

Diocese of Rupert's Land
Executive Committee Minutes
April 18, 2023, St. George, Crescentwood, Winnipeg

Present = P Partially Present = P* Regrets = R Absent = A (*) = *ex officio*

R	Akinwale, The Rev. Wilson	P	Rampton, The Rev. Andrew
P	Blaikie, The Ven. Simon (*Exec. Arch.)	P	Ripley, Jim (*Chancellor)
P	Cummings, Lucy	P	Robinson, The Rev. Theo
P	Dorrian, Colin	P	Routley, Mrs. Sharon (*Treasurer)
P	Johnson, The Very Rev. Paul (*Dean)	P	Russell, Mr. Gary
P	Labdon, The Ven. Dave (*Archdeacon)	R	Woodcroft, The Rt. Rev. Geoffrey (*Bishop)
P	Lampman, The Ven. Paul (*Archdeacon)	Staff (Present not voting)	
P	Mawejje, The Ven. Godfrey (*Archdeacon)	P	Nixon, Melissa (office coordinator)
P	Manzongo, The Ven. Naboth (*Archdeacon)	P	Valencerina, Joy (director of finance)

1. Call to Order -1:31 pm

Welcome, land acknowledgement, and opening prayer – Read by S. Blaikie

2. Land acknowledgment

3. Regrets – Read by S. Blaikie

4. Approval of Agenda

Motion: *Be it resolved that the Agenda for the 18 April 2023 meeting (including the application for Youth Ministry grant as #9) of the Executive Committee be approved*

Moved by G. Mawejje, Seconded by J. Ripley

Carried

5. Approval of Minutes from 21 March 2023

Motion: *Be it resolved that the meeting minutes from 21 March 2023 of the Executive Committee be adopted*

Moved by J. Ripley, Seconded by L. Cummings

Carried

6. Bishop's reflection on CM&M

Highlights of the Bishop's Consideration on The Common Ministry and Mission Task Group Report, and Subsequent Motions (as read by S. Blaikie)

- I thank the Common Ministry and Mission (CM&M) Task Group for their great effort and dedication utilized through the gathering of information, and their subsequent deliberations concerning that information. It has been a daunting task and heightened by the very real decline of parishes in general. The Task Group was mandated to make a report to Diocesan Council (DC); it is incumbent upon DC to decide on how it wishes to use the information supplied by the report to carry out its responsibilities and duties. At the January 2023 meeting of DC the matter was referred to the Executive Committee.
- The report accurately and comprehensively communicates the results of the committee's conversations/surveys of various parishes, clergy and deaneries. In reviewing the motions, which were later affixed to the report, I see that there are uncertainties and misunderstandings of both the Task Group and those surveyed about CM&M's yearly application and approach.
- I offer the following observations in regards to the four proposed motions. In general, the 'motions' appear to me to be suggestions that may warrant further discussion going forward:
 - Common Ministry and Mission or Apportionment as it was known as in 2004 has been the subject of discussion at DC, Executive Committee since at least 2004. It was likely discussed at the 101st Session of Synod of the Diocese of Rupert's Land, was the subject of Motion C-13

of the 102nd Session of Synod of Rupert's Land (2006) and Motion B10 of the 108th Session of the Synod of Rupert's Land (2018). Much of these discussions/meetings included much of the information requested by the first motion offered by the Task Group. As it is the role of Council to be the Synod between Synods, it is incumbent upon the Executive Committee or an appointed committee of DC to unpack and memorialize the origins, motions and practical implementation of CMM, to give the DC the necessary foundation to make educated decisions regarding that motion.

