

Clergy Terms of Service

The implications for Ministerial Review and CME

Just over two years ago the Introductory Material issued with the Draft Terms of Service Regulations set out an expectation

that all clergy should take part in regular and discerning Ministerial Development Reviews and make full use of Continuing Ministerial Education to help them flourish and develop in the expression of their vocation

It is now clear that when Clergy Terms of Service are introduced in 2010, Common Tenure Office holders will be required to

- Participate in an annual Ministerial Review (now usually called Ministerial Development Review MDR)
- Undertake a specified amount of CME (now usually called Continuing Ministerial Development CMD)

The Regulations relating to Clergy Terms of Service are still being debated, but we can take an educated guess at what lies ahead

The Future of Ministerial Review

The ministry Division of the Archbishops Council issued some interim advice on Ministerial Review last year and it is worth quoting:

<http://www.cofe.anglican.org/lifeevents/ministry/workofmindiv/dracsc/rctshomepage/mdr.doc>

Ministerial development review is founded on the assumption that all office holders are responsible to God for the ministry entrusted to them and that they are accountable to the Church and to one another for the way in which it is exercised. Ministry is a gift and a trust for which each individual holds account. Accountability is about preparedness to grow and develop on the basis of experience and the learning gained from it. It is also about how the work is done and how individual ministry can make a real difference. It is about affirmation and encouragement as well as challenge.

The purpose of the review is to look back and reflect on what has happened over the last year or two of ministry and, informed by that, look forward to plan, anticipate and develop a clearer vision for what lies ahead..

Whatever model of review preparation is prepared or adopted by the diocese the office holder should spend some time reflecting on their progress towards the objectives set at their last review, or at appointment. They are recommended to ask themselves:

- How far have the objectives been met, or have they changed?
- How fruitful have the objectives been in the life of the parish/benefice/the focus of ministry?
- How have the objectives fitted in with the objectives that the local church has set for itself?
- How have the objectives supported the mission of the diocese?
- How fruitful have the objectives been for the postholder personally?

Ministry Division proposes a system for MDR that:

- Turns on a questionnaire
- Includes feedback from colleagues.
- Sets clear (and SMART) objectives.
- Includes a Review meeting in which the office holder does most of the talking,
- And in which there is some real discussion
- Produces a written report for the Bishop.
- Acknowledges that the report will be kept in the office holder's blue file (the file held by the Bishop which is passed on if the office holder moves dioceses)

The Ministry Division document goes on to offer, in broad outline, a number of different ways in which the questionnaire at the heart of MDR might be constructed. So, the starting point could be:

- The Ordinal
- The Diocesan Mission Plan, or *Vision and Values*
- Core Competencies of Ministry (Leadership, Collaborative skills, Worship...)
- Objectives

In practice this means that, for the time being, in this diocese, MDR will continue as before.

- We already arrange our questionnaires around objectives set in Episcopal Review.
- Episcopal Review already gathers feedback from others.
- We already have a system in which clergy reflect on their own ministry and then discuss their insights.
- We already produce written reports.
- All that really changes is that there will be a clear undertaking that these Reviews *must* happen annually and *must* produce a written report.

It seems probable that in years to come there will be further change. As we become more self conscious about employment laws it is quite likely that MDR will need to be more carefully focussed on areas of difficulty and on the resources and training that can help us overcome those difficulties. In the immediate future though, the only change we are really likely to notice is a slight increase in the attention we pay to the way objectives are set and monitored. Ministry Division have already set out the kind of language we might expect to be using; language long familiar to those who have had secular employment.

- *what change does the office holder want to bring about?*
- *is it congruent with their role description?*
- *how will it support the parish/deanery or diocesan mission strategy?*
- *how will they do it?*

- *do they need support, training or development to facilitate this change and what steps will they take to receive this?*
- *how will they know whether the objective has been met? (what will success look like?)*
- *what are the milestones to success? (an action plan)*
- *how will they keep track of progress? (arrangements for monitoring)*

Continuing Ministerial Development

Rather less guidance is currently available about what kind of expectations there are about training. There are three key developments

1. CMD will be mandatory
2. We do not know how much CMD will be required but in professional life 3-6 days training each year is common.
3. We do not know if there will have to be a particular style or content to this training, but Ministry Division advises that it should be:
 - ❖ *Good quality*
 - ❖ *Relevant to practice*
 - ❖ *Linked to key points of transition in ministry*

What that means in practice is that we will probably focus more on the moments of change:

- The transition from curacy to incumbency
- The transition to a new parish
- The moment parishes are newly amalgamated
- The transition into new responsibility (like becoming an Area Dean or a Training Incumbent)
- The recognition that being in mid-ministry or late ministry might feel like a time of stock taking

We will also, gradually, see other changes in CMD:

- We will need to be clearer than we are that all our clergy need equal access to training and that more and more of the non-stipendiary and retired clergy bear significant responsibility for the continuing life of local churches.
- We will have to address the changing profile of ministry, in 2010 there are likely to be as many self supporting (SSMs) and active retired clergy as stipendiary clergy. 22% of those ordained as SSMs are retiring as stipendiaries. Ordinands are older; in the near future the average ordinand will have less than twenty years of ministry ahead of them.
- Provision for training is currently 'front loaded' it focuses on first incumbent, but there is now a growing trend towards leadership courses
- We will have to think about what we can afford. What should be the average spend on Continuing Ministerial development (CMD) for each priest?

- As we increase our commitment to working collaboratively we will need to develop a growing culture of training clergy and laity together
- We will need to refine the link between Ministerial Review (MDR) and training. Are we giving the right resources to the right people?
- Are we doing succession planning - identifying and training future leaders of CMD?

None of these changes are likely to come quickly and for many years we will be in a culture in which only some of our clergy are required to do CMD. Much of the responsibility for seeking and completing appropriate training will pass to each individual. Diocesan Officers will offer some training, but will also probably have the job of acting as a clearing house for opportunities available elsewhere. Diocesan Officers will certainly have to monitor the quality of what is on offer and log who is doing what.