

Missionary Diocese of Tasmania

Review of Enabler Supported Ministry

Final Report

April, 2006

Jeff McKinnon

deeperplace ministries (Incorporated)

1.

Contents

Introduction	Page 2
Process	Page 3
Methodology	Page 4
Observations & Findings	
The ESM model	Page 5
The ministry support teams	Page 12
The enablers	Page 15
Recommendations	
The ESM model	Page 20
The ministry support teams	Page 22
The enablers	Page 23
Appendices	
1. Channel-Cygnnet	
2. Circular Head	
3. Hamilton	
4. New Norfolk	
5. Penguin	
6. Riverlinks	
7. St Helens	
8. Sheffield	

Introduction

It has been an honour to serve the Missionary Diocese of Tasmania and the Enabler Supported Ministry (ESM) parishes through this review process.

The objective of this consultation has been: 'to assess the implementation of ESM in Tasmania with reference to its impact on parish health'. Specific areas explored were determined in consultation with the Diocesan Mission Enabler.

The eight parishes consulted were those listed on page 1. West Coast Parish, which commenced ESM during the period of this review, was not included.

This was a formative review only - the continuance of the ESM model within the diocese was never in question. Because this review covers many different issues relating to ESM this Report contains a larger than usual number of Observations and Findings. Recommendations have been deliberately kept to a workable minimum.

In addition to this Report, an appendix relevant to each parish has been prepared with any local information gleaned that may be of assistance. A copy of this Report, all appendices and a Private Report have been forwarded to the Diocesan Mission Enabler.

Thank you to all who contributed to this process. I appreciate the busyness of ministry support teams, parish councils, enablers, clergy and Diocesan Ministry Council members. I hope that our times of reflection together have both deepened your awareness and encouraged you.

In particular I wish to acknowledge those who arranged my visits in each centre.

Thank you too for the generous hospitality and fellowship afforded me in my visits. It was a real delight and encouragement to meet warm communities of leaders seeking to be God's servants in their locations. I was very impressed by the calibre and dedication of so many. Please be assured of my on-going prayers.

Jeff McKinnon.

Process

The following process has been followed:

8 September 2005	Initial meeting with the Diocesan Mission Enabler to establish the scope of the review.
20 September 2005	Interview with the north-west enabler
22 September 2005	Interview with the Riverlinks enabler
12 October 2005	Meeting with the Penguin Ministry Support Team
12 October 2005	Meeting with the Penguin Parish Council
18 October 2005	Meeting with the Circular Head Parish Council
18 October 2005	Meeting with the Circular Head Ministry Support Team
19 October 2005	Meeting with the Sheffield Parish Council
26 October 2005	Clergy Comment Group (open to all clergy present at the annual Clergy Conference)
28 October 2005	Meeting with the Sheffield Ministry Support Team
9 November 2005	Meeting with the Diocesan Ministry Council
9 November 2005	Interview with the south-east enabler
5 December 2005	Meeting with the Channel-Cygnet Ministry Support Team
5 December 2005	Meeting with the Channel-Cygnet Parish Council
9 December 2005	Combined meeting with the St Helens Parish Council & Ministry Support Team
2 February 2006	Meeting with the New Norfolk Ministry Support Team
2 February 2006	Meeting with the New Norfolk Parish Council

4.

20 February 2006	Meeting with the Riverlinks Parish Council
22 February 2006	Meeting with the Hamilton Ministry Support Team
22 February 2006	Meeting with the Hamilton Parish Council
6 March 2006	Meeting with the Riverlinks Ministry Support Team
12 March 2006	Interview with one ministry support team member
23 March 2006	Questionnaires sent out to eight interstate enabled ministry practitioners who had recently observed Tasmanian ESM parishes (one reply)
26 April 2006	Presentation of this Report to the Diocesan Ministry Council in Hobart
29 April 2006	Presentation of this Report to diocesan and ESM parish representatives at Longford

Methodology

5 Interviews with the Diocesan Mission Enabler, the enablers and one Ministry support team member

15 Target Groups

2 Comment Groups

Mapping Exercise - Local Church Health Benchmarks (adapted from Christian A. Schwarz)