- In regards to the second proposed motion, there is no such designation as “a parish in arrears”. Simply stated, neither the Director of Finance nor the Bishop have a mandate to reduce parish services, Synod status or removal of incumbent priests regarding a parish in arrears.
- The 3rd and 4th motions direct the “Diocese” to assume responsibility for the action, and infer that the DC expects that work to be completed by Diocesan Staff. DC does not have the authority to assign tasks to the Diocesan Staff, or any other body, other than Treasurer and Secretary of Synod. The staff continues to honor requests for information, clarity on policy and archival research. Diocesan staff continues to administer provisional and year-end forms on behalf of DC, and offers mid-term and yearend reports of CM&M behaviour within the Diocese proper.
- Motion B10 of the 108th Synod also sets into motion the requirement for every second meeting Of Diocesan Synod to review the CM&M Contribution Rate. We are long over-due for such a review and it is imperative that Diocesan Council prepare Synod 2024 to accomplish this work.
- Therefore, it is my recommendation that DC establish a CMM working group of 6-10 members with the general goal of addressing the substance of our Common Ministry and Mission at the Diocesan Synod of 2024. I recommend that DC make every effort to nominate to the Bishop, names of individuals who are knowledgeable and skilled practitioners with both theological insight and sound fiduciary understanding for appointment as soon as possible. Nominees need not be members of DC, however, the working group will include two members of DC. The work of animating CMM requires DC's immediate attention and understanding to properly address our present fiscal situation.

The responsibility of DC is to call the parishes to each make their annual CM&M contribution, monitor the effectiveness or ineffectiveness, and prescribe necessary changes to CM&M, and in my opinion it is incumbent upon DC to fulfil the mandate set forth by the acts of Diocesan Synod.

Finally, I assure the Executive Committee and the DC that I am doing my very best address CM&M, and the issues articulated in the task-group report; and shall continue to do so.

Motion: *Be it resolved that the Executive Committee recommends to the Diocesan Council establish a CMM working group of 6-10 people and that members of Diocesan Council nominate potential people to the Bishop as soon as possible.*

Moved by G. Russell/ Seconded by G. Mawejje

Carried

-A. Rampton asked since the projected date of Synod 2024 is about 18 months away, and we don't expect next years deficit to get any smaller, will the diocese be solvent in a year, is this a matter than can wait? Discussion ensued around calling synod earlier and it would likely be part of the directive of the working group.

-S. Blaikie mentions that we've heard the term “summit” used lately in terms of CM+M but also about evangelism, about parishes amalgamating, about all the things the diocese and the parishes are currently facing. So there likely will need to be a gathering of the minds before Synod 2024

7. Bishop's reflection on Discipleship Developer Position

Highlights of Bishop Geoff's Reflection (as read by S. Blaikie): The Discipleship Developer position, in relation to MNO's Congregational Development Position

- I am grateful for the Task Group work and creativity in developing the Job Description we accepted and owned at the February DC.
- In February 2023 Bishop Jason Zinko asked us to test DC regarding a shared Discipleship/ Congregation Developer. I sent the MNO job design to the DC early in March, asking that DC consider Bishop Zinko's request, and come to the next council meeting prepared to discuss.
- I received several responses from our membership:
 - many simply stating that they agreed with the content of the MNO proposal, or with what other council members stated.
 - Several voiced concurrence with joint Anglican and Lutheran work and structures. Some early respondents cautioned that 50% was not enough to meet the goals of DC's Discipleship Developer job description.
 - Responses also came later, particularly after the last DC meeting. They cautioned the loss of ability to propel to our position to do what we want and expect of it. Issues raised:
 - how will time be shared,
 - have the bishop's agreed to do something together,
 - a venture such as this would require a vigorous attempt by both churches to design and implement,
 - does the MNO and Diocese over-lap enough, or would MNO require more of the allotted time
 - It appears that the position from both Anglican and Lutheran perspectives is an ordained role, is there one person with the experience and knowledge in both groups?
- As I reviewed the responses, I observed that ecumenism and cost effectiveness were common themes.
- Bishop Jason and I recently met about the proposal. We agreed that the USA job description and the DRL job description both require full-time incumbents, both remain denomination specific as they are written, and that MNO is ready to discuss further. We agreed that our respective polity(ies) require much addressing before something of this nature can truly flourish. We do not wish to pursue this opportunity at this time.

