home town. Here we can glimpse both the Sacramental and Mystical Community Models. Finally, Mary’s personal commitment to and engagement with the language training program for new immigrants she operates at her current church speaks clearly of the Servant Model.

For Ruth, the primary driver of her commitment to her Church is the quality of the community. The clergy can be disappointing, but they cannot keep her from what she feels is important in her life. She feels a sense of acceptance and belonging; she is a member of a Mystical Communion.

Lydia was attracted to a small, dynamic congregation that was committed to serving the neighbourhood in helpful ways. Clearly, with her background in community development she was attracted to the Church as Servant Model. What was perhaps surprising for her was how much she enjoyed participating in the liturgy, which she described as “transformative.” She encountered the Sacramental Model of the church in a way that was deeply personal.
As a practical man, Peter became actively involved in the life of his parish church by volunteering for a practical program, the Marriage Project. He found this experience of service useful and rewarding, and through it was introduced to the wider community of the diocesan Church. His participation in the “same-sex dialogue” in the 1990s led him to a positive encounter with members of Integrity and others who broadened his perspective and enriched his life. For Peter, participation in the Servant Church led him to benefit as a member of the Church as Mystical Communion.

In describing her Church involvement as being “in her DNA,” Martha speaks to the power of the Church as a community that can endure for generations. She enthusiastically volunteered for leadership as a way of serving a community which feels like part of her extended family. In co-chairing MAP, she had to come to terms with the institutional strengths and limitations of the Church. For Martha, belonging to the Mystical Community led her to serve the Institution in a spirit of hope and optimism.

By virtue of having spent nearly his entire life involved in his church, first as a toddler, then through Sunday school and youth programs, and now in leadership as an adult, Silas is deeply connected to his community. It is a community which has been instrumental in his formation as a faithful Christian. He has high hopes for the Christian formation of his own children, which is why he is so concerned about Sunday school. For Silas, the dominant operative model is Mystical Communion. Through the community he has encountered the sacramental life of the church and the Gospel proclaimed, so we can note evidence of the Sacramental and Herald models.

Phoebe’s commitment to leadership also stems from her life-long involvement in her church. As a Warden she had to negotiate some difficult transition times between clergy. She felt estranged from the synod office because she felt unsupported and neglected. In contrast, the members of her church community were supportive and appreciative of her efforts. Being part of a supportive community is what motivates Phoebe’s involvement. The closest model, then, is Mystical Communion.

Curiosity about a woman priest at a local church drew Sarah into an unexpected journey of 30 years of commitment and leadership. She was welcomed, invited to participate, and agreed to take on leadership, all in the first year of membership. The final year was the most challenging,
when she had to manage the affairs of the church as it prepared to close. Although she found the
process stressful, she also rose to the challenge. Indeed, she felt confident and competent as she
fulfilled her responsibilities. She expressed her loyalty to the community through her service to
the institution. Therefore we see evidence of both the Mystical Communion and Institution
models.

As self-described idealist, Elizabeth has high hope for a church which makes a difference in her
neighbourhood. She is less concerned with issues of Anglican identity but is passionate about
how her church can make a positive impact in the world. Clearly, Elizabeth is at home with the
Servant Model. In addition, she is mindful of the way the church manages its volunteers. She has
seen too many people get burnt out by the demands of the institution. Therefore, she works
toward building up a supportive community, where no one is asked to shoulder more than they
can bear. She also recognizes that the people at the synod office are just as idealistic as she is,
and understands the importance of working together. For Elizabeth the Institutional Model is
important insofar as it helps the Church be a better Servant.

James’s involvement in his church is deeply personal. Since he retired from his career, he has
devoted a good portion of his time to church leadership as a Warden. This has meant crisis
management after one Rector died, participating in two clergy transition times, and negotiating
the MAP process with an eye to protecting his church’s best interests. He finds satisfaction in
serving his church community, and from this we can conclude his operative model is Mystical
Communion.

The following chart summarizes the operative models of the Church we have discovered are
implicit in the personal profiles of the Focus Group members:
Table 5: Operative Models of the Church for Focus Group Members

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Institutional</th>
<th>Mystical Communion</th>
<th>Sacrament</th>
<th>Herald</th>
<th>Servant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mary</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruth</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lydia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martha</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silas</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phoebe</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarah</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elizabeth</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

While every Model is accounted for, with many subscribing to two or more Models, the prevailing or dominant one is Mystical Communion. Clearly, the importance of belonging to a particular church community, or “my church,” outweighs the commitment to an institution called “the Church.” While the Institution Model is acknowledged, it is subservient to the other models. That is, Focus Group participants seem to intuitively understand that institutional aspects are required in order for the Church to be effective as Mystical Communion, Sacrament, Herald, or Servant, but that Institution is not the primary Model.

The Mandate Questions tended to focus on the Church as either Institution or Servant. The Focus Group members had a broader range of operative models, with Mystical Community being most dominant. As we further examine the Focus Group material according to the five models, we are now equipped to notice how frustration and conflict arose: the range of operative Models of Church were not acknowledged or affirmed.
5.7.3 Pathways to Leadership

We noted that the pathways to leadership were informed by commitment, competence, and availability. Commitment is to the welfare of the church community. As Sarah demonstrates, leaders often get involved because they care about their church and have a sense of loyalty to the people with whom they have a relationship. Most leaders demonstrated competence in an area that was of some benefit to the community; James had financial stewardship experience, Lydia was a good note taker. Certainly, availability is a significant factor. It is not surprising that retired people such as Peter are often recruited as Wardens simply because they are more likely to have the time to do the job. Mary and Phoebe demonstrate that mid-career professionals are also willing to make a significant commitment of time and energy to church leadership when they have a strong reason to be involved.

What we observe of all the Focus Group members is that their commitment to the leadership of the Institution comes via their commitment to their community. The Mystical Communion model resonates most strongly, and leads them to serve the Institutional model. When the Institutional model overshadows Mystical Communion, tensions arise, especially when there is no opportunity to acknowledge the importance and validity of the church as Mystical Communion. When MAP conversations precluded discussion about the development of healthy and vital church communities in favour of talking about achieving the efficient use of resources, the Institutional model had taken over. These frustrations emerged, especially in the feelings expressed about the Bishop and the clergy, as we shall see, below.

5.7.4 The Bishop

As noted in Chapter 4, perceptions about the Bishop’s agenda was a source of ongoing concern. Some felt he wanted to encourage new and creative thinking about how the church could be organized, others thought he wanted to close “their” church. An evaluation of the Bishop’s actual agenda is outside the scope of this study, but, rather than adopt a hermeneutic of suspicion with regard to his motives, let us acknowledge that it is appropriate for a bishop to raise challenging questions. The Bishop is “called to guard the faith, unity, and discipline of the Church.” As the “chief priest and pastor,” the Bishop is responsible to “encourage and support all baptized people in their gifts and ministries.” (BAS 636-7) This mandate given at ordination is certainly broad enough in scope to justify asking the Mandate Questions. Asking fundamental questions about
parish ministry can be unsettling for some, so that, as was the case with Martha, he is perceived to be a “bad boss.”

By virtue of the office, a Bishop will necessarily be working from the Institutional Model. Other models will also have influence, of course, but the Bishop, as a Bishop, cannot avoid representing the Institution. Clearly, the Focus Group members saw the Bishop primarily as a symbol of the Institution whose interests were at times contrary to their understanding of Church as local community or Mystical Communion.

5.7.5 Buildings

The questions about buildings were top of mind for the duration of the MAP discussions. For some there were simply too many buildings and not enough people. And yet, there did not seem to be a way of dealing with this issue in a rational, practical way. Why not simply reduce the number of buildings, combine church communities, and enjoy the benefits of the efficient use of resources?

One comment is particularly instructive as we try to understand the dynamic at play. As noted in Chapter 4, Elizabeth said she worked hard with her congregation to reassure them that ‘we can let go of our building and still be the people of God.’ We can see her attempting to hold in tension the requirements of the Institutional Model, in being willing to let go of the building as a financial liability, with a commitment to the Mystical Communion model, in affirming the congregation as the ‘people of God.’ But the question of how to sustain and nurture the community as the people of God apart from a consideration of a building to house it was not addressed.

In a similar way, Mary was criticised when someone claimed she was ‘attached to the building and not the ministry,’ suggesting she had to make a choice between the Institutional and Servant Models. Her response of ‘I’m not attached to the building; I can go anywhere’ (rather than I can do anything) underscores the fact that lay leaders choose to stay despite Institutional challenges. It is not the Institution they are staying for, it’s the Mystical Community.
5.7.6 Money

The assumption that money is scarce and that there is not enough to go around seemed to inform the MAP conversations about finances. Focusing on perceptions of long-term financial viability based on past performance and current assets seems a common sense, business-like practice. In hindsight we can notice that the conversation lacked language on stewardship praxis. Even taking a simple definition of stewardship such as “using the gifts God has given us to do the ministry God is calling us to do” was missing. In addition, while the cost of buildings was often raised, the issue of salary costs of clergy, musicians and support staff, or the requirements of the diocesan apportionment formula (often the second or third largest budget expense for each church), were not addressed in the Ministry Plan.

The lack of a constructive, non-anxious conversation about money and church finances was also hampered by the fact that the priests were, in effect, in a conflict of interest. Any proposal about staffing which had a potential negative impact on their livelihood put them in an untenable position. Hence, when Ruth shared her positive experience of four parish churches served by three priests, the response she received (“I felt mocked”) was personal and negative.

Indeed, the unfortunate pattern of put-downs, and the overall negative portrait of the clergy which emerges from the Focus Group material underscores the emotionally charged nature of these conversations related to money. Certainly, the Institution Model, with its emphasis on sound financial practices and efficient use of resources, might be the source of this unease, but that may be too simple an explanation. Unease about money perhaps is a symptom of a broader issue. If money is the measure of hope, what does this tell us about our fundamental theology of the Church?

5.7.7 Put-downs / Lack of Support

Heated discussions involving money, livelihoods, and buildings in the context of an uncertain future will inevitably lead to confrontation and hurt feelings. Moreover, as we noted in Chapter 1, the prospect of change can be especially threatening when people feel that something of great value could be lost. Perhaps it is this anxiety about loss which helps to create a context where an unsatisfactory answer to a question can feel like a put-down. For example, James’ experience of seeing his priest’s question get rebuffed with a rude put-down helped to motivate his continuing involvement in MAP, but with a view to protecting the interests of his church.
Another example is Lydia. When she perceived that her priorities were not shared by diocesan staff she concluded that they lacked the skills to support her church community. The experience of James and Lydia is consistent with people who value their church as Mystical Communion and perceive the Institution itself as a threat to their interests.

5.7.8 Clergy / Top-down

Two structural factors were identified by the Focus Group as having a major impact on how the clergy participated in MAP. First, as one of the participants observed in Chapter 4, “if we’re talking about closing churches we are talking about clergy losing their jobs.” The second was the high level of turnover of clergy during MAP and the implementation of the Ministry Plan, as we noted in Chapter 1.

These factors had an impact on the way the clergy participated in MAP and how their participation was experienced by others. This created a sense of ambivalence about the clergy: some thought they were simply protecting their own interests, some wanted to clear the decks by posting the clergy elsewhere, and others wanted them to clearly articulate a vision but felt disappointed when this did not happen.

In retrospect, we can also identify the fact that the role of the clergy was not clarified at the outset of MAP. Clergy were expected to attend meetings, but there was no clear direction as to how they might contribute to a successful outcome. While in the parish they might see themselves as a pastoral leader with very clear responsibilities, in the regional framework as set out by the Mandate Questions, their role was not made clear.

This lack of clarity speaks to an absence of a positive operative model of Church with regard to the clergy. The Institutional model in effect became a fallback position which is reflected in the experience of clergy providing “top-down” direction, as described by Lydia and others in Chapter 4. When in doubt, the clergy had a tendency to revert to an authoritarian mode of leadership, asserting their authority in ways that appeared to be “non-transparent,” to use Mary’s term.
5.7.9 Sources of Hope

When Focus Group members were free from trying to sort out the conundrum posed by the statement “there are too many buildings and not enough people,” and invited to reflect on their hopes for the future, the energy of the conversation shifted dramatically. In particular, the missional focus as presented by Alan Roxburgh seemed to capture many people’s imaginations.

Indeed, the neighbourhood engagement focus of the “missional” approach led to a music coffee house at one church, a community garden at another, and a language program for new Canadians at a third. It is instructive that none of these initiatives were part of the formal Ministry Plan, but were initiated in a sense ‘under the radar’ by committed lay leaders. Here the operative model is clearly the Servant Church.

With the immediate possibility (or threat) of amalgamation now understood to be set aside, there is also a sense of hope evident in the optimism Focus Group members feel about their church communities. A balanced budget represents an important milestone at Elizabeth’s church because it is a sign of vitality. Phoebe sees progress in how the older generation are less anxious about the building because they value the people more. James is optimistic his church can grow. There is a general consensus among Focus group participants that they feel their churches will each thrive. This is tempered by realism; Silas remains concerned that his children will have access to a high quality Sunday school program. James understands that over time it seems unlikely that all five churches will be able to continue. Nevertheless the value of local churches is assumed, and the Mystical Communion model is evident.

The following table provides a summary of the operative models of the Church we have identified in the Focus Group responses:
Table 6: Operative Models of the Church for Focus Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Institutional</th>
<th>Mystical Communion</th>
<th>Sacrament</th>
<th>Herald</th>
<th>Servant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pathways to Leadership</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bishop</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buildings</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Money</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Put-downs / Lack of Support</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clergy / Top-down</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sources of Hope</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The advantage of plotting the operative models in tables 5 and 6 is we easily identify the models that are over- and under- represented. Clearly, the Institutional model informed the discussion of the categories Bishop, Buildings, Money, Put-downs/Lack of support and Clergy/Top-down. Pathways to Leadership relies on Mystical Communion. Sources of hope appeals to both Mystical Communion and the Servant model. Notable for their absence are references to both the Sacrament and Herald models.

When we combine our observations into a single table the pattern that emerges becomes more obvious:
Table 7: Combined Operative Models

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mandate Questions</th>
<th>Institutional</th>
<th>Mystical Communion</th>
<th>Sacrament</th>
<th>Herald</th>
<th>Servant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Serving Our Community…</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus on Anglican Identity…</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renewing our Anglican Faith…</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharing Resources…</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Personal Profiles</th>
<th>Mary</th>
<th>✓</th>
<th>✓</th>
<th>✓</th>
<th>✓</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ruth</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lydia</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Peter</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Martha</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Silas</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Phoebe</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sarah</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Elizabeth</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>James</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Focus Group Response</th>
<th>Pathways to Leadership</th>
<th>Bishop</th>
<th>Buildings</th>
<th>Money</th>
<th>Put-downs / Lack of Support</th>
<th>Clergy / Top-down</th>
<th>Sources of Hope</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5.8 Balcony perspective

Returning to our ‘balcony’ perspective from Chapter 1, we observe that the influence of the Institutional model is clear through the Mandate Questions, Personal Profiles, and Focus Group responses. Mystical Communion is the dominant operative model for Focus Group members. If Institution is a shout and Mystical Communion a raised voice in response, Servant is heard to interject on occasion, Sacrament is a reticent mumble, while Herald, ironically, is a mere whisper.