Questionnaire to xx interstate enabled ministry practitioners who had recently observed Tasmanian ESM parishes

11 Submissions were received, including a copy of the Bishop's 2004 Vision statement, *transforminglife*.

Documents received from the diocese - two extensive folders of background materials

Observations & Findings

The ESM model

General

1. It was reported that the ESM model has been the cause of significant discussion and lobbying within and beyond the diocese. Some perceive that some priests felt threatened by the ESM model.
2. A number of respondents claimed that the longer ESM has functioned in the diocese the more positive folk tend to be concerning the ESM model. This appears to be generally true at both parish and diocesan levels.
3. Though differing ecclesiastical positions continue, there seems to be an increasing acceptance of the ESM model within the diocese.
4. The Bishop has stated, "I am fully convinced that the concept of Enabler Supported Ministry leadership is a key ministry model for us" (*transforminglife* page 16) and, "we must adopt ministry options that allow us to live within our means" (*transforminglife* page 20).
5. Some claimed that there is confusion amongst many Tasmanian Anglicans regarding ESM. Others suggested that equal confusion exists within and between other dioceses concerning ministry models and ordination.
6. Some suggested that diocesan structures were not designed for ESM and at times don't support the development of ESM; that in the past some diocesan decisions have been made without proper awareness of the ESM parishes; and that diocesan mail addressed to "the rector" communicated a lack of respect and awareness of the sacrificial role being played by ministry support teams. It was suggested that these insensitivities are now diminishing as ESM becomes more broadly established across the state.
7. One person claimed, "The diocese does not yet have an ESM philosophy. Often a program to meet all needs is offered rather than equipping people for ministry."
8. Some respondents were concerned about "local ordination". Some felt that:
 - ◆ the terminology being used is very poor;

6.

- ◆ there is need for much greater clarity as to the status of both the locally ordained priests and the non-ordained ministry support team members;
 - ◆ the model confuses ordination and incumbency;
 - ◆ there is inconsistency in requiring ordination to celebrate holy communion but not for preaching; and
 - ◆ the model as developed so far is not in harmony with the Ordinal.
9. Others could see that the adoption of ESM was “a big risk for the Bishop” and are thankful that that risk was taken. “A healthy church will be a risk taking community.” (*transforminglife* page 6)
10. Some parishes are very appreciative of the close working relationship they have with the diocese.
11. Despite some specific areas of concern, there is widespread support amongst respondents for the general direction the Bishop is taking the diocese.
12. Some suggest that some clergy-based parishes are already adopting much or some of the ESM philosophy. Others believe that clergy should be encouraged and trained to ‘enable’ their parishes. “We need to build up our parishes before they lose energy and capacity. Don’t let them become too small before taking action.”
13. It would appear that the ESM model is generally functioning very well in a number of parishes. Some parishes report having experienced phenomenal change of heart since moving from the clergy-based model. “This is one of the best periods in the long history of this church”. “God is in this way of being church.” “The Holy Spirit has been with us through ups and downs”.
14. Numerous respondents suggested that the model has worked very well wherever it has been properly applied.
15. A number of parishes reported the importance of prayer and faith behind their effectiveness.
16. It was reported that although ESM parishes are generally not yet growing numerically some have, against trends in the wider diocese, stemmed the long-term tide of shrinking numbers.

7.

17. The ESM parishes widely reported that the model is life-giving and empowering for parish councils, ministry support teams and enablers, though it is also very tiring for ministry support teams. "ESM is self-directed transformation, the people are empowered to lead and minister."
18. A number of parishes reported that ESM was life-giving for parish councils because finances are no longer so tight now that clergy do not need to be paid. Parish Councils can now think more creatively and can ask what God wants to do.
19. One respondent stated that ESM is life-giving if participants feel genuinely supported and cared for as people, not just for what they do.
20. Some parishes report a greater mutuality between their parish councils and their ministry support teams than was previously experienced between parish councils and clergy. There is no evidence from this review of ESM causing any significant conflict between ministry support teams and parish councils.
21. There appears to have developed a lovely awareness and cooperative spirit between some ESM parishes ("We have come to love the other parishes.") including:
 - ◆ Shared youth ministry;
 - ◆ Assistance with funerals;
 - ◆ Safe Ministry training conducted between parishes;
 - ◆ Releasing the enabler's time to assist newer ESM parishes; and
 - ◆ Prayer for each other.
22. The ESM model appears to have created opportunities for women to minister and lead in numbers not previously seen in the diocese.