Therefore, I wish to move ahead with the appointment/ hiring of a Diocesan Discipleship Developer. However, the appointment/hiring cannot be subject to the approval of the 2024, and subsequent years, Diocesan budgets for at least two reasons. First, it would be unethical to appoint/hire someone, potentially have then uproot their families and move to Winnipeg, only to have their position terminated within the next few years. Second, it will take at least five years for this work to begin to bear fruit. Therefore, and keeping in mind the second position of Urban Indigenous Ministry Developer is in a similarly tenuous position, I propose the following motion be made:

Be it resolved that the Executive Committee recommends that Diocesan Council approve the costs associated with the stipend, benefits and program support for the two positions, i.e. Urban Indigenous Ministry Developer and Diocesan Discipleship Developer be removed as an operating cost of the Diocesan budget and be coded against the New Church Development Fund and that this be in effect from January 1, 2023 until the end of Fiscal Year 2028. *Moved by P. Lampman / Seconded by G. Mawejje* **Carried**

-S. Routley says things have to change, we spend so much time arguing about the dollars and cents, but we need to come together to do things differently, to try to revitalize ourselves, and bring in new people with different ideas and accept those ideas.

-P. Johnson agrees with Bishop Woodcroft in that we cannot call someone to help and heal our community and then fire him next year. We need to commit to funding the position, and it appears the best option that we should do it from the New Church Development Fund

-D. Labdon points out that built into the job description is that in the first 6 - 12 months, the individual have to come up with a plan that they will put in place across the diocese and will have to report to council on how that will actually be implanted. There is a lot of overlap with the CM+M work and those reports will be helpful for the new position. If DC were to send out a letter or questionnaire to parishes, asking about what they offer (Christian education, outreach) and how they have responded to the A resolutions of Synod 2022, then we would have little bits of gold dust for the person coming into the position

-G. Mawejje pointed out that this fund is titled the New Church development fund, while this is not how it was imagined it would happen, we are using it, to plant a seed and grow ourselves into a new church.

8. Discussion on the acts of the 116th & 118th Session of Synod

S. Blaikie quickly reviewed the act of the 116th Session of Synod with particular care to how B-11 is a continuation of the B-15 committee.

S. Blaikie filled in status updates for 118th session of Synod;

A-1 – ongoing*; A-2 – ongoing*; A-3 – ongoing*; A-4 – ongoing*

(*need to be engaging with our parishes and our disciples about how this is coming to fruition in their lives and in their parishes)

S. Blaikie suggests DC may want to send a letter out to parishes inviting comments, stories, some method of check in on these resolutions. If this was done before or during the interview process it would save the individual months of work and may help form questions to ask during the interview.

All motions from the *Presentation of motions by the Treasurer* are completed.

C-1 - completed

C2, C3, C4, C5 – many thanks to the Anti-black racism committee for taking this on. The first deadline is in C-4 and has a deadline for Faith Horizons 2023

C6, C7, – ongoing, a letter will need to be drafted by DC asking each parish to answer this question.

C8 – Will need to come to the May 2023 DC meeting so they can decide how they plan on achieving this goal.

C9 – In Progress. Bishop Woodcroft just finished working with a discipleship program on Monday nights. He has also booked a sabbatical for June and in September with Haney at the Virginia Theological Seminary particularly on Anglicism and what it looks like in today's context.

C-10 – has this happened? Is this planned to happen? A letter to follow up will be necessary.

C-11 – ongoing, how can we ensure non-ordained chaplains don't get missed?

9. New Business

Youth Grant Application – brief summary of the application reviewed

Motion: *Be it resolved that the Executive Committee approve the Youth Ministry Grant application for St. Aidan's mission trip to Leaf Rapids, providing the safety plan is completed.*

Moved by P. Johnson/ Seconded by G. Mawejje

Carried
(1 abstention)

10. Announcements

-Include approved Diocesan council minutes, and a link on where to find them on the website in the weekly "4 your parish".

-T. Robinson reminded us all about the upcoming Clergy Conference and how the topic is centered around sharing and listening to each other's stories and how that theme applies to Resolution A-1

- Bishop Geoffrey Woodcroft & Rev. Abraham Chuol received the Queen Elizabeth II Platinum Jubilee Medal

-G. Russell filled us in on his work with the Franciscan order and the presentation he is making.

11. Adjournment – 2:55 pm

Motion: *Be it resolved that Executive council be adjourned*

Moved by J. Ripley.