With the thrust of the MAP conversation dominated by the Institutional model, lay leaders operated primarily from Mystical Communion; as we noted above, for these lay leaders “my church” is more important than “the Church.” This tension permeated the MAP process and is likely the main reason why the Ministry Plan was a disappointment, as it could not resolve the tension between these dominant models. Instead, it serves as an example of how a technical response to a challenge leads inadvertently to the maintenance of the status quo rather than to adaptive change.

Our balcony perspective also reveals deficits in the use of the ‘minority’ models of Sacrament, Herald and Servant. To be sure, Servant has a strong appeal in some instances, and has led to important grass roots initiatives. It also comes to the fore in the discussion of hope for the future. If the balance of models is a worthy objective, then we note that Sacrament and Herald are clearly under-represented.

Nevertheless, our balcony perspective helps us to answer the question of why lay leaders stay: in revealing their implicit operative model of the Church as Mystical Communion, they demonstrate that their primary loyalty is to their particular parish church communities (my church) and not to an impersonal institution (the Church). This sense of strong loyalty to their respective communities is their primary motivation for staying involved in leadership in the Church.
5.9 Why do they stay?

The tension between the Institutional and Mystical Communion models is closely aligned with issue identified in Chapter 3 in the discussion of the early Church. *Ekklesia* and *koinonia* were uneasy partners in the apostolic church, and they remain to be so in the contemporary church. In this sense, we have not discovered anything new in this exploration. Perhaps we have simply rediscovered the limits of human frailty. And yet, despite the endurance of this tension, lay leaders more often than not choose to stay with their communities.

The predominance of the Mystical Communion model resonates with the insights of Cox and Bass on the motivations of Christian believers, as discussed in Chapter 3. The great Age of the Spirit as forecast by Cox sees the church recovering its sense of being a movement of the Spirit, where people embrace authentic experiences of spirituality and discipleship in communities unencumbered by institutional demands. Bass understands how the priority of Belonging to a supportive community leads to Behavior (or service) culminating in Belief. In asking the question “why do they stay?” we can answer, simply “because they belong.”

Is it enough to simply belong? Bass suggests Belonging is merely the starting point on a spiritual journey that leads to a commitment first to service and then to the deepening of belief. Dulles notes that all models have value and to overemphasize one model over others can lead to serious problems. He notes that the limitation of the Mystical Communion model is it can lead to the “unhealthy divination” of the church community with a weak sense of mission. Is the solution to try to rebalance Mystical Communion with the other models in order to arrive at a more ‘sustainable’ model?

Our first impulse might be to redesign MAP or a similar strategic planning process to be more effective by affirming the Mystical Communion model as a source of strength from which to build, and not as evidence of stubbornness or intransigence. We might want to seek a process in which would result in all five models in a harmonious balance. The danger of such an approach is it can all too easily fall into the trap of merely being a technical response. Dulles’ models are descriptive, but not necessarily prescriptive: the natural inclination to try to rebalance Mystical Communion with the other models falls into the realm of technical response and avoids the necessary and urgent challenge of adaptive change. As we have argued, a technical response to the challenge of change merely leads to a repair of the status quo. In Chapter 3 we argued that, in
order to be faithful to its primary purpose in serving God’s mission, the Church must move toward adaptive change as a mission-shaped church.

Church leaders, both lay and ordained, will continue to be required to navigate the difficult challenges brought on by the dynamics of change. Change can be imposed by external forces such as the changing demographic profile of a neighbourhood, or internal forces brought by new church policies, worship styles, or Bishop- or Synod-mandated initiatives. We can choose to be reactive or proactive in the face of the inevitability of change. As we observed in Chapter 1, change is often experienced as loss, and leaders who are mission-focused will have to be sensitive to the pastoral demands of a mission-shaped church. Nevertheless, embracing adaptive change is necessary if the Church is to be faithful to its mission. Conventional expectations may have to be discarded; for example, it may not be economically possible to continue to staff all churches with full-time clergy. This will not be a surprise for those in rural dioceses where multi-point clergy appointments are the norm, but it may well become a more common model in the Diocese of New Westminster and other urban dioceses. Lay leaders will no doubt find there are increasing demands made of their ‘time, talent and treasure’ as stewards of their church communities. Supporting lay leaders through training, mentoring and pastoral support in this important work will necessarily be a high priority for the ekklesia if it is to have the hopeful future God is calling it to live (and love) into.

In exploring the question “Why do they stay?” we have observed that the quality of community expressed in the biblical notion of koinonia is particularly important. People are active in their church because they are members of a caring community. When people are called to leadership in these communities they respond out of a sense of loyalty to their community. They are much less likely to respond with enthusiasm or express loyalty to the Church as an institution. As has been noted several times in this thesis, for many lay leaders “my church” is more important than “the Church.” Rather than approaching this as a problem to be overcome, those who work with lay leaders will see that loyalty to community is better recognized as a core strength of churches, particularly of small churches. Indeed, this sense of loyalty to community is key to understanding the motivations of lay leaders; it helps explain why they stay involved.
If the Church, or, more specifically, the Anglican parish churches in North Vancouver, are to embark on adaptive change as mission-shaped churches, what will this look like from the point of view of the lay leaders we have been observing?

First, we can recognize the importance of Mystical Communion and affirm the commitment of lay church leaders to their home church communities and commend this as a strength rather than a weakness or impediment to change. At the same time, we can recognize the limits of Mystical Communion in order to avoid the temptation to divinize these communities as self-regarding ends-in-themselves.

We have also observed that many lay leaders have a passion for service beyond the parochial concerns of their church communities. We can recognize this passion as an openness to the Servant Model, and seek to cultivate this capacity in the direction of a Missional focus. While Dulles’ Servant model is not the same thing as “Missional” or “Mission-shaped church,” the movement from self-serving to self-giving is a shared attribute of these categories. We have noted that lay leaders want their church to make a meaningful contribution to their immediate neighbourhood and the wider world. The point is that this attraction to a more ‘missional’ perspective bodes well for the future of the Anglican Church.

Although mission belongs to God, God relies on people to respond to God’s call in helping to accomplish it. Small churches have played an important role in God’s mission since the beginning of Christianity. God continues to call people together into communities which engender strong bonds of love and loyalty. The koinonia of the small church is perhaps its greatest gift and a source of hope for the future.

There is no doubt that change will be required of the Church if it is to keep faithful to God’s mission. The attributes of a Mission-shaped Church described in Chapter 3 are worth repeating:

- Focus on people, community
- Contained experimental initiatives
- Willingness to risk and learn from failure
- Stewardship by generosity, sharing and self-giving
- Making investments in people
• Culture of risk and encouragement

• Priority of baptismal ministry

The challenging work of adaptive change toward a mission-shaped Church will begin with a new set of strategic questions. Rather than expecting lay leaders to respond to the institution-oriented conundrums such as “there are too many buildings and not enough people, what shall we do?” or “how do we preserve and maintain our Anglican identity?” let us begin by asking questions such as:

• How can the institutions of the Church better support the ministry of all the baptized in serving God’s mission?

• How can we better recognize, affirm and support the strength and resilience of lay leaders?

• How can clergy be better equipped and deployed to provide creative and effective pastoral leadership of parish churches as they experience the stresses and challenges of adaptive change?

• How can we make planning processes more inclusive and transparent for the people who will be affected?

• How can we more effectively use the Marks of Mission as guideposts for growing mission-shaped church communities?

When I described my initial interest in pursuing a Doctor of Ministry in the area of congregational development, a colleague responded somewhat facetiously, “Let me know if you discover the answer.” While I don’t think I have discovered “the answer,” I have, perhaps, caught a glimpse, as “in a mirror, dimly” (1Cor 13:12) of a way forward toward renewed congregational health and vitality in service to God’s mission.
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Background and Context

I am an Anglican priest who has served in three small parish congregations over the past 15 years. The first parish was the Church of Cleopas, Kamloops B.C. in the Diocese of Cariboo. It had approximately 75 families on the membership roll and had an average Sunday attendance of about 50. I served as Deacon-in-charge and then as Incumbent priest from 1997 to 2002. The next was St. Monica, West Vancouver in the Diocese of New Westminster. It was similar in size to Cleopas, and also included a small congregation on Bowen Island, a short ferry trip from Horseshoe Bay. I served there from 2002 to 2007. The current church I serve is St Agnes in North Vancouver. Again, it is similar in size to both Cleopas and St Monica, although with a slightly larger membership and an endowment fund worth over $600,000. I have served as the Rector of St Agnes since May 1, 2011.

St Agnes is one of five Anglican parish churches which comprise the Deanery of North Vancouver. Until 2011, there were seven churches in the deanery, but since then two have been closed and the properties sold. The five remaining churches have been cooperating in the creation and implementation of a common deanery ministry plan. This planning process predates my arrival at St Agnes by some four years. The Ministry Assessment Process (MAP), initiated by the diocese, was begun in 2007 and a
Ministry Plan was created in 2010. When I was appointed on May 1, 2011, the bishop at the time instructed me to work closely with my deanery colleagues and to assist in the implementation of the Ministry Plan.

One of the main reasons for the MAP process and the creation of the Ministry Plan is summarized in the following chart:

With five (formerly seven) churches found within a relatively small geographical area comprising both the District of North Vancouver and the City of North Vancouver, many recognize that change is needed to rectify the situation. For many, the solution to the problem is obvious: either increase the number of members of each church or decrease the number of churches and consolidate the membership into fewer congregations. The trend over the last three decades has been a
decrease in active church membership, so expecting an increase in numbers appears to be naïve if not foolish. The diocesan Archdeacon stated this case in clear, stark language:

one does not have to be a social geographer or urban planner to know that what we have presently is not what we need and I think cooler heads would be willing to say we need two, maybe three, churches to serve the population and mission we’re about. (Fenton 2012)

It should be a straightforward, if not easy, technical fix. All we have to do is reduce the number of churches to achieve a structure that is both financially sustainable and makes mission possible.

The Ministry Assessment Process (MAP) was a tool developed by the Diocese of New Westminster synod office staff to assist parishes with ministry planning and congregational development. It featured work books for parish councils, facilitated consultations with congregations, demographic research for regions and parishes, and coaching assistance from staff and volunteers. Its purpose was to help parishes assess their mission and ministries and to plan for the future with a view toward financial self-sufficiency. Between 2007 and 2013 approximately thirty five, or half, the parishes of the diocese participated in MAP.
In 2007, the Bishop determined it would be appropriate for the seven churches in North Vancouver to do MAP together. The intention was to encourage the lay and ordained leaders to work together to create a common regional Ministry Plan. In this way it was anticipated that the issue of the financial viability of the churches would be addressed and resolved. After an extensive series of consultations involving the parish leaders of all seven churches, a comprehensive Ministry Plan for the region was created in 2010. The plan included thirteen specific recommendations, including the development of “a new model of shared ministry,” that parishes be grouped according to three main geographical areas, and that “new ministries” be created and funded through the “release of assets” made available as a result of the sale of redundant church properties.

By 2013, three properties, St Richard, St Clare and the St Clare rectory, were put on the market. Although some thought there would be a significant windfall from the sale of these lands, with the expectation that they would be attractive to developers and therefore sold at a premium, the market value of the two church properties was restricted by the fact that they were zoned as “public assembly” land. The municipalities want to protect land that has been designated for schools, hospitals and churches and are reluctant to change the zoning to allow for commercial or residential development.
One property, St Richard’s, sold fairly quickly to a Muslim congregation which then built a mosque on the original foundation. The St Clare rectory sold quickly, and the church building was sold to a local Baptist congregation after being on the market for over a year. All funds from the sale of these assets are held by the diocese. Some funds from the sale of St Richards have been used to subsidize some clergy positions in the deanery.

One key issue the Ministry Plan seeks to address is the question of financial viability. The intention of the plan is to seek out ways in which the five churches, reduced from seven, can cooperate, especially in the common use of what are known as “resources for ministry” which are otherwise known as revenue and buildings. Some feel the issue that needs to be addressed is the question of the buildings; they believe there are too many, that they are too old and in need of costly repairs, and that these costs are preventing ministry from happening. Others look at the budgets of the churches and note that personnel costs account for 70% of expenses and wonder if the problem is an overabundance of paid clergy, musicians and support staff. This is an ongoing conversation with no easy answers.

In early 2013, in light of a deficit budget, the Vestry of the largest of the five churches (St Catherine’s) passed a resolution calling for the church to immediately pursue merger
opportunities with other Anglican, Lutheran or possibly United congregations. It does reveal the impatience felt by many with the slow pace of change achieved by MAP and the implementation of the Ministry Plan. For these people especially, the MAP process and regional Ministry Plan have not provided a solution to the question of financial sustainability and long term viability.

Problem and Purpose

Despite the hundreds of hours devoted to discussion, planning and program implementation, the key issues MAP was design to address are as yet unresolved. With hindsight, we can recognize that the original goal of encouraging seven parish churches to work together in a way that reduces costs, rationalizes resources, and achieves financial self-sufficiency was overly ambitious.

Throughout the MAP process, including the implementation of the Ministry Plan, lay leaders from the five churches have devoted themselves to many hours of meetings. Since 2011, I have heard anecdotes from members of all the churches who, at different times and usually in private, have mentioned to me how difficult they found these meetings. Many thought they had to protect the interests of their church against the demands of
others. Some felt the clergy were forcing an agenda of amalgamation and change. Others felt the Bishop and synod office staff were more interested in the value of the land as salable property than in the welfare of the church members. One Warden told me a typical reaction to a MAP meeting was to be unable to sleep properly for several days following. Some clergy participants confided to me that they found the MAP process exhausting.

It is interesting to note that currently, only one priest remains in the same position she had at the outset of the MAP process. Of the other four, one changed position within the deanery, one (me) arrived just as the Ministry Plan was being implemented, one arrived mid-way through implementation, and one arrived the fall of 2014 after two interim priests have come and gone. The change in clergy underscores that it is the ongoing participation of lay leaders that has remained constant.

To be sure, some engaged in active participation in the process, and then took a break while they handed over the task to someone else. What I have observed is that these people did not simply abandon a stressful experience and not return, but would, in many cases, return to the ‘fray’ after a year or two. The particular focus of this study is on the lay people who participated as parish leaders through the MAP process. Despite the stress and challenges, they remained faithful to their
calling to be leaders in the church. Perhaps contrary to expectation, these leaders were not moved to abandon the process or leave their churches. I am curious as to why these lay leaders stayed with such a demanding process.

**Thesis Statement**

This study seeks to explore a deeper understanding of why lay leaders of small churches choose to remain in positions of leadership despite the often stressful challenges of institutional change.

**Theoretical Framework**

**The dynamics of change**

Change is hard for people, not simply because they resist things being different or unfamiliar. In their insightful book, *Leadership on the Line*, Heifetz and Linsky point out that “people do not resist change per se... people resist loss.” (Heifetz @ Linsky 2002, 11) The process of managing change is a process of managing loss:

People must face the challenge of adapting to a tough reality, and the adaptation requires giving up an important value or a current way of life. Leadership becomes dangerous, then, when it must confront people with loss. (13)
Providing a framework for effective leaders who can manage loss through adaptive change is the premise of their work on leadership. One key distinction they make that is essential to understanding the nature of change is the difference between technical solutions and adaptive challenges.

Technical challenges are those areas of expertise where people feel most competent when faced with the challenge of managing change. A simple but effective metaphor would be the sense of urgency people might have felt to rearrange the deckchairs on the Titanic while it sank. “People often try to avoid the dangers, either consciously or subconsciously, by treating an adaptive challenge as if it were a technical one.” (14) People know how to rearrange deck chairs, but they don’t know what to do when the ship is sinking.

Adaptive change comes from understanding the limitations of technical fixes which do not address the underlying problem or real issue. It takes a sense of perspective to recognize an adaptive challenge – a bird’s eye view. An effective adaptive leader will go up to the bridge and observe that the ship is indeed sinking, and then go back on deck to direct people away from the deck chairs and toward organizing the life boats instead. A technical solution might keep people busy, but an adaptive change will ensure they survive.
Of course adaptive leadership is not always that easy or straightforward: “adaptive work creates risk, conflict and instability . . . leadership requires disturbing people – but at a rate they can absorb.” (20) More importantly, “leadership . . . requires not only the reverence for the pains of change and recognition of the manifestations of danger, but also the skills to respond.” (48) Or, to use church language, adaptive leadership requires extraordinary pastoral sensitivity.

Theology of Ministry

James White provides a simple but helpful definition of the sacraments as “meaningful actions . . . which make God’s love visible.” (White 1990, 165) The dominical sacraments of Baptism and Eucharist are the meaningful actions through which the sacramental community of the Church is formed and sustained.

Following White, my sacramental theology begins with the belief that God acts in the sacraments. (188) The ‘meaningful actions’ of baptism and eucharist are not simply public performances enacted for the sake of the participants. They are truly sacred events which reveal the mystērion of God:

As the New Testament uses the term, (mystērion) refers to the secret thoughts of God, which transcend human reason and therefore must be revealed to those whom God wishes these secrets to reach. . . . The basic insight in the use of this term for those sign-acts which we call sacraments is that mystērion implies acts in which God is disclosed to us. (171)
This self-disclosure of God is primarily an act of self-giving. God takes the initiative in revealing Godself. This is most fully revealed in the person of Jesus Christ:

In Jesus Christ, God showed us the fullness of divine love. But we need to be shown this divine love again and again. In the sacraments, God continues in present visibility what God has already done in self-giving in the historical visibility of Jesus Christ. (189).

This sacramental remembering (anamnesis) is most fully experienced in the church, a sacramental community where “God’s self-giving as love is made visible through relationships of love within community.” (190) This is the quality of community known as koinonia.

Baptism

Jesus’ ministry begins with his baptism by John. Following this example, those who seek to follow Christ also begin their ministry with baptism. Baptism is both personal and corporate. It is personal because baptism is transformative; once baptized, a person belongs to Christ, branded “as Christ’s own forever.” (BAS 160) It is corporate because the newly baptized becomes a member of the Church, the Body of Christ. As The Book of Alternative Services explains it, “baptism is the sign of new life in Christ. Baptism unites Christ with his people. That
union is both individual and corporate . . . Christians are not just baptized individuals; they are a new humanity.” (BAS 146)

The newly baptized make specific promises framed by the following questions, to which they reply “I will, with God’s help:”

- Will you continue in the apostle’s teaching and fellowship, in the breaking of bread, and in the prayers?
- Will you persevere in resisting evil and, whenever you fall into sin, repent and turn to the Lord?
- Will you proclaim by word and example the good news of God in Christ?
- Will you seek and serve Christ in all persons, loving your neighbour as yourself?
- Will you strive for justice and peace among all people, and respect the dignity of every human being?
- Will you strive to safeguard the integrity of God’s creation, and respect, sustain and renew the life of the Earth?¹ (BAS 159)

Commitments are made by the newly baptized, but no baptized person is alone in fulfilling these commitments. Indeed, these commitments are supported by the community of the baptized - the church. In a very practical sense, a church is a community of

¹ The sixth baptismal promise was authorized to be included in the BAS by the Anglican Church of Canada’s General Synod in 2013.
the baptized whose members support each other in living out their baptismal commitments.

**Eucharist**

If baptism is the sacrament of belonging to the church and a commission for mission, the eucharist is the sacrament for the building up and nurture of the community of the baptized. White notes the Jewish origins of the Eucharistic meal:

From Judaism... comes a profound understanding of each meal as a sacred event. The most common of human social activities became for Judaism an opportunity for praising and thanking God as well as forming a bond of unity between partakers. Far from being simply physical necessity, the meal became a means of encountering God as provider, host and companion (White, 168).

In this light we see that St Paul draws on the Jewish tradition of the sacred meal even as he describes a uniquely Christian expression of it in the earliest written account of the eucharist:

For I received from the Lord what I also handed on to you, that the Lord Jesus on the night when he was betrayed took a loaf of bread, and when he had given thanks, he broke it and said, “This is my body that is for you. Do this in remembrance of me.” In the same way he took the cup also, after supper, saying, “This cup is the new covenant in my blood. Do this, as often as you drink it, in remembrance of me.” For as often as you eat this bread and drink the cup, you proclaim the Lord’s death until he comes.

(1 Corinthians 11:23-25)
Here we see that the basic elements of the eucharist are very simple: thanksgiving, remembering, eating and drinking. These are the same elements we continue to use today as the community (the koinonia) gathers weekly for this sacred meal.

Of course, it is more that “just” a meal. As noted in the World Council of Church’s document, *Baptism, Eucharist, and Ministry:*

> The eucharist opens up the vision of the divine rule which has been promised as the final renewal of creation, and is a foretaste of it. Signs of this renewal are present in the world wherever the grace of God is manifest and human beings work for justice, love and peace. The eucharist is the feast at which the Church gives thanks to God for these signs and joyfully celebrates and anticipates the coming of the Kingdom of Christ.” (BEM, 13)

As a sacramental act, the eucharist unites the community of the baptized in one common ministry as followers and disciples of Jesus Christ. It is a source of spiritual nurture and sustenance for the journey of discipleship. It makes possible the sacramental character of personal discipleship as the baptized seek to be expressions of God’s love made visible in the world. Perhaps most importantly, it is the spiritual wellspring that supports the work of mission.
Ministry of the baptized

The relationship between baptism, community and ordered ministry is captured in Michael Peer’s explanation of the church as “the household of the baptized.” He begins with the baptismal covenant which:

calls for a community of witness, gathering to learn, to pray, to share the hospitality of the Lord’s table. It calls for clear thinking and self-knowledge in response to sin - our own as well as that of others. It calls us to membership in a people that bears witness to God’s story and God’s way, made known in Jesus. It calls for discernment of Christ in all persons, as St Benedict charged his monks to remind themselves every time they opened a door to a stranger. And it would lead us to ways of peace, justice and the dignity of every person. The drama within which this covenant is set is nothing less than the re-founding of our lives. This is the drama, not of a sect or a cult, but of a people. That is itself held within a liturgy of undefended love and the cost of that love, reminds us that this people does not lay claim to or defend a space of its own, but lives by the truth that the world is a single household to be made fit and hospitable for all God’s children.” (Peers 2003, 8)

As a member of this ‘new people,’ each baptized person has an important role to play in the mission of the church. The role of the laity is not to support those in ordained ministry; it is the other way around. Ordained persons are to fulfill their role in equipping the whole household for the work of mission and ministry.

All ministry, lay and ordained, is based on the holistic and integrated model provided by Jesus Christ. Certain aspects
of Jesus’ ministry are given a particular focus in ordered ministry; in this way they ‘refract’ the ministry of Christ:

Our orders refract the ministry of Jesus - his servanthood is the servanthood to which all the baptized are called, refracted through, but never exclusively possessed by, those who serve in the order of deacons. His self-giving is the self-giving to which all the baptized are called, refracted through, but never exclusively possessed by, those who serve in the order of presbyters. And the hospitality of his table fellowship is the hospitality to which all the baptized are called, refracted through, but never exclusively possessed by, those who serve in the order of bishops. (11)

This theology of refracted ministry is another way of affirming the “Apostolate of the Laity” as explained by David Bosch. He observes that in the post war context of the last century, both Protestant and Catholic churches “discovered again that apostolicity was an attribute of the entire church and that the ordained ministry could be understood only as existing within the community of faith.” (Bosch, 482) In affirming the shared apostolicity of the entire community of the baptized, it becomes clear that

The priesthood of the ordained ministry is to enable, not to remove, the priesthood of the whole church. The clergy are not prior to or independent of or over against the church; rather, with the rest of God’s people, they are the church, sent into the world.” (485)

Peer’s view is consistent with Bosch’s:
the work of the church is not completed when the bishop, priest, deacon or communion minister places the Body of Christ in the hands of a Christian, but when that Christian carries the Body of Christ into the world in acts of servanthood, self-giving, and hospitality. (Peers 2003, 11)

This is indeed the work of the mission of the church, shared by all the members of the church.

The Anglican Consultative Council has expressed the ministry of the baptized in terms of the *Five Marks of Mission*:

- To proclaim the Good News of the Kingdom.
- To teach, baptize and nurture new believers.
- To respond to human need by loving service.
- To seek to transform unjust structures of society, to challenge violence of every kind and to pursue peace and reconciliation.
- To strive to safeguard the integrity of creation and sustain and renew the life of the earth.

The Five Marks of Mission have become more central to the life and work of the Anglican Church of Canada through their promotion by the current Primate, Archbishop Fred Hiltz. In 2013 they were endorsed by the Synod of the Diocese of New Westminster. They provide a programmatic focus for the ministry of the church. While they may superficially resemble a “to-do list” (Duraisingh, 12), each mark is sufficiently broad to allow for local churches to pursue mission appropriate to their particular context.
Operative Assumptions

- Every small church has a valid ministry as a sacramental community.
- All the baptized share in a common ministry which is to participate in God’s mission of self-giving love to the whole world.
- Lay leaders choose to be in leadership roles.
- Lay leaders exercise power and can influence decisions in their churches.
- Change is challenging and difficult for a variety of reasons.
- There is an important distinction between technical problem solving and adaptive change, and that faithfulness to God’s mission will require adaptive change;
- Pastoral leadership is needed in the management of change experienced as loss.
- God leads the church into the world in mission.

Action Research Component

Intervention

Myers describes the "Pro-Active Research Method" as a method that "intentionally engages qualitative research while
pro-actively working toward transformation." (Myers 2002, 25) In other words, the researcher is not simply an observer of the subjects in a study; the researcher is actively engaged in the process, and has a vested interest in the outcome of the study. "Transformation" of both the subjects/participants and the researcher is the desired outcome. For the participants, transformation may take the form of a new insight or self-discovery as a result of the action-in-ministry. For the researcher, transformation may take the form of new learning or deeper knowledge of the particular problem the action-in-ministry is designed to address.

In my case, I am interested in exploring the nature of lay leadership within the small church, and in particular I seek to provide an opportunity through an action-in-ministry to help transform the self-understanding of lay church leaders as empowered leaders who can identify their own strengths and feel more confident in exercising their role as leaders in their communities. This will entail an action-in-ministry that will take the form of a focus group workshop, individual questionnaires, and in-depth individual interviews with participants who have been involved as lay leaders through the North Vancouver MAP/Ministry Plan process. The project will explore the experience of lay leaders in order to gain insight into why people are drawn to leadership, the challenges they
face, and how they can be better supported. I will lead these sessions with the hope and expectation that the participants will feel more empowered as leaders as a result of the experience. I also anticipate my own transformation in terms of learning about my own assumptions about leadership and gain insight into how I can be more effective as a teacher, coach and mentor for lay leaders.

**Qualitative Research Methodology**

This pro-active methodology will require several methods of data collection to allow for adequate triangulation; a focus group, a questionnaire, personal interviews, followed by a preliminary ‘reality check-in’.

**Focus Group:**

- Up to two lay leaders from each of five Anglican Churches involved in MAP and its implementation.

- Up to two lay leaders from each of the two North Vancouver churches which were closed.

- Participants will be recruited through an arms-length process; I will invite the current clergy to nominate participants based on the criteria I provide. See Appendix 2.
• The group will construct a case History of the MAP process, focusing on key events in terms of how they were experienced by the leaders themselves (note: this is not an evaluation of MAP or its outcomes). See Appendix 4.

• The group will then be encouraged to engage in theological reflection of their experience in a group discussion.

Questionnaire

The leaders will then be invited to respond to a written questionnaire designed to solicit deeper personal reflection on their experiences in church leadership. A draft version of the questionnaire is found in the Appendix 3.

Personal Interviews

Each participant will be invited to be interviewed by me as a way to explore in greater depth the issues identified in the questionnaire, with an emphasis on theological reflection.

Reality Check-in

The members of the focus group will be invited to reconvene for an opportunity for me to present preliminary findings in terms of important images, themes and issues that emerged in the
data. The group will be given an opportunity to respond to the question “am I hearing you correctly?”

**Procedures for data collection**

- **Focus Group:** the case history and initial reflections will take the form of notes on newsprint which will be transcribed after the meeting. An audio recording will also be made and then transcribed.
- **Questionnaires:** the participants will provide written responses, which will then be transcribed.
- **Interviews:** the interviews will be audio recorded and transcribed.

**Procedures for data analysis**

- The written material will be coded, borrowing techniques associated with Grounded Theory: Open, Axial, etc.
- The coded responses will be systematically analyzed to identify key concepts which may shed light as to the motivation and resilience of lay leaders.

**Results**

I hope to find key themes that help to identify the sources of resilience and faithfulness of lay leaders. The textual analysis using the tools of grounded theory will hopefully yield key
concepts which will then be illustrated with excerpts from the data itself.

Resources

Timeline

• May 2015: Assemble Focus Group
  I will invite the priest of each of the seven North Vancouver churches to recommend up to four lay leaders from their community who meet the following criteria:
    ➢ Participated in the MAP process;
    ➢ Is currently involved in parish leadership (formally or informally);
    ➢ Is willing and able to participate in the study.

Participants will be selected primarily on the basis of availability to participate. My assumption is that the demands of the timeline will reduce the pool from as many as twenty to ten or twelve.

• Early May: on a Saturday, run the focus group program, including creation of the case study, group reflection, and personal questionnaires.
• Mid-May: follow up in-depth personal interviews.
• June: take study leave to transcribe and code data.
• July: reassemble focus group for “reality check-in”.


• Aug: evaluation, results, conclusions based on data.
• September - December: complete thesis.
• January 1, 2016: deadline to submit completed D Min Thesis for graduation in May.

**Finances and materials**

Financial: Minimal outlay for coffee, tea, snack items for participants. A summer student may be hired for transcription services at a cost of up to $1000; grant money is available.

Facilities: church meeting rooms are available at no charge.

Human resources: A volunteer to help with the focus group, no other required apart from researcher and participants.

**Ethics Review**

Protocol is included in the appendices.

**Risks and Limitations**

The study is limited to exploring the experience lay church leaders during a particular time and through a particular process in North Vancouver. The focus is not on the efficacy of the MAP process itself or the impact of any particular program or initiative. Rather, the study is primarily concerned with the
subjective experience of lay leaders as they themselves articulate their experiences. The study assumes a fairly high capacity for critical self-awareness on the part of the participants. An inherent risk is that the participants may be inarticulate and lack a measure of self-awareness, and therefore unable to generate usable data for the researcher to assess. The study exposes participants to minimal risk of harm.

One issue for me to be aware of as the researcher is the power differential between me as a priest and the research participants as lay people in the church. For some participants, the perception of me as an authority figure may be an impediment to full and honest participation. Some people may want to please me or avoid displeasing me in the way they participate or respond to questions. In order to mitigate this sense of power differential, I will state quite clearly at the outset, and back it up in writing, that there will be no rewards or negative consequences, either implicit or explicit, for participants in the study as they result of the views they express. In addition, I will arrange for a disinterested third party to be available to provide confidential pastoral support to any participant who requires it. This person will be a qualified pastoral care provider who has not been directly involved in the North Vancouver Anglican parishes or in the MAP process.
Contributions of this Study

I intend to interpret my findings by drawing on the data while using my theological and theoretical assumptions as an interpretive framework. I will discuss the implication of my findings as they relate to the participants of MAP, the lay leadership of the North Vancouver churches, and the lay leaders in the Diocese. My hope is that the results will also assist Anglican clergy in the diocese and beyond in their understanding and appreciation of lay leaders, in order that they may more effectively encourage and support lay leaders at all levels of the church.
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Appendix 1: Definitions

Archdeacon: a senior priest appointed by the bishop to assist in the ministry of oversight of the diocese.

Archdeaconry: the territory assigned to an archdeacon, usually comprised of more than one deanery.

Regional Dean: a priest appointed by the bishop to assist in the ministry of oversight but with a focus of pastoral relationships with fellow clergy within a deanery.

Deanery: the territory within which several (typically six to 10) parishes are located.

Diocese: the geographical territory comprised of parishes, deaneries and archdeaconries over which a diocesan bishop has episcopal authority.

Lay leader: a baptized member of a local church who has a formal or informal leadership role within a church community.

Parish: the territory within the care of a parish church.

Priest: a baptized person who has been ordained to be a “pastor, priest and teacher” for the church.

Synod delegate: a baptized member of a local parish church who has been duly authorized to be a member of synod.
**Synod:** a gathering within a diocese convened by the diocesan Bishop in accordance with the Canons (law) of the diocese for the purpose of governance and oversight.

**Warden:** a baptized lay member of a parish church who has been duly authorized to exercise manage the affairs of a parish church in partnership with the Incumbent priest or priest-in-charge.

**Deanery of North Vancouver:** The five churches comprise a “deanery” within the Diocese of New Westminster. The diocese itself comprises some seventy churches in the lower mainland of British Columbia. The diocese is subdivided into six “archdeaconries” and all but one archdeaconry has two deaneries.
Appendix 2: Recruitment Letter

(Toronto School of Theology Letterhead)

Draft letter to Colleagues to recruit suitable research project participants. To be sent to the current incumbent clergy of St Clement, St Catherine, St. John, and St Martin in North Vancouver, as well as the clergy who had pastoral responsibility for St Richard and St Clare when they were closed.

Date

Dear Colleague:

As you may know, I am currently working on my Doctor of Ministry degree through the Toronto School of Theology at the University of Toronto. My area of interest is lay leadership in small churches. For my thesis project I wish to assemble a focus group of lay leaders who have been involved in the MAP/Ministry Plan process in North Vancouver.

Would you kindly recommend up to four lay members of your church community who have been involved in MAP and other leadership positions in your parish community over the last several years. These people may have held a formal position such as warden or trustee, or they may be informal leaders. Ideally, participants will be those who participated in MAP from the beginning and continue in some form of church leadership today. They do not necessarily have to be current members of Regional Council, but they may have been in the past. Perhaps those who participated in our planning day on February 14 would provide an initial list for consideration.

The participants will be invited to be part of a focus group that will involve completing a detailed questionnaire, attending a group meeting, and being interviewed by me. The results will be kept confidential and will be transcribed to form an anonymous data set for analysis.

In addition, I will arrange for a disinterested third party to be available to provide confidential pastoral support to any participant who requires it. This person will be a qualified pastoral care provider who has not been directly involved in the North Vancouver Anglican parishes or in the MAP process.
The research will be conducted during the months of May and June of this year.

I am avoiding picking people myself to reduce the impact of my bias. I ask that you simply forward me their names and contact information and allow me the opportunity to explain the project and to extend the invitation to participate. Please do not extend a blanket invitation but simply send your list to me in confidence. I anticipate that not everyone you nominate will actually be able to participate because of scheduling challenges, but I will do my best to include as many of your recommended participants as possible. I am hoping that at least two of the four will actually be available. I may come to you for more names if availability becomes a problem.

Would you kindly reply to me at your earliest convenience, and feel free to contact me if you have any questions.

Sincerely

The Reverend Stephen Muir
Appendix 3: Draft Questionnaire for participants

The focus of this study is to reflect on your personal experience of the Ministry Assessment Process (MAP) and subsequent Ministry Plan of the North Vancouver churches. Your responses are for the purposes of a Doctor of Ministry study conducted by the Rev. Stephen Muir and will only be shared as part of an anonymous coded data set in his thesis.

For each question, kindly provide as much detail as possible. Use as much paper, and as much time, as you need.

Thank you for your participation!

****

Name: 
Parish: 

Age: 
Gender: 

1. Please describe the reason you became involved in the MAP process (eg ‘My priest asked me to,’ ‘I volunteered,’ ‘it was required because I was a Warden,’ etc):

2. Describe the nature of your involvement (eg the type and approximate number of meetings you attended and in what capacity)

3. As you reflect on your experience, was there a time when you felt particularly positive? Please describe in detail.

4. Was there a time when you felt particularly negative? Please describe in detail.

5. Overall, how would you describe your experience of the MAP process?

6. Did you participate in the process from the start? Why?

7. Did you ever take a break or stop? Why?

8. How do you feel about the leadership provided by the clergy? Please describe in detail.

9. Do you have concerns about the future?

What gives you hope?
Appendix 4: Draft Focus Group Workshop Plan

The focus group will be drawn from a pool of qualified participants from seven North Vancouver parishes who are available on the day of the workshop. Every effort will be made to find a date that maximizes the number of participants, but it is likely the number available will be about 12-14. Prior to this group meeting, each participant will be required to complete a preliminary survey (per the attached draft) as preparation for the meeting.

The meeting will take place in a meeting room, most likely at St Agnes Anglican Church in North Vancouver, where the researcher (Stephen) is the Rector and has free and full use of the facility. Stephen will be assisted by a volunteer who will help record comments on newsprint.

8:45 am: Participants gather. Coffee and tea available.

9:00 am: Welcome & introductions; purpose of the morning.

9:10 am: The pastoral support person will be introduced and contact information provided to participants. She or he will then leave.

9:20 am: Step 1: Creating an “objective” case history of the MAP process.
   • In groups of two, help each other remember when MAP started, the reasons for it, and how you became involved.
   • Share conversation with group - on a newsprint timeline begin to plot significant dates and events as an aide memoire for the group
   • The MAP process resulted in a Ministry Plan - can you remember some of the main features of this plan?

10:20 am: comfort break - coffee/tea, snacks

10: 30 am: Step 2: Reflecting on personal, “subjective” experience

Questions for discussion:
   • What were the reasons for MAP?
   • Why did you get involved?
   • Was there ever a specific occasion when you felt particularly hopeful about the MAP process?
   • Was there ever a time when you something else?
   • Was there a time when you felt anxious?
• What was the issue that made you most anxious? Why?
• Do you have concerns about the future?
• What gives you hope?

11:30 am: Step 3: Reflecting on leadership

• As you reflect on your MAP/Ministry Plan experience, do you see yourself as a leader?
• In what ways did you feel supported?
• Did you ever feel let down?
• Did you look to the clergy for leadership?
• How would you characterize the leadership provided by the clergy?
• Can you think of an example of good leadership from one or more of the clergy?
• Can you think of a time when clergy let you down in some way?
• What can clergy do to support lay leaders in the church?

12:15 pm: Wrap up, further instructions to set up interview times.

12:30 pm: Thank you & goodbye.
Appendix B: Ethics Review
ETHICS REVIEW PROTOCOL SUBMISSION FORM FOR SUPERVISED AND SPONSORED RESEARCHERS
(For use by graduate students, post-docs, and visiting professors/researchers)

SECTION A – GENERAL INFORMATION

1. TITLE OF RESEARCH PROJECT

Why do they stay? Lay church leaders and the demands of institutional change.

2. INVESTIGATOR INFORMATION

Investigator:
Title (e.g., Dr., Ms., etc.): Rev.
Name: Stephen Muir
Department (or organization if not affiliated with U of T): Toronto School of Theology
Mailing address: 965 Shavington Street, North Vancouver BC V7L 1K6
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III. The research will not undergo scholarly review (Please note that all research greater than minimal risk requires scholarly review)
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The review was/will be part of a larger grant

10. CONFLICTS OF INTEREST
(a) Will the researcher(s), members of the research team, and/or their partners or immediate family members:

(i) Receive any personal benefits (e.g., financial benefit such as remuneration, intellectual property rights, rights of employment, consultancies, board membership, share ownership, stock options, etc.) as a result of or in connection with this study? Yes ☐ No ☑

(ii) If Yes, please describe the benefits below. (Do not include conference and travel expense coverage, or other benefits which are considered standard for the conduct of research.)

(b) Describe any restrictions regarding access to or disclosure of information (during or at the end of the study) that have been placed on the investigator(s). These restrictions include controls placed by the sponsor, funding body, advisory or steering committee.
(c) Where relevant, please explain any pre-existing relationship between the researcher(s) and the researched (e.g., instructor-student; manager-employee; clinician-patient; minister-congregant). Please pay special attention to relationships in which there may be a power differential – actual or perceived.

The researcher is an Anglican priest and the researched are members of the church; there is an explicit or implicit pastoral relationship. This is a relationship of trust and mutual obligation with the onus on the priest/researcher to respect the privacy and or confidentiality of personal disclosures made by the researched. One issue for me to be aware of as the researcher is the power differential between me as a priest and the research participants as lay people in the church. For some participants, the perception of me as an authority figure may be an impediment to full and honest participation. Some people may want to please me or avoid displeasing me in the way they participate or respond to questions. In order to mitigate this sense of power differential, I will state quite clearly at the outset, and back it up in writing, that there will be no rewards or negative consequences, either implicit or explicit, for participants in the study as they result of the views they express. In addition, I will arrange for a disinterested third party to be available to provide confidential pastoral support to any participant who requires it. This person will be a qualified pastoral care provider who has not been directly involved in the North Vancouver Anglican parishes or in the MAP process.

(d) Please describe the decision-making processes for collaborative research studies. If Terms of Reference exist, attach them. Collaborative research studies include those where a number of sites (e.g. other universities, non-TAHSHN hospitals, etc.) are involved, as well as those that involve community agencies.

Not applicable

SECTION B – SUMMARY OF THE PROPOSED RESEARCH

11. RATIONALE

Describe the purpose and scholarly rationale for the proposed project. State the hypotheses/research questions to be examined. The rationale for doing the study must be clear. Please include references in this section.

The study seeks to explore a deeper understanding of why lay leaders of small churches choose to remain in positions of leadership despite the often stressful challenges of institutional change.

Lay leaders in parishes of the Anglican Church of Canada have faced many challenges and changes over the past generation, including but not limited to: the remarriage of divorced persons; the ordination of women as deacons, priests and bishops; liturgical innovation; Indian Residential School litigation and the ongoing reconciliation efforts with First Nations; the blessing of same gender partnerships; the open ordination of LGBTQ clergy. Externally driven change caused by economic shifts, changing immigration patterns and demographics, and changing social and cultural mores have coincided with a decrease in membership in Anglican churches in Canada. (Bibby, 2012)

Yet, despite the stresses of change, lay people continue to provide leadership in their church communities. These volunteers choose to remain active in their churches, enduring stress and uncertainty. This study seeks to explore why lay leaders choose to remain in leadership despite the fact that the process of institutional change is often experienced as deep personal loss (Heifetz & Linsky 2002).

Myers describes the "Pro-Active Research Method" as a method that "intentionally engages qualitative research while pro-actively working toward transformation." (Myers 2002, 25) In other words, the researcher is not simply an observer of the subjects in a study; the researcher is actively engaged in the process, and has a
vested interest in the outcome of the study. "Transformation" of both the subjects/participants and the researcher is the desired outcome. For the participants, transformation may take the form of a new insight or self-discovery as a result of the action-in-ministry. For the researcher, transformation may take the form of new learning or deeper knowledge of the particular problem the action-in-ministry is designed to address.

In my case, I am interested in exploring the nature of leadership within the small church, and in particular I seek to provide an opportunity through an action-in-ministry to help transform the self-understanding of church leaders as empowered leaders who can identify their own strengths and feel more confident in exercising their role as leaders in their communities. This will entail an action-in-ministry that will take the form of a workshop in which the nature of leadership will be explored. The data generated by the workshop will be supplemented with data from individual questionnaires and personal interviews. I will conduct the research with the hope and expectation that the participants will feel more self-aware, encouraged and empowered as leaders as a result of the experience. I also anticipate my own transformation in terms of learning about my own assumptions about leadership and learn how to be a more effective teacher, coach and mentor for church leaders.

12. METHODS

(a) Please describe all formal and informal procedures to be used. Describe the data to be collected, where and how they will be obtained and how they will be analyzed.

This pro-active methodology will require several methods of data collection to allow for adequate triangulation; a focus group, a questionnaire, personal interviews, followed by a preliminary ‘reality check-in’.

Focus Group:
- Two lay leaders from each of seven Anglican Churches originally involved in the Ministry Assessment Process (MAP) and its implementation from 2010 to the present.
- The group will construct a case History of the MAP process, focusing on key events in terms of how they were experienced by the leaders themselves (note: this is not an evaluation of MAP or its outcomes).
- The group will then be encouraged to engage in theological reflection of their experience in a group discussion.

Questionnaire
The leaders will be invited to respond to a written questionnaire designed to solicit deeper personal reflection on their experiences in church leadership. A draft version of the questionnaire is found in the Appendix.

Personal Interviews
Each participant will be invited to be interviewed by me as a way to explore in greater depth the issues identified in the focus group and questionnaire, with an emphasis on theological reflection.

Reality Check-in
The members of the focus group will be invited to reconvene for an opportunity for the researcher to present preliminary findings in terms of important images, themes and issues that emerged in the data. The group will be given an opportunity to respond to the question “am I hearing you correctly?”

Procedures for data collection
- Focus Group: the case history and initial reflections will take the form of notes on newsprint which will be transcribed after the meeting. The focus group session be audio recorded and transcribed.
- Questionnaires: the participants will provide written responses, which will then be transcribed.
- Interviews: the interviews will be audio recorded and transcribed.

Procedures for data analysis
- The written material will be coded, borrowing techniques associated with Grounded Theory: Open, Axial, etc.
The coded responses will be systematically analyzed to identify key concepts which may shed light as to the motivation and resilience of lay leaders.

I hope to find key themes that help to identify the sources of resilience and faithfulness of lay leaders. The textual analysis using the tools of grounded theory will hopefully yield key concepts which will then be illustrated with excerpts from the data itself.

(b) Attach a copy of all questionnaires, interview guides and/or any other instruments. Attached.

(c) Include a list of appendices here for all additional materials submitted (e.g., Appendix A – Informed Consent; Appendix B – Interview Guide, etc.):

Appendix A – Recruitment Letter
Appendix B – Informed Consent
Appendix C – Draft Questionnaire
Appendix D – Draft Focus Group Plan
Appendix E – Individual Interview Plan

13. PARTICIPANTS AND/OR DATA
(a) Describe the participants to be recruited, or the individuals about whom personally identifiable information will be collected. List the inclusion and exclusion criteria. Where the research involves extraction or collection of personally identifiable information, please describe from whom the information will be obtained, what it will include, and how permission to access the data is being sought. (Strategies for recruitment are to be described in section #15.) Where applicable, justify the sample size.

Participants will be lay adults in leadership roles in their churches in North Vancouver, BC. They will be identified by their local priest (minister) as someone who has participated in the Ministry Assessment Process (MAP) in North Vancouver.

(b) Is there any group or individual-level vulnerability related to the research that needs to be mitigated (for example, difficulties understanding informed consent, history of exploitation by researchers, power differential between the researcher and the potential participant)?

No.

14. EXPERIENCE OF INVESTIGATORS WITH THIS TYPE OF RESEARCH
(a) Please provide a brief description of previous experience with this type of research by (i) the principal investigator/supervisor or sponsor, (ii) the research team and (iii) the people who will have direct contact with the participants. If there has not been previous experience, please describe how the principal investigator/research team will be prepared.

The researcher is an experienced Anglican priest who has extensive experience in small group process within a church context. He also has experience as a journalist and is skilled at collecting and analyzing data. He has successfully completed a graduate level course on Quantitative Research and Design (TSM5022H).

(b) For projects that will involve community members (e.g., peer researchers) in the collection and/or analysis of data, please describe their status within the research team (e.g., are they considered employees, volunteers or participants?) and what kind of training they will receive?

Participants are lay members of local churches who will know the researcher as a priest/minister.

15. RECRUITMENT OF PARTICIPANTS
Where there is recruitment, please describe how, by whom, and from where the participants will be recruited.
Where participant observation is to be used, please explain the form of insertion of the researcher into the research setting (e.g., living in a community, visiting on a bi-weekly basis, attending organized functions).
If relevant, describe any translation of recruitment materials, how this will occur and whether or not those people responsible for recruitment will speak the language of the participants.
Attach a copy of all posters, advertisements, flyers, letters, e-mail text, or telephone scripts to be used for recruitment.

Participants will be nominated in a process to ensure “arms-length” separation from the researcher by local parish priests who will be made aware of selection criteria – see attached recruitment letter. Participants from the researcher’s own church will be nominated by the Archdeacon (senior priest) of the region.

16. COMPENSATION  Please see U of T’s Compensation and Reimbursement Guidelines.

(a) Will participants receive compensation for participation?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Financial</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-kind</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(b) If Yes, please provide details and justification for the amount or the value of the compensation offered.

(c) If No, please explain why compensation is not possible or appropriate.

Participants are drawn from a pool of church volunteers who are accustomed to offering their time and expertise without remuneration.

(d) Where there is a withdrawal clause in the research procedure, if participants choose to withdraw, how will compensation be affected?

SECTION C – DESCRIPTION OF THE RISKS AND BENEFITS OF THE PROPOSED RESEARCH

17. POSSIBLE RISKS

(a) Please indicate all potential risks to participants as individuals or as members of a community that may arise from this research:

(i) Physical risks (e.g., any bodily contact or administration of any substance): Yes  No

(ii) Psychological/emotional risks (e.g., feeling uncomfortable, embarrassed, or upset): Yes  No

(iii) Social risks (e.g., loss of status, privacy and/or reputation): Yes  No

(iv) Legal risks (e.g., apprehension or arrest, subpoena): Yes  No

(b) Please briefly describe each of the risks noted above and outline the steps that will be taken to manage and/or minimize them.
There is a chance some participants may feel uncomfortable as a result of recalling a past experience which was upsetting. The interventions (questionnaire, interview, group work) are not intended to cause this reaction. If a participant feels uncomfortable for any reason they will be free to end their participation with no negative consequences. A disinterested third party will be available to provide confidential pastoral support to any participant who requires it. This person will be a qualified pastoral care provider (chaplain) who has not been directly involved in the North Vancouver Anglican parishes or in the MAP process.

18. POSSIBLE BENEFITS

☐ Describe any potential direct benefits to participants from their involvement in the project
☐ Describe any potential direct benefits to the community (e.g., capacity building)
☐ Comment on the potential benefits to the scientific/scholarly community or society that would justify involvement of participants in this study

Participants may gain insight as to the reasons for their commitment as lay leaders in their church and the sources of their resiliency for this work. Lay and ordained leaders may gain understanding about what motivates lay leaders in order to support their work more effectively. Most studies of congregational vitality focus either on asking why people leave the church or how to recruit new members. There is relatively little research on why people, and in particular lay leaders, stay with their church. This study seeks to offer new insight and knowledge about why people stay active in their churches. It is likely that the results will have relevance beyond the Anglican Church and may be useful to other Christian denominations or even non-Christian congregations of various faiths.

SECTION D – INFORMED CONSENT

19. CONSENT PROCESS ☐ ☐ (a) Describe the process that will be used to obtain informed consent and explain how it will be recorded. Please note that it is the quality of the consent, not the form that is important. The goal is to ensure that potential participants understand to what they are consenting.

(b) If the research involves extraction or collection of personally identifiable information from or about a research participant, please describe how consent from the individuals or authorization from the data custodian (e.g., medical records department, district school board) will be obtained.

The project will be described by the researcher in detail and the invitation to participate extended. It will be the participant's choice to participate. Participants will be required to read, understand and sign a consent form – attached. They will be given a copy of the signed consent form.

20 CONSENT DOCUMENTS ☐ ☐ (a) Attach a copy of the Information Letter/Consent Form. For details about the required elements in the information letter and consent form, please refer to our informed consent guide (http://www.research.utoronto.ca/wp-content/uploads/2010/01/GUIDE-FOR-INFORMED-CONSENT-April-2010.pdf)

Additional documentation regarding consent should be provided such as:
- screening materials
- introductory letters, letters of administrative consent or authorization

(b) If any of the information collected in the screening process - prior to full informed consent to participate in the study - is to be retained from those who are later excluded or refuse to participate in the study, please state how potential participants will be informed of this course of action and whether they will have the right to refuse to allow this information to be kept.
21. COMMUNITY AND/OR ORGANIZATIONAL CONSENT, OR CONSENT BY AN AUTHORIZED PARTY

(a) If the research is taking place within a community or an organization which requires that formal consent be sought prior to the involvement of individual participants, describe how consent will be obtained and attach any relevant documentation. If consent will not be sought, please provide a justification and describe any alternative forms of consultation that may take place.

(b) If any or all of the participants are children and/or others who are not competent to consent, describe the process by which capacity/competency will be assessed, and the proposed alternate source of consent.

   i) Submit a copy of the permission/information letter to be provided to the person(s) providing the alternative consent

   ii) Describe the assent process for participants and attach the assent letter.

22. DEBRIEFING and DISSEMINATION

(a) If deception or intentional non-disclosure will be used in the study, provide justification. Please consult the Guidelines for the Use of Deception and Debriefing in Research

(b) Please provide a copy of the written debriefing form, if applicable.

(c) If participants and/or communities will be given the option of withdrawing their data following the debriefing, please describe this process.

(d) Please describe what information/feedback will be provided to participants and/or communities after their participation in the project is complete (e.g., report, poster presentation, pamphlet, etc.) and note how participants will be able to access this information.

   The final thesis containing the results of the research project will be made available to participants. In addition, the researcher will present the research in a public forum to which participants will be invited.

23. PARTICIPANT WITHDRAWAL

(a) Where applicable, please describe how participants will be informed of their right to withdraw from the project and outline the procedures that will be followed to allow them to exercise this right.

   They are informed in the consent form of their right to withdraw and may leave at any time without penalty. A personal request to the Researcher or to the chaplain will be sufficient notice.

(b) Indicate what will be done with the participant’s data and any consequences which withdrawal may have on the participant.
Questionnaire and interview data will be destroyed. Paper records will be shredded, electronic data permanently deleted. Focus group data attributed to the withdrawn participant(s) will be redacted whenever possible. Focus group data from those withdrawn will not be used in analysis.

(c) If participants will not have the right to withdraw from the project at all, or beyond a certain point, please explain. Ensure this information is included in the consent process and consent form.

SECTION E – CONFIDENTIALITY AND PRIVACY

24. CONFIDENTIALITY
Data security measures must be consistent with UT’s Data Security Standards for Personally Identifiable and Other Confidential Data in Research. All identifiable electronic data that is being kept outside of a secure server environment must be encrypted, consistent with the standards described at: http://www.utoronto.ca/security/UTORprotect/encryption_guidelines.htm:

(a) Will the data be treated as confidential? Yes No

(b) Describe the procedures to be used to protect the confidentiality of participants or informants, where applicable

Participants will be assured their responses will kept confidential. They will be required to keep other participant’s confidential when meeting as a group. The data will be transcribed and sorted to create an anonymous data set.

(c) Describe any limitations to protecting the confidentiality of participants whether due to the law, the methods used, or other reasons (e.g., a duty to report)

25. DATA SECURITY, RETENTION AND ACCESS

(a) Describe how data (including written records, video/audio recordings, artifacts and questionnaires) will be protected during the conduct of the research and dissemination of results.

Written records on paper will be stored in a secure, locked filing cabinet in the researcher’s office. Digital records will be stored on a password protected, encrypted storage device (Kingston Digital 16GB Data Traveler AES Encrypted Vault Privacy 256Bit 3.0 USB Flash Drive) which will be kept in a secure, locked filing cabinet in the researcher’s office.

(b) Explain how long data will be retained. (If applicable, referring to the standard data retention practice for your discipline) Provide details of their final disposal or storage. Provide a justification if you intend to store your data for an indefinite length of time. If the data may have archival value, discuss how participants will be informed of this possibility during the consent process.

Data will be retained until the final thesis is approved. Raw data including paper records, personal questionnaire results and audio recordings and transcriptions in digital format will be destroyed once the thesis is approved. Paper files will be shredded, electronic data will be permanently deleted. Anonymous data set will be saved as an appendix to the thesis.

(c) If participant anonymity or confidentiality is not appropriate to this research project, please explain.
(d) If data will be shared with other researchers or users, please describe how and where the data will be stored and any restrictions that will be made regarding access.

SECTION F – LEVEL OF RISK AND REVIEW TYPE

See the Instructions for Ethics Review Protocol Submission Form for detailed information about the Risk Matrix.

26. RISK MATRIX: REVIEW TYPE BY GROUP VULNERABILITY and RESEARCH RISK

(a) Indicate the Risk Level for this project by checking the intersecting box

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group Vulnerability</th>
<th>Research Risk</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(b) Explain/justify the level of research risk and group vulnerability reported above:
Participants are simply being asked to share their opinions, perspective, perceptions and reflections on experience of being in leadership in small churches.

(Please note that the final determination of Review Type and level of monitoring will be made by the reviewing University of Toronto REB)

Based on the level of risk, these are the types of review that a protocol may receive:

Risk level = 1: Delegated Review; Risk level = 2 or 3: Full Board Review

For both delegated and full reviews (SSH&E, HS, or HIV), please submit one electronic copy of your protocol and all appendices (e.g., recruitment, information/consent and debriefing materials, and study instruments) as a single Word document or a pdf. Do not submit your entire research proposal. Please ensure that the electronic signatures are in place and e-mail to new.ethics.protocols@utoronto.ca

The deadline for delegated review (SSH&E or HS) is EVERY Monday, or first business day of the week, by 4 pm. Information about full REB meeting and submission due dates are posted on our website (SSH&E, HS or HIV).

HIV REB reviews all protocols at full board level but applies proportionate review based on the level of risk.

All other submissions (e.g., amendments, adverse events, and continuing review submissions) should be sent to ethics.review@utoronto.ca

SECTION G – SIGNATURES

27. PRIVACY REGULATIONS

My signature as Principal Investigator, in Section G of this protocol form, confirms that I am aware of, understand, and will comply with all relevant laws governing the collection and use of personally identifiable information in research. I understand that for research involving extraction or collection of personally identifiable information, provincial, national and/or international laws may apply and that any apparent mishandling of personally identifiable information must be reported to the Office of Research Ethics.
For U of T **student researchers**, my signature confirms that I am a registered student in good standing with the University of Toronto. My project has been reviewed and approved by my advisory committee or equivalent (where applicable). If my status as a student changes, I will inform the Office of Research Ethics.

Signature of Investigator: ____________________________ Date: **24 April 2015**

***For **Graduate Students**, the signature of the Faculty Supervisor is required. For **Post-Doctoral Fellows** and **Visiting Professors or Researchers**, the signature of the Faculty Sponsor is required. In addition to the supervisor/sponsor, the chair or the dean of the department is required to approve and sign the form***

As the **Faculty Supervisor** of this project, my signature confirms that I have reviewed and approve the scientific merit of the research project and this ethics protocol submission. I will provide the necessary supervision to the student researcher throughout the project, to ensure that all procedures performed under the research project will be conducted in accordance with relevant University, provincial, national or international policies and regulations that govern research involving human subjects. This includes ensuring that the level of risk inherent to the project is managed by the level of research experience that the student has, combined with the extent of oversight that will be provided by the Faculty Supervisor and/or On-site Supervisor.

As the **Faculty Sponsor** for this project, my signature confirms that I have reviewed and approve of the research project and will assume responsibility, as the University representative, for this research project. I will ensure that all procedures performed under the project will be conducted in accordance with all relevant University, provincial, national or international policies and regulations that govern research involving human participants.

Signature of Faculty Supervisor/Sponsor: ____________________________ Date: ____________________________

☐ As the **Departmental Chair/Dean**, my signature confirms that I am aware of the **requirements for scholarly review** and that the ethics protocol for this research has received appropriate review prior to submission.

In addition, my administrative unit will follow guidelines and procedures to ensure compliance with all relevant University, provincial, national or international policies and regulations that govern research involving human participants. My signature also reflects the willingness of the department, faculty or division to administer the research funds, if there are any, in accordance with University, regulatory agency and sponsor agency policies.

Print Name of Departmental Chair/Dean (or designate):

Signature of Departmental Chair/Dean: ____________________________ Date: ____________________________

(or designate)
Appendix A: recruitment letter

Draft letter to Colleagues to recruit suitable research project participants. To be sent to the current incumbent clergy of St Clement, St Catherine, St. John, and St Martin in North Vancouver, as well as the clergy who had pastoral responsibility for St Richard and St Clare when they were closed.

Date

Dear Colleague:

As you may know, I am currently working on my Doctor of Ministry degree through the Toronto School of Theology at the University of Toronto. My area of interest is lay leadership in small churches. For my thesis project I wish to assemble a focus group of lay leaders who have been involved in the MAP/Ministry Plan process in North Vancouver.

Would you kindly recommend up to four lay members of your church community who have been involved in MAP and other leadership positions in your parish community over the last several years. These people may have held a formal position such as warden or trustee, or they may be informal leaders. Ideally, participants will be those who participated in MAP from the beginning and continue in some form of church leadership today. They do not necessarily have to be current members of Regional Council, but they may have been in the past. Perhaps those who participated in our planning day on February 14 would provide an initial list for consideration.

The participants will be invited to be part of a focus group that will involve completing a detailed questionnaire, attending a group meeting, and being interviewed by me. The results will be kept confidential and will be transcribed to form an anonymous data set for analysis.

In addition, I will arrange for a disinterested third party to be available to provide confidential pastoral support to any participant who requires it. This person will be a qualified pastoral care provider who has not been directly involved in the North Vancouver Anglican parishes or in the MAP process.

Members
- Emmanuel College – United
- Knox College – Presbyterian
- Regis College – Roman Catholic, Jesuit
- St. Augustine’s Seminary – Roman Catholic, Diocesan
- University of St. Michael’s College – Roman Catholic, Basilian
- University of Trinity College – Anglican
- Wycliffe College – Anglican, Evangelical

Affiliates
- Conrad Grebel University College – Toronto Mennonite Theological Centre – Mennonite
- Huron University College – Anglican
- Institute for Christian Studies – Reformed
- Waterloo Lutheran Seminary – Evangelical Lutheran
The research will be conducted during the months of May and June of this year.

I am avoiding picking people myself to reduce the impact of my bias. I ask that you simply forward me their names and contact information and allow me the opportunity to explain the project and to extend the invitation to participate. Please do not extend a blanket invitation but simply send your list to me in confidence. I anticipate that not everyone you nominate will actually be able to participate because of scheduling challenges, but I will do my best to include as many of your recommended participants as possible. I am hoping that at least two of the four will actually be available. I may come to you for more names if availability becomes a problem.

Would you kindly reply to me at your earliest convenience, and feel free to contact me if you have any questions.

Sincerely

The Reverend Stephen Muir  
Doctor of Ministry Student  
Toronto School of Theology  
email: stephen.muir@mail.utoronto.ca  
cel: 778 229 831; office: 604 987 0432
Appendix B – Informed Consent

Date

Dear Participant:

Thank you for agreeing to participate in my research project.

As you may know, I am currently working on my Doctor of Ministry degree through the Toronto School of Theology at the University of Toronto. My area of interest is lay leadership in small churches. For my thesis project I wish to assemble a focus group of lay leaders who have been involved in the MAP/Ministry Plan process in North Vancouver. You have been selected because your name was forwarded to me by your priest, the Reverend ____.

The project involves being a member of a focus group comprised of approximately thirteen other people, most of whom you will already know. I will ask you to attend a three and a half hour focus group session, complete a detailed personal questionnaire, and be interviewed by me. There will also be a follow up meeting I call a “reality check” when I will provide preliminary results to the focus group and ask you if I have heard you correctly. You will also be welcome to read my completed thesis once I graduate!

Throughout the process I will seek your honest responses, opinions, reflections and comments. There are no “correct” or “incorrect” answers. My focus is on understanding your experience as a lay leader in the church.

The results will be recorded using a digital audio recording device and transcribed to form an anonymous data set for analysis. This means that all your responses to the questionnaire, group work, interview and “reality check” will be kept confidential. Any comments I quote in the research will not be attributed to you personally. Care will be taken to protect confidentiality at all times.

There is minimal personal risk involved. If, for any reason, you choose not to participate there will be no penalty. If you choose to participate, there will be no rewards or negative consequences, either implicit or explicit, for you as the result of the views you express. If you choose to withdraw at any time during the process, there will be no penalty.

Members
Emmanuel College – United • Knox College – Presbyterian • Regis College – Roman Catholic, Jesuit • St. Augustine’s Seminary – Roman Catholic, Diocesan University of St. Michael’s College – Roman Catholic, Basilians • University of Trinity College – Anglican • Wycliffe College – Anglican, Evangelical

Affiliates
Conrad Grebel University College – Toronto Mennonite Theological Centre – Mennonite • Huron University College – Anglican Institute for Christian Studies – Reformed • Waterloo Lutheran Seminary – Evangelical Lutheran
You are asked to participate as an unpaid volunteer and there will be no remuneration. This project has been vetted by the University of Toronto Office of Research Ethics, and you may contact them at any time if you have questions about your rights as a participant: ethics.review@utoronto.ca, 1-416-946-3273.

In addition, I will arrange for a disinterested third party to be available to provide confidential pastoral support (chaplain) if you require it. This person will be a qualified pastoral care provider who has not been directly involved in the North Vancouver Anglican parishes or in the MAP process.

Your participation will help me achieve my goal of understanding lay leaders in the church and the challenges they face in order to be better equipped to support lay leaders in their important and invaluable ministry.

Thank you for agreeing to participate in this project. Please sign both copies of this letter, keep one and return one to me to indicate your consent to being be a participant of the project as outlined in this letter.

I, ________________________________, consent to participating in Stephen Muir’s Doctor of Ministry Research Project.

Participant’s Signature: __________________________ Date: __________________________

Researcher’s Signature: __________________________ Date: __________________________

Sincerely,

The Reverend Stephen Muir
Doctor of Ministry Student
Toronto School of Theology
stephen.muir@mail.utoronto.ca
cel: 778 229 831; office: 604 987 0432

Thesis Supervisor:
David Neelands, Dean of Divinity, Trinity College and Margaret E. Fleck Professor of Anglican Studies
6 Hoskin Avenue, Toronto, Ontario, Canada M5S 1H8
1-416-978-7750; email: d.neelands@utoronto.ca

University of Toronto Office of Research Ethics
1-416-946-3273; email: ethics.review@utoronto.ca
Appendix C: Draft Questionnaire for participants

The focus of this study is to reflect on your personal experience of the Ministry Assessment Process (MAP) and subsequent Ministry Plan of the North Vancouver churches. Your responses are for the purposes of a Doctor of Ministry study conducted by the Rev. Stephen Muir and will only be shared as part of an anonymous coded data set in his thesis.

For each question, kindly provide as much detail as possible. Use as much paper, and as much time, as you need.

Thank you for your participation!

****

Name: 
Parish: 

Age: 
Gender: 

1. Please describe the reason you became involved in the MAP process (eg ‘My priest asked me to,’ ‘I volunteered,’ ‘it was required because I was a Warden,’ etc):

2. Describe the nature of your involvement (eg the type and approximate number of meetings you attended and in what capacity)

3. As you reflect on your experience, was there a time when you felt particularly positive? Please describe in detail.

4. Was there a time when you felt particularly negative? Please describe in detail.

5. Overall, how would you describe your experience of the MAP process?

6. Did you participate in the process from the start? Why?

7. Did you ever take a break or stop? Why?

8. How do you feel about the leadership provided by the clergy? Please describe in detail.

9. Do you have concerns about the future?

10. What gives you hope?
Appendix D: Draft Focus Group Workshop Plan

The focus group will be drawn from a pool of qualified participants from seven North Vancouver parishes who are available on the day of the workshop. Every effort will be made to find a date that maximizes the number of participants, but it is likely the number available will be about 12-14. Prior to this group meeting, each participant will be required to complete a preliminary survey (per the attached draft) as preparation for the meeting.

The meeting will take place in a meeting room, most likely at St Agnes Anglican Church in North Vancouver, where the researcher (Stephen) is the Rector and has free and full use of the facility. Stephen will be assisted by a volunteer who will help record comments on newsprint.

8:45 am: Participants gather. Coffee and tea available.

9:00 am: Welcome & introductions; purpose of the morning.

9:10 am: The pastoral support person will be introduced and contact information provided to participants. She or he will then leave.

9:20 am: Step 1: Creating an “objective” case history of the MAP process.
- In groups of two, help each other remember when MAP started, the reasons for it, and how you became involved.
- Share conversation with group – on a newsprint timeline begin to plot significant dates and events as an aide memoire for the group
- The MAP process resulted in a Ministry Plan – can you remember some of the main features of this plan?

10:20 am: comfort break – coffee/tea, snacks

10: 30 am: Step 2: Reflecting on personal, “subjective” experience

Questions for discussion:
- What were the reasons for MAP?
- Why did you get involved?
- Was there ever a specific occasion when you felt particularly hopeful about the MAP process?
- Was there ever a time when you something else?
- Was there a time when you felt anxious?
- What was the issue that made you most anxious? Why?
- Do you have concerns about the future?
- What gives you hope?

11:30 am: Step 3: Reflecting on leadership

- As you reflect on your MAP/Ministry Plan experience, do you see yourself as a leader?
• In what ways did you feel supported?
• Did you ever feel let down?
• Did you look to the clergy for leadership?
• How would you characterize the leadership provided by the clergy?
• Can you think of an example of good leadership from one or more of the clergy?
• Can you think of a time when clergy let you down in some way?
• What can clergy do to support lay leaders in the church?

12:15 pm: Wrap up, further instructions to set up interview times.

12:30 pm: Thank you & goodbye.
Appendix E: Individual Interview Plan

The individual Interviews will be conducted after both the Focus Group and Questionnaire are completed. The interviews will use the context of the shard experience of the Focus Group and the individual experience of completing the Questionnaire as the context for the personal Interview. In this way the Interview will take the form of follow-up questions to the Focus Group and Questionnaire.

Sample follow up questions may include:

- In reflecting on your experience as a member of the Focus Group, would you say it was a generally a positive or negative experience? Why?
- In reflecting on your experience of the Focus Group, did you gain any insight about your role in the Ministry Assessment Process (MAP)? Did you gain any insight as to other people’s experiences of MAP?
- In reflecting on some of the issues raised in the Focus group, was there anything that surprised you? Why?
- Were there moments of tension during the focus group that you became aware of? What is your perspective on what happened?
- Were there issues not talked about that you think should have been raised? If yes, what is the issue? Why do you think this issue was not discussed?
- In the Questionnaire, you wrote (x) in response to question (y), can you tell me more to help me understand what you mean?
- I see you provided a very brief answer to question (y). Can you please expand on this answer to help me understand your point of view?
- Is there anything else you would like to share?
Appendix C: Ministry Plan
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Preface

This report is submitted at the conclusion of the Ministry Assessment Process in the Deanery of North Vancouver, Diocese of New Westminster of the Anglican Church of Canada.

Representatives from the North Vancouver parishes have prepared this report and these recommendations for Bishop Michael Ingham and for Diocesan Council in the first instance. It is our hope that the report will be favourably received, and that - as necessary and appropriate - representatives of the Deanery MAP Group may be invited to attend the meetings of the committees that will be called upon to provide advice to Diocesan Council in August 2010, namely the Ministry and Congregational Development Committee and the Administration and Finance Committee. Following Diocesan consideration, parish vestry meetings will be scheduled to review and approve the report and the recommendations it contains.

Actions which result from the report will, by necessity, have to take place step by step. It cannot happen all at once and indeed, the MAP group would probably call this "a work in progress", with aspects of the recommendations solidifying as each stage or milestone is completed.

The MAP leadership team, and the individual parish MAP teams, have worked diligently on this process with the assistance of staff from the Diocese and our mentor and our facilitator. Collaboration, cooperation, and friendship have resulted in this process. We ask that this ministry plan be endorsed so that we can proceed with God's work in North Vancouver and in this Diocese.
Executive Summary

The Goal of the North Vancouver Deanery Ministry Assessment Process is a revitalized and sustainable Anglican Church presence based on scripture, reason and tradition; which uses a relational approach to proclaiming the gospel in the community; and reflects and demonstrates theological, liturgical and community diversity.

We recommend that:

1. A new model of shared ministry be initiated in North Vancouver which will establish, enable and provide for the sharing of lay and ordained ministry expertise throughout the Deanery, while maintaining an identifiable, on-going relationship between particular clergy and worshiping communities to engage in pastoral care, worship and ongoing responsibility.

2. The North Vancouver worshipping communities be grouped according to the following geographic areas:
   1. Lynn/Seymour: St. Agnes, St. Clare and St. Clements
   2. Lonsdale: St. John’s and St. Martin’s
   3. Capilano: St. Catherine’s and St. Richard’s

3. Pastoral care, worship and ongoing responsibility for St. Clare be shared by the people of St. Clare and the incumbents and communities of St. Agnes and St. Clements effective September 1st and until the canonical process is completed.

4. The Diocese start a canonical process for shared ordained appointments at St. Clare, St. Clements, St. John’s and St. Agnes (see recommendations in Section 5.3.1) so that new appointments can be made by the end of 2010 and by February 2011. This will require a blended selection process involving input from the worshipping communities, the Ministry Team, the Implementation Steering Committee and the Bishop’s office.

5. In Phase One, a new regional position be created for a half-time Children and Youth Co-ordinator, for an initial 2 year term, to be funded by the release of assets and CTF monies within the Deanery.

6. A Deanery curacy position be created by the Diocese, to be funded in combination by the release of assets and CTF monies within the Deanery and the Diocesan Growth Fund. This will allow the curate to participate in and learn from a new model of ministry, as it is being formed within the Deanery.

7. The roles of deacons be reviewed by the Diocese to reflect new models of shared ministry.

8. Professionally qualified advice be sought to give the Deanery direction on options and priorities for the existing parish properties.

9. St. Clare, in conjunction with Diocesan Council, proceeds with the sale of the Rectory of St. Clare.

10. Following an assessment of the best options, the Deanery will consider the sale of the church properties of St. Richards and St. Clare, to remove the burden of upkeep, thereby releasing resources. Consideration will also be given to selling the rectories of St. Martin’s and St. Catherine’s in due course.

11. A proposed plan be implemented to retire St. Clare’s and St. John’s outstanding debts, and as soon as practicable restart payments on St. John’s loan (refer to Tables 1 and 2).

12. For the purpose of continuity, consideration be given to the extension of the interim priests-in-charge at St. John’s and St. Clement’s, until the completion of the canonical process.

13. A regional plan, supported by local strategies be initiated for "moving back into the neighbourhood".

ii
1 Background

The North Vancouver Deanery Ministry Assessment Process (MAP) was initiated in 2008. There were two primary reasons for this. First, the overall membership in the then existing seven parishes (St. Agnes, St. Catherine, St. Clement's, St. Clare, St. John the Evangelist, St. Martin and St. Richard\(^1\)) had steadily declined over the previous decade. Second, the freewill offerings in all parishes had declined over the previous decade and, in three parishes the expenditures were greater than the revenue; two parishes were utilizing the capital of their Consolidated Trust Fund (CTF). Other reasons include the change in the demographic make-up of North Vancouver in the three preceding decades.

The Bishop agreed to a specific mandate for North Vancouver MAP that included a number of elements for inquiry, including:

- Serving Community: What is God calling us to do in North Vancouver?
- Renewing our Anglican Faith: What might constitute a lively expression of our Anglican roots for the 21st Century?
- Sharing Resources: What is good stewardship of the assets and resources we have been given?

A copy of the condensed version of the mandate questions is attached as appendix A to this report.

Each Parish formed a MAP team that worked on the initial “Parish Study” phase of the MAP process, and continued to provide support to members also serving on the Deanery MAP Team. Parish MAP teams also took responsibility for communicating with the wider parish during the process.

The Deanery MAP team initially consisted of one representative from each parish and one clergy representative, with Diocesan support in the persons of Tasha Carrothers, MAP Associate and the Rev. Alisdair Smith who acted as Mentor. Subsequently, the team was expanded to include all members of the North Vancouver Clericus and an additional representative from each Parish. From April 29 to June 30, 2010 the Rev. Cheryl Black from Highland United was engaged to act as the team’s facilitator. Senior Diocesan staff members, Rob Dickson, Business Administrator and Paul Borthistle, Director of Parish Support Ministries, also attended Deanery MAP team meetings upon request to provide valuable information and guidance. The team is grateful to all of those who assisted, guided and participated in its work.

The Deanery MAP team met regularly and with increasing frequency from March 2008 to June 30, 2010 to develop recommendations based upon consensus within the team. The team’s work was significantly informed by two, well-attended “Deanery-wide” sessions held in January and March of 2010. Parishioners from across the Deanery gathered at these sessions to discuss our vision for the Anglican Church in North Vancouver. Some members of the Deanery MAP team will continue to work on the newly constituted Implementation Steering Committee.

All recommendations will be brought to Diocesan Council (Ministry and Congregational Development Committee, Administration and Finance Committee and Grants and Loans Committee) for those matters requiring specific decisions and approvals by the Diocese and Bishop Michael. Parishes will hold vestry meetings in the fall to approve the directions of the report and consider the next steps for implementation.

---

\(^1\) St. Richard decided to close effective Dec. 31, 2009. The pastoral needs of that community continue to be met by St. Catherine’s Parish and the neighbourhood ministry in the Norgate area will continue to be considered by the Deanery as a whole.
2 Vision and Mission

God is present in North Vancouver bringing reconciliation and transformation of people’s lives. The Anglican Church is a visible sign of God’s presence and mission and we joyfully share in that mission in worship, fellowship and service with the communities of North Vancouver.

Being a unified Anglican presence in North Vancouver means:
- Working together as a worshipping, inclusive, transforming and risk-taking community of faith intentionally present and deeply involved in our neighbourhoods and the world;
- Collaboration in providing pastoral care to our worshipping congregations and our neighbours; sharing Eucharist and providing for the growth in faith of individuals;
- Offering hospitality, and caring for and supporting people in their everyday lives.

We intend to listen and reach out to the communities in which we live and work and seek to be good partners with others in discerning and pursuing God’s mission among the people of North Vancouver.

The mission of the North Vancouver Deanery Ministry Assessment Process is:
- Vital, effective and sustainable engagement with the neighbourhoods and communities of North Vancouver in the mission of God;
- Appreciation of our communities of Christian faith and practice in the Anglican triad of scripture, reason and tradition embodying the Anglican ideal of unity and diversity: including diverse size, outlook, liturgical preference and inclusivity; and
- Deep collaboration, seamless service, and engagement with the people of North Vancouver

The parishes are committed to working together to:
1. Develop shared mission across the Deanery
2. Support one another in mission
3. Learn from and with one another
4. Ensure the best possible stewardship of the assets and resources entrusted to us

3 Overview

Consistent with Diocesan policy, we affirm that parish and Regional/Deanery ministry will provide for the following elements:
- services of worship,
- pastoral care,
- opportunities for participation in the Mission of God,
- re-connection to the spiritual and physical needs of the community,
- Christian formation (education),
- responsible stewardship of what God has given us, and
- partnerships with other agencies and faith groups

We are very conscious of the need to honour the trust between the local parish, region and the wider Diocese. There will be a creative new way of engaging in God’s mission, taking the best of what we have inherited and moving out in new directions.

The North Vancouver Region has major assets in property and restricted/unrestricted trust funds. A major liability is the cost of keeping buildings fit for purpose. There is a surplus of facilities to accommodate the number of people worshipping in the churches. The major operational expense is staff salaries. The number of people in the region who are members of the existing Anglican parishes has declined, as well as the amount of giving.
Up until June 30, 2010, there were 6.25 paid clergy positions in the Deanery. Based on current revenue, we cannot continue at this level.
4 Key Points of Consensus

The following represent key points of consensus that informed each of the detailed recommendations that follow:

- The Deanery must consolidate resources to maintain and grow energy, vision and neighbourhood engagement
- We are currently spending too much time, money and energy on buildings and maintenance; we need to reduce the number of buildings to release energy for Ministry
- Our goal is our redefined Mission to engage with our community; we want to share the Christian narrative – to be "salt and yeast" in God’s world
- There is a profound and purposeful intention that all members of the Deanery will work together in the fulfillment of God’s mission

Appendix B contains the complete list of statements agreed upon by consensus of the Deanery MAP team.

5 Recommendations

The Deanery Ministry Plan and vision is separated into five areas of focus:

1. Neighbourhood Engagement
2. Ministry Centres
3. Shared Ministry Team
4. Congregation and Deanery Development
5. Stewardship of Resources

Each focus area is described by a number of vision elements and criteria that emerged from our discussions.

The plan elements are divided into three phases:

- Phase One: June – September 2010, the transition period
- Phase Two: October – February 2011
- Longer Term: 2011-2015

Items not completed in Phase One will continue into Phase Two.

During Phase One we will identify useful milestones and measurements of our progress in each of the focus areas. The North Vancouver Deanery MAP implementation team will record the results and provide feedback on the process for future uses in the Diocese.

Figure 1 illustrates a pictorial view of the Deanery Ministry Plan.
The neighbourhoods of North Vancouver are grouped into three hubs: Lonsdale, Lynn/Seymour and Capilano.

Each hub is a Ministry Centre, comprised of existing churches, but flexible to grow and change with the needs of the neighbourhoods.

Each of the Ministry Centres reach outward, engaging the neighbourhood.

The three Ministry Centres overlap with a common Mission as their central focus.

Encompassing the three Ministry Centres are Congregation & Deanery Development, Shared Ministry Team and Stewardship of Resources.
5.1 Neighbourhood Engagement

5.1.1 Vision Elements

- Deep engagement of the Anglican Church in the local communities of North Vancouver – “Moving back into the neighbourhood”
- Development of the necessary skills to connect with the community
- Deepened and strengthened ecumenical relationships
- Enhanced interfaith understanding
- Successful collaboration on region-wide and local outreach initiatives – “A significant difference is being made in people’s lives”

5.1.2 Phase One

- Focus on preparation for “moving back into the neighbourhood”
- Training for clergy and congregations on how to connect more meaningfully with our neighbours and listen to their life stories
  - What does “Moving back into the neighbourhood” look like
  - What are the practical steps for doing this
  - What are the indicators that we are achieving this objective
  - Encourage parishioners to attend the Diocesan workshop “Serving our Streets” in October led by Alan Roxburgh
  - Host a Deanery workshop on “Moving back into the neighbourhood”
- Further develop the recently established Deanery Social Outreach Committee
- Take steps to understand and appreciate how members of our congregations are already engaged in the community
  - Examples:
    - Lions Gate Auxiliary
    - Harvest Project
    - Meals on Wheels
    - Sharing Abundance
    - Refugee Sponsorship
  - Set up a task group to inventory our parish communities for their interests and connections
  - Start recruiting and training lay people to work on task groups for specific priorities
- Look at the vision elements around ecumenical and interfaith understanding
  - What do we mean by ecumenical and inter-faith
  - How can these broad vision elements be achieved in the context of neighbourhood engagement
- Explore the community needs that have been identified as requiring attention:
  - Children and families
  - Youth
  - Seniors
  - Pastoral care

5.1.3 Phase Two

- Ongoing training for the purpose of intentional ministry within the region
- Continue consultation with the District and the City of North Vancouver and various potential community partners for a greater understanding of neighbourhood needs
- Continue to explore the priorities and begin to develop initial plans for pilot ministry projects, to be implemented in 2011
- Convene regional task groups (cross parish teams) for the priority areas, to gather more information from the neighbourhoods and make recommendations for their priority areas
- Assess where the energy and synergies are and develop plans for selected pilot initiatives:
  - Decide which ministries are better done regionally
    - Set up regional task groups (cross parish teams) for the priority initiatives
    - Develop regional plans for these initiatives
+ Look at ministries that need to be done locally
  - Identify how regional ministry teams might support these local ministries
  - Support local teams to identify priorities and develop plans for these ministries

5.1.4 Longer Term
- Assess and establish priorities and projects for the longer term
- Implement and evaluate pilot projects assessing whether the initiatives are relevant and sustainable
- Assess how the priorities and projects are meeting the goals articulated in our vision elements
- Continue assessing the requirements of the neighbourhood
- Develop the mid to longer term priorities and strategies for ongoing neighbourhood engagement and regional ministries

5.2 Ministry Centres

5.2.1 Vision Elements
- Worshipping communities will use a variety of established parish centres and new worship spaces in rented or shared facilities
- Sacred spaces will be well kept, appreciated and flexible allowing more uses by the community
- Locations are appropriate to and congruent with the fabric of identifiable neighbourhoods
- Evaluate locations of present buildings

NOTE: In this section, Parish names denote geographical boundaries and area served, not existing or potential congregations.

5.2.2 Phase One
- Recommend our worshipping communities be grouped according to the following geographic areas:
  1. Lynn/Seymour: St. Clement’s, St. Clare, and St. Agnes
  2. Lonsdale: St. John’s and St. Martin’s
  3. Capilano: St. Catherine’s and St. Richard’s
- This recommendation has been influenced by the emerging official community plans of the District and the City of North Vancouver
- The division of the geographical areas may need to be reviewed as we proceed with the ministry plan
- With the approved neighbourhood identifications in hand, the Deanery recommends professionally qualified advice be sought to give the Deanery direction on options and priorities for the existing parish properties for:
  - renovation,
  - rental,
  - lease as a building,
  - lease as land (long lease),
  - sale, or
  - purchase or renting new space
- St. Clement’s to continue active discussions about an Anglican presence in Lynn Valley Centre in relationship with other worshipping communities in Lynn/Seymour
- A concerted Deanery effort should be made to engage and understand the neighbourhood needs of the St. John’s/Lower Lonsdale community, which is currently seen as a central hub for the Anglican presence in North Vancouver
- Deanery support for pastoral care and ministry in lower Capilano area
5.2.3 Phase Two

- Recommend that St. Clare, in conjunction with Diocesan Council, proceed with the sale of the Rectory of St. Clare
- Following an assessment of the best options, the Deanery will consider
  + The sale of the church properties of St. Richard's and St. Clare, in order to remove the burden of management/uptake, thereby releasing resources
  + Renovations needed at other facilities
  + Collaborations with other faith partners
- Consideration will also be given for the sale of St. Martin's and St. Catherine's rectories in due course
- Significant upgrades to facilities would need to be presented, and sanctioned by the Regional Council (refer to section 5.4.2 for more details)
- Decisions would be made early in this phase about the locations of worship and engagement, and resulting changes would be phased-in

5.2.4 Longer Term

- The ministry model has changed so that our use of buildings, owned, rented and borrowed, is formed by response to our move back into our neighbourhoods

5.3 Shared Ministry Team

5.3.1 Vision Elements

- A financially sustainable mixed ministry team to serve and be shared by the Deanery, consisting of
  + Clergy – stipendiary and non-stipendiary
  + Laity – salaried and voluntary
- These roles may include:
  + Ministry Development – training for pastoral work and vocational development
  + Leadership Development – enabling the system to be more effective, healthy and faithful
  + Community Engagement
  + Pastoral Care
  + Spiritual Formation
  + Adult Education
  + Children and Family support
  + Youth
- The Ministry team, together with the congregations identifies the requirements of the worshipping communities and their neighbourhoods, and provide coordination of functions, resources and programs to meet these needs
- There will be a pastoral connection between a specific priest and the worshipping communities in each Ministry Centre
- Alignment of complementary skills and experience to fulfill the mission of the Deanery
- The team will consist of existing and new ministry team members
- Allocation of priestly resources will be determined on the basis of requirements, within the available financial resources
- Continuity of relationship between identified members of the team
  + priests,
  + deacons, and
  + congregations
- Team members have opportunities for education and experiences in order to be grounded and equipped for engagement in a new model of ministry
- We are committed to developing and nurturing a healthy team

NOTE: In this section, Parish names refer to worshipping communities, not church buildings.
5.3.2 Phase One

- There is a clear understanding that roles will change during this time, incorporating blended parish and regional roles.
- Develop detailed role descriptions for the congregational and wider Deanery roles for each position and person.
- Develop working terms for the ministry team including schedule of meetings, lines of accountability, and means of review.
- The following priests will continue:
  - Jeremy Clark-King – St. Martin’s
  - Keith Gilbert – St. Agnes
  - Lynne McNaughton – St. Clement’s
  - Christine Rowe – St. Catherine’s
- The following priest will continue in phase one, until the canonical process for St. John’s has been completed:
  - Gary Hamblin – St. John’s
- The following deacons will continue:
  - Lizz Lindsay and Andrew Wilhelm-Boyles – St. Agnes
  - Elizabeth Mathers – St. Clement’s
- Recommend pastoral care, worship and ongoing responsibility for St. Clare be shared by the people of St. Clare and the incumbents and communities of St. Agnes and St. Clements effective September 1st and until the canonical process is completed.
- Incumbents will have their current positions modified in order to meet the vision of a shared ministry team working together to provide support for congregations and the community
- Assistance will be required for the clergy to discern gifts for the definition of roles within the Ministry Team.
- Recommend the Diocese start a canonical process for shared ordained appointments at St. Clare, St. Clements, St. John’s and St. Agnes so that new appointments can be made by the end of 2010 and by February 2011. This will require a blended selection process involving input from the worshipping communities, the Ministry Team, the Implementation Steering Committee and the Bishop's office.
- Recommend, for the purpose of continuity, consideration be given to the extension of the interim priests-in-charge at St. John’s and St. Clement’s, until the completion of the canonical process.
- Address on-going healing within the Deanery, to prepare for and support ongoing change management.

5.3.3 Phase Two

- Recommend the creation of a new regional position for a half-time Youth Co-ordinator, to be funded by the release of assets and CTF monies within the Deanery.
- Recommend the creation of a curacy position within the Deanery, allowing the curate to participate in and learn from a new model of ministry as it is being formed.
- These positions would be funded by monies released by the sale of assets and the available CTF money (Refer to Table 1: Fund Allocation in section 5.5 Shared Resources for additional information).

**Ministry Centre Clergy Appointments - February 2011**

- Appointments would be made to provide the following congregational and Deanery assignments:
  - St. Martin and St. John:
    - Current incumbent at St. Martin to continue full-time
    - Appointment of a part-time clergy
  - St. Agnes, St. Clare and St. Clement:
    - Appointment of one full-time and one part-time clergy
  - St. Catherine:
    - Current incumbent to continue full-time
    - Appointment of a part-time clergy
- All clergy will have both local and Deanery responsibilities.
- Ministry roles to be funded in part by monies released by the sale of assets and the available CTF money (Refer to Table 1: Fund Allocation in section 5.5 Shared Resources for additional information).
- Recommend that the roles of deacons be reviewed by the Diocese to reflect new models of shared ministry.
5.3.4 **Longer Term**

- Other Deanery focused roles to be developed and could include:
  - Parish/Deanery Nurses (St. Stephen’s Ministry)
  - Leadership development and training
- Congregations and the Deanery would actively engage in calling new deacons to ministry, for specific worshipping communities or for the whole Deanery

5.4 **Congregation and Deanery Development**

5.4.1 **Vision Elements**

- Mutual support of the diverse worshipping congregations of varying sizes in North Vancouver
- A church that explores and embraces new and traditional inherited models of ministry and liturgy
- Collaborative, integrated programming delivered regionally and/or locally
- Mutual support and evaluation of major building projects
- Consider centralization of salaries of all paid staff
- Changed structure and governance model which is effective and relevant, including
  - Regional Council
  - Local parish councils

5.4.2 **Phase One**

- Deanery Steering committee continues in an implementation role
- Recommend the creation of a Regional Council with
  - Clearly defined roles and responsibilities
  - Size, representation, proportional content, wardens, clergy, and governance to be determined
  - Ongoing discussion and consultation with the Diocese is required
- Identify activities that must be delivered locally e.g. pastoral care, some weekly worship, some rentals
- Development of a new process for recruitment, selection and appointment of team members, taking into consideration the attributes and needs of congregations, as well as the new Deanery-wide (Regional) responsibilities
  - This new regional canonical committee would be made up of representatives from the congregation and the region

5.4.3 **Phase Two**

- The Regional Council assumes its new responsibilities
- Recommend a Regional Covenant be drawn up and signed, recognizing and celebrating the identity of the Deanery

5.4.4 **Longer Term**

- Review of organizational structure 18 months after implementation

5.5 **Stewardship of Resources**

5.5.1 **Vision Elements**

- The Deanery and the three Ministry Centres will be self-sufficient, contributing their full apportionment to the Diocese and keeping up with loans/mortgages for capital expenses
- Shared ministry across the Deanery
- Shared financial resources at the neighbourhood and regional level so that the mission of the Region can be appropriately funded
- Shared Regional administration to be explored for book-keeping, publications and duplication, web design and maintenance
5.5.2 Phase One

- Establish the process of sharing resources on a pilot basis to allow operations flexibility
- Parish Treasurers' Group to develop a financial budget to support the Deanery Ministry Plan
  + Refer to Appendix B for The Deanery of North Vancouver, Statement of Revenue and Expenses for
  the year ending December 31, 2009
- Recommend a proposed plan be implemented to retire St. Clare's and St. John's outstanding debts, and as
  soon as practicable restart payments on St. John's loan (refer to Tables 1 and 2).
- Recommend a new regional position be created for a half-time Children and Youth Co-ordinator, for an
  initial 2 year term, to be funded by the release of assets and CTF monies within the Deanery.
- A Deanery curacy position be created by the Diocese, to be funded in combination by the release of assets
  and CTF monies within the Deanery and the Diocesan Growth Fund. This will allow the curate to
  participate in and learn from a new model of ministry as it is being formed within the Deanery.
- Recommend the allocation of funds as per Table 3:

Table 1: Sale of Assets

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Asset</th>
<th>Estimated Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>St. Clare rectory</td>
<td>$800,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Clare Church</td>
<td>$1,123,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Richard's Church</td>
<td>$1,123,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Richard's CTF</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$3,346,400</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*estimates may vary due to zoning and development restrictions under the District of North Vancouver's
Official Community Plan

Proceeds to the Deanery

50% of Total $1,673,200

Table 2: Loan Repayments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Loan</th>
<th>Estimated Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>St. Clare -- loan</td>
<td>$419,545</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. John's -- loan arrears</td>
<td>$47,643</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. John's -- unpaid assessment</td>
<td>$87,132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$554,320</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*loan repayment amount contingent on the Deanery receiving 50% of the proceeds

Remaining Funds $1,118,880

Table 3: Draft Ministry Plan Fund Allocation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ministry</th>
<th>Estimated Cost – over 5 years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Deanery part-time youth ministry worker</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deanery part-time adult educator</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deanery Stewardship campaign</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missional neighbourhood consultant</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curacy -- for 2 years*</td>
<td>$120,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shared Ministry team training and development</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding for Pilot Ministry Projects i.e. Store front</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real Estate/building &amp; property assessments</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renovations of Church Buildings</td>
<td>$550,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,100,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Partially funded by the Diocesan Growth Fund
5.5.3 Phase Two
- Develop alternative sources of income including:
  - Enterprises
  - Rent
  - Grants (from foundations and other agencies)
- Develop a Deanery plan for legacy giving opportunities
- Identify one or more projects that could be accomplished by the Region, with the human and financial resources that are available, possibly in partnership with other agencies

5.5.4 Longer Term
- Assess projects and determine whether there is a continued requirement
- Consider whether other needs emerged that need addressing
Appendix A: MAP Mandate Questions

1. Serving Community: What is God calling us to do in North Vancouver?

**Focus on Community**

| Where we are today? | • Who is our community?  
|                    | • What are the demographics?  
|                    | • How are we present in the neighbourhood?  
|                    | • What is God calling us to do?  
| Looking at others? | • What models of Christian communities exist in other provinces, states or countries (bishop’s question)  
| Where we want to be? | • How can we be present in the neighbourhood?  

**Focus on Anglican Identity**

| Where we are today? | • What is an Anglican presence in North Vancouver?  
|                    | • What model/s of leadership should we be exploring?  
|                    | • What is our presence? Why do we want to continue?  
| Looking at others? | • What are other models of Anglican communities that exist around the world, the country, BC?  
| Where we want to be? | • How does our church need to change to meet the needs of the community around us?  

2. Renewing our Anglican Faith: What might constitute a lively expression of our Anglican roots for the 21st Century?

**Engaging Anglican Community**

| • How do we keep everyone actively engaged in ways that are meaningful and engaging for them?  

**Worship**

| • How strongly do we feel about traditional worship? Are we willing to change?  
| • How can we make our liturgies more open, accessible and welcoming?  

3. Sharing Resources: What is good stewardship of the assets and resources we have been given?

**Within the Anglican Community**

| • How can we become financially sustainable?  
| • What do we mean by sustainable/vital?  

**To engage the Wider Community**

| • Why growth? What do we want to grow?  
| • How do we continue to celebrate and refine the best of what we have and do, to grow, and to meet the changing needs of the community?  
| • How do we reconcile inertia and busyness?  

Appendix B: MAP Consensus Statements

The following are statements agreed on by consensus by the North Vancouver Deanery MAP team.

a. Sacred space is important for the worshipping community and the wider community.
b. As Anglicans we are a visible sign of the presence of God in North Vancouver through worship and community outreach.
c. God's work is towards reconciliation and the transformation of peoples' lives.
d. We respond to the needs of the local community/neighbourhood, together as a Deanery and separately.
e. We are called to show the transformative power of God where we are.
f. God's mission includes:
   - Diverse, broad and relevant worship
   - Nurturing peoples' lives of faith.
   - Supporting clergy and staff.
   - Pastoral care.
   - Fellowship in Christian community.
g. God's mission in the wider community includes:
   - To be always seeking what the needs are by listening to the community.
   - To be with people on the margins.
   - Focus together e.g. refugees, Sharing Abundance, justice issues, community needs, environment.
   - To be actively serving in the community.

h. We value the unique diverse worshipping communities in this Deanery.
i. The congregations and their worship styles do not necessarily depend on the buildings in which they are now practiced.
j. The status quo is not sustainable.
k. The MAP plan for the Deanery will proceed in stages (i.e. it will not all happen on June 30).
## Appendix C: Deanery of North Vancouver Statement of Revenue and Expenditures

### Deanery of North Vancouver

Statement of Revenue and Expenditures

For the year ended December 31, 2009

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>St. Agnes</th>
<th>St. Catherine's</th>
<th>St. Clare</th>
<th>St. Clement's</th>
<th>St. John's</th>
<th>St. Martin's</th>
<th>St. Richards</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Incomes</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost of Goods</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$757</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$757</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Church Fees</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$757</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$757</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Income</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$757</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$757</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Income</strong></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$757</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$757</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Expenditures

|                      |           |                |          |               |            |              |              |       |
|---                   |           |                |          |               |            |              |              |       |
| **Salaries**         | $113,049  | $113,050       | $51,120  | $319,899      | $136,192   | $137,284     | $137,284    | $715,349 |
| Accounting Fees/Rev. | $0        | $1,722         | $0       | $0            | $1,800     | $1,451       | $1,451       | $4,592  |
| Advertising          | $369      | $680           | $1,852   | $333          | $1,899     | $605         | $605         | $5,392  |
| Assistance           | $30       | $72,740        | $0       | $0            | $13,073    | $1,230       | $1,230       | $47,743 |
| Bank Charges         | $739      | $2,891         | $497     | $263          | $1,157     | $512         | $512         | $6,551  |
| **Building Mainte.** | $18,368   | $18,085        | $10,255  | $3,291        | $8,542     | $7,403       | $7,403       | $54,012 |
| **Total Expenses**   | $137,284  | $137,284       | $51,120  | $319,899      | $136,192   | $137,284     | $137,284    | $715,349 |

### Net Income

|                      |           |                |          |               |            |              |              |       |
|---                   |           |                |          |               |            |              |              |       |
| **Net Income (Loss)**| $(3,900)  | $(116,864)     | $(54,677)| $(8,860)      | $(5,851)   | $(10,788)    | $(10,788)    | $(202,261)|
| **Restricted Income**| $52,089  | $52,089        |          |               |            |              |              | $52,089 |
| **Restricted Fund Expenditures**| $(53,044)| $(53,044)      |          |               |            |              |              | $(53,044)|
| **Net Income (Loss)**| $(3,900)  | $(116,864)     | $(54,677)| $(8,860)      | $(5,851)   | $(10,788)    | $(10,788)    | $(202,261)|

### Statements

|                      |           |                |          |               |            |              |              |       |
|---                   |           |                |          |               |            |              |              |       |
| **Average Sunday Attendance**| 54        | 154            | 25       | 65            | 90         | 99           | 15          | 493    |
| **Households**       | 72        | 320            | 271      | 77            | 159        | 146          | 14           | 474    |
| **Clarity (25+40+60+80)* | 1.50      | 1.03           | 1.25     | 1             | 1          | 7            | 2            | 7      |
| **Administrative Staff**| 0.56      | 0.75           | 0.50     | 0.50          | 0.50       | 0.50         | 0.50         | 2.75   |
| **Paid CEO/Custodian**| 0.56      | 0.75           | 0.50     | 0.50          | 0.50       | 0.50         | 0.50         | 2.75   |
| **Paid CEO/Custodian**| 0.56      | 0.75           | 0.50     | 0.50          | 0.50       | 0.50         | 0.50         | 2.75   |
| **Paid CEO/Custodian**| 0.56      | 0.75           | 0.50     | 0.50          | 0.50       | 0.50         | 0.50         | 2.75   |

### Results

|                      |           |                |          |               |            |              |              |       |
|---                   |           |                |          |               |            |              |              |       |
| **Average Giving per Household**| $1,520    | $1,021         | $1,031   | $1,510        | $700       | $717         | $717         | $4,545  |
| **Total Expense per Household**| $1,959    | $1,491         | $1,491   | $1,491        | $1,491     | $1,491       | $1,491       | $4,471  |
| **Gross Income per Household**| $1,520    | $1,021         | $1,031   | $1,510        | $700       | $717         | $717         | $4,545  |
| **Profitability/Revenue% (Gross Only)**| -24%      | -46%           | -57%     | -34%          | -18%       | -10%         | -10%         | -46%   |

### Notes

1. The data reflects the financial statement for the year ended December 31, 2009, for the Deanery of North Vancouver.
2. All figures are in Canadian dollars.
3. The statement includes all income and expenses related to the diocesan activities.
4. The net income represents the surplus or deficit after all expenses have been deducted from the total income.
5. The figures are rounded to the nearest dollar for ease of reading.