Location and Smaller Parishes

23. Location appears to be a secondary factor to the success of ESM. The primary issue appears to be the capacity, training and commitment of the ministry support team.
24. Some respondents suggested that ESM works best in rural centres due to:
 - ◆ Ministry support team members tend to have a quieter pace of life and more flexible lifestyles,
 - ◆ Rural communities tend to have a stronger community life, and
 - ◆ City folk often disappear on weekends.

25. On the other hand some respondents noted that urban centres and some regional centres may tend to have more capable leaders and ministry support team members compared to some smaller or isolated rural localities. It was also reported that the model is working well in some New Zealand urban parishes.
26. The ESM model has been, in part, a response by the diocese to shrinking parishes especially in rural areas. However the criticism that the ESM model is merely propping up unsustainable parishes is inaccurate.
27. The ESM model has brought fresh life, energy and transformation to four previously shrinking rural parishes. Indications at Riverlinks at this early stage suggest ESM will have a very positive impact in the parish, including its smaller rural centres.
28. Three of the eight ESM parishes reviewed appeared to be struggling due to internal factors and particular local setbacks. It was suggested that possibly ESM was introduced too late for some of these parishes to healthily adopt the model.
 - ◆ One of these parishes appears to be too small to sustain the ESM model and appears to be in need of an exit strategy from its current arrangements. Such a strategy ought to include full recognition of local needs and gifting within their ministry support team.
 - ◆ The other two of these parishes remain marginal under the ESM model.
29. One centre in one ESM parish has noticeable socio-economic factors that appear to hinder the development of the model in that town.
30. There is a range of views within the diocese regarding how much the ESM model can be modified to fit smaller centres and any unique circumstances whilst retaining its integrity:
 - ◆ Members of one ministry support team claimed that “the beauty of this new way of ministering is that it can be flexible” to suit smaller parishes.
 - ◆ Another respondent suggested that the limiting factor when ESM parishes are smaller is whether or not there are sufficient gifted people to effectively operate as the ministry support team. The danger of dominant personalities in smaller teams was also noted.
31. Some of the better examples of effective ESM parishes in Tasmania would be best described as “small parishes”.

32. Numerous respondents stated that the fundamental principle of a local ministry support team functioning “as the rector” under the supervision of and with the training and support of an external enabler must not be compromised.
33. The ESM model has already been applied in a variety of ways in Tasmania, including:
- ◆ How much contact the enabler has with the congregations;
 - ◆ Whether the enabler visits one day per week or stays for one block of time each month;
 - ◆ The number of preaching centres in the parish;
 - ◆ Whether multiple services are offered in the parish on any given Sunday or the parish seeks to travel as a whole to one location; and
 - ◆ The size of the ministry support team.
34. The multi-centred ESM parish (which is common in Tasmania) is not the model envisaged by Roland Allen. Nevertheless, ESM is functioning healthily in a number of multi-centred parishes.
35. There appears to be an assumption in some places that ‘church’ can only be done in traditional ways. This assumption unnecessarily ties up limited resources and hinders missional opportunities especially in smaller centres.
36. One respondent saw a huge resourcing crisis facing the diocese as numbers and finances dwindle. “Only 30% of parishes are able to cover stipendiary costs from offertory giving.” (*transforminglife* page 8) “The danger of this ESM Review is what it does not address. Can we sustain the rector model statewide? We can pull down assets for a time but the clock is ticking. We urgently need a review of the ministry and mission of the whole diocese.” It was suggested that parishes desperately need mentoring, support and resourcing and that the Diocesan vision must be resourced at the local level.
37. One respondent warned against rushing parishes into ESM and of having a “one-model-fits-all” mentality. Each parish needs to be carefully understood and a strategy offered that best meets its unique challenges.

Visionary Leadership & Missional Churches

38. Most respondents held that the ESM model encourages 'visionary' leadership when properly applied. It has the potential to significantly raise confidence and empower lay leaders. "We have freedom to explore new ideas and new skills". "Leaders and new ideas are emerging from beyond the ministry support team."
39. Some respondents expressed dislike for the term "visionary leadership' preferring emphasis on leaders being grounded in faith as God's pilgrim people, in touch with God and their community.
40. Most respondents held that the ESM model encourages shared decision-making and "ownership" of the mission of the parish.
41. The concept of "missional" churches varies according to one's theological perspective. The term in current usage tends to be contrasted against an "attractional" approach to church life. A number of respondents correctly emphasized a wholistic view of mission - that evangelism is only one (though very important) element of Christian mission. "Mission is not narrowed down to an activity of making individuals 'new creatures' ..." (David Bosch quoted in *transforminglife* page 18).
42. Some respondents pointed out that good ecclesiology ought to aid the church to be more missional. They saw the ESM model as good ecclesiology.
43. Most respondents held that the ESM model is not more or less missional than the traditional parish structure. Examples were given of the interest of non-church folk in the ESM model. However thus far many ESM ministry support teams have focused on worship services and pastoral care and have yet to address missional strategies (not necessarily to be carried out by the ministry support team).
44. One parish appears to have a legacy of past priests that hinders the development of a missional focus.

Theological Basis and Training

45. The theological basis of the ESM model appears to be much better understood in some parishes than in others.
46. Ministry support teams generally understand the theological basis of the ESM model better than parish councils.

47. Some respondents reported that many members of ESM congregations have very limited or no understanding of the model and the theological perspectives that undergird it.
48. The early implementation and reception of ESM appear to have been quite different in various parishes. Some found the documents and accessibility of diocesan staff and folk from other ESM parishes very helpful. Others found there was too much paperwork that was rarely read.
49. How new parishes are introduced into the ESM model is an important issue to be addressed. It has been suggested that a prescribed training model, based on past experience could be helpfully developed.
50. It was widely reported that it takes significant time and effort to grasp the full implications of ESM and to understand its theological underpinnings. It was suggested that the change-over ought not to be rushed.
51. The need was expressed for on-going education of teams and parish members as personnel changes over time.

Critical Issues

52. Critical issues suggested for the effective implementation of ESM offered by participants included:
- ◆ faith and prayer, personal relationships with Christ;
 - ◆ the support and encouragement of the congregation(s);
 - ◆ the willingness of the ministry support team and the parish council to embrace the model;
 - ◆ the support of the diocese, including “rapid response” when needed;
 - ◆ the selection and training of enablers;
 - ◆ the selection of the ministry support team based on gifts. One respondent suggested that locally ordained priests ought to be as rigorously selected as are traditional clergy;
 - ◆ the training of the ministry support team;
 - ◆ the capacity and commitment of ministry support team members;
 - ◆ the unity and diversity of the ministry support team, love and trust;
 - ◆ lots of time together as a ministry support team to build teamwork; available time in busy lifestyles for ministry support team members to meet;

- ◆ the careful sequential education of the congregation so they understand the model with clarity, lots of communication!;
- ◆ careful preparation of the parish and ministry support team to clarify their identity as God's people, to determine their gifts and to strategise how best to engage with their community;
- ◆ finding time to identify spiritual gifts;
- ◆ an intentional strategy to raise up the next generation of leaders;
- ◆ find locally appropriate ways to have effective local outreach followed by discipleship;
- ◆ good administration and communication; and
- ◆ the administration person must be a team person not seeking power for themselves.

Ministry support teams (LMST)

Sustainability and Functioning

53. Most ministry support teams report that they are generally functioning very well and enjoying ministry despite often significant tiredness from the heavy demands of family, employment and ministry and the pain-bearing involved in pastoral ministry.
54. Some ministry support teams have now been carrying the full brunt of ministry for a number of years. They have experienced the highs and lows of local church ministry.
55. One ministry support team takes a break over the summer period plus some take holidays during the year. One ministry support team stressed that there is no pressure on members to stay on the team if they need a break.
56. There have been some changes of personnel within ministry support teams over time. The amount of change appears to have been approximately in keeping with what one might normally anticipate. In the main these changes seem to have been caused by factors external to the ESM model.
57. Many ministry support team members have commented with enthusiasm that they are now ministering in ways not imaginable under the clergy model. "Parish life has been more enjoyable under ESM".

58. The comprehensive action-reflection based training and support offered to ministry support teams by the enabler in some places is very impressive.
59. Reportedly, in some cases previous rectors have burnt out trying to sustain what is now thriving under ESM.
60. It was widely reported that the ministry support team approach reduces stress on individuals (compared to the clergy model) because:
- ◆ To a significant extent team members can focus on areas of gifting and interest;
 - ◆ Parishes are served by a range of personalities and giftings lessening the likelihood of criticism;
 - ◆ It would seem that volunteers are less likely to be criticized than are professional clergy;
 - ◆ Team members can debrief with each other and a strong sense of camaraderie seems to have developed in many teams;
 - ◆ ESM encourages 'modeled mutuality'; and
 - ◆ Individuals can take short breaks from ministry when overloaded. Team members can 'cover' one another.
61. As ministry support teams grow in experience and confidence team members appear to often reach out to each other for advice and support before contacting the enabler.

The Ministry of Word and Sacrament

62. Ministry support teams, parish councils and enablers generally felt that the ministry of word and sacrament is being effectively exercised. Many examples were given of the benefits of a team of local ministers over the clergy model.
63. One respondent claimed that ESM ministry support teams will not provide 'top of the pole' theology in sermons. Others disagreed. One respondent challenged critics of ESM to compare the quality and regularity of the ministry of word and sacrament in rural ESM parishes with that offered in other rural parishes.
64. In some parishes it is evident that the churchmanship of a previous enabler has influenced the amount of training given to 'word' and the amount given to 'sacrament'.
65. Fifteen members of the various ministry support teams reportedly attended a statewide preaching workshop.

66. Ministry support teams are generally motivated and encouraged. Numerous members expressed amazement that God was using them in ways they could never have imagined a few years ago. Many stressed they would never want to go back to the clergy model.
67. In some places preaching rosters regularly include members of the congregation who are not on the ministry support team.
68. Some respondents called (controversially) for lay presidency at the Eucharist.

Formation and Maintenance of Teams

69. It was widely reported that it takes considerable time to form teams and establish each team member.
70. It was widely reported that there is considerable pressure on teams in the early months to 'get up to speed', especially in preaching, conducting funerals and weddings and handling pastoral crises.
71. Some suggested that ministry support team members ought to take a mandatory (or recommended) one year "sabbatical" after a set period of ministry.
72. Ministry support team members have attended annual Clergy Conferences and post-ordination training.
73. It was reported that there can be a "them and us" culture amongst clergy. The term "microwave priests" has been used of locally ordained priests. Such a culture has in the past discouraged the involvement of ministry support team members at diocesan training events. However this appears to be diminishing as ESM becomes an accepted part of the diocese.
74. Some respondents suggested that ministry support teams ought to have more contact with each other for mutual learning and encouragement.
75. One respondent expressed concern that locally ordained priests have participated in the same retreat and ordination service as other ordinands. It was felt that this has reinforced a "rector" mentality in these ministry support team members.
76. Many suggested that on-going 'quality control' of ministry support teams is needed. Support and accountability should include regular observation of ministry by team members followed by reflection.

77. There is a variety of opinions regarding how small a ministry support team can be. Some suggest it depends on what needs to be done in a small community. Others see dangers in modifying the model too much to prop up a parish.
78. Some respondents foresee the replacement of ministry support team members as a major difficulty as current team members age.
79. One respondent expressed concern that there are no guidelines or encouragement to ESM parishes to reimburse ministry support team members for ministry costs.

Equipping the Body

80. The model appears to have the potential for folk beyond the ministry support team to be equipped for ministry. There are notable examples of where this is currently happening. At this stage there are few examples of ministry-equipping other than in the leading services and in pastoral care.

Enablers

General

81. The current three enablers are all generally highly valued and appreciated by their parish councils and ministry support teams.
82. Some parishes feel they do not see enough of their enabler but understand his commitments in other parishes. Some members of congregations and parish councils feel they have not got to know their enabler as much as they would have liked. This seems, in part, to be a legacy from the clergy model.
83. Enablers differ quite markedly with regards to how much contact they make with the congregations. This is in part dictated by the varying parish structures. But it also seems to stem from differing philosophies of ministry on the part of enablers.
84. Many commented that the sacrifice, contribution and influence of their current enabler ought to be acknowledged. One ministry support team stated that they actively try to “look after” their enabler because they value his work so much.

85. Some respondents raised concerns about an enabler also being an MSO including the amount of work being expected of them, the additional traveling required, the potential for confusion of roles within their ESM parishes and the lack of support for an enabler/MSO.

Sustainability

86. The single biggest issue in the sustainability of enablers appears to be is their own personhood - including:

- ◆ personality type;
- ◆ adequate support and accountability structure in place (ie, such strategies as spiritual direction, mentoring, clergy retreat group, time off and personal retreat days);
- ◆ organizational and time management skills;
- ◆ the capacity to fulfill three or four part-time roles in as many localities;
- ◆ commitment to the ministry philosophy of the ESM Model;
- ◆ the willingness to train and release others into ministry; and
- ◆ (in multi-parish enabling) the enjoyment of travel.

87. A number reflected on the skilling of the enabler as a key factor in the success of the ESM model. Fundamental skills required of enablers include:

- ◆ A clear grasp of the theological basis of ESM and wise language choice to communicate with clarity;
- ◆ The ability to come alongside people;
- ◆ Mentoring and action-reflection training;
- ◆ Supervision; and
- ◆ The ability to give and receive trust and respect.

88. It is evident that there is a personal cost for enablers in "letting go" and entrusting ministry to others. Not all clergy may be able to make this shift.

89. There is considerable pressure on an enabler in getting a new ESM parish operational or where a parish faces a particular difficulty. Greater time allocation is essential in the short-term.

90. However the enabler role appears to be in many ways far healthier than the traditional clergy role where so much of the pressure within the parish tends to be focused on one person.

Travel

91. The amount of travel involved and resultant tiredness is a significant factor for multi-parish enablers. Most parishes report that they are concerned about the amount of travel required by multi-parish enablers. "It is humanly impossible to keep up the traveling long-term." However neither of the multi-parish enablers shared this concern and point to their length of service thus far.
92. Other clergy in the diocese expressed concern about the amount of travel especially late at night on rural roads.
93. In some places there has been a lack of clarity as to whether or not travel time by the enabler should be calculated as part of the parish's time allocation. If so, this severely disadvantages outlying parishes. The location of an enabler's residence would then have a significant impact on some parishes.
94. There is significant feeling amongst clergy that the diocesan travel allowances are inadequate and that this is a particular burden for multi-parish enablers.
95. In one instance an enabler stays overnight on a monthly visit to one parish.

Family

96. The role of enablers currently does not permit them to worship in the same place most Sundays (except where an evening service is available). This has implications for an enabler's spouse and children. This appears to be a more significant issue for some families than it is for others. Some factors include:
- ◆ the needs of the spouse;
 - ◆ the age and needs of the children; and
 - ◆ the geographical location of the parishes being served and where the enabler lives.
97. Enablers appear to address family needs in different ways:
- ◆ by the spouse traveling with the enabler each Sunday (thus not having their own one spiritual family) and adult children free to attend other churches;
 - ◆ by the spouse and children attending other churches; and
 - ◆ by the enabler and spouse having a "their parish" outside of the ESM parishes being served.

98. The optimum number of well-established ESM parishes per enabler appears to normally be four.

99. Factors that may reduce this number in some instances may include:

- ◆ where a parish is just commencing ESM;
- ◆ where a parish has particular difficulties to be addressed;
- ◆ where distances are extreme; and/or
- ◆ as in the case of Riverlinks, where one parish may be considerably larger than a typical parish with a large ministry support team.

100. Respondents suggested that as parishes first enter into the ESM model enablers need to give extensive attention to them. In this case less than four parishes or less travel demands will normally be necessary.

101. Four parishes would be too many for an enabler whenever one or more are dysfunctional or facing a serious crisis.

102. Though the diocese may need to look at the option of part-time enablers, it was reported that there is an advantage in having specialist enablers who are enabling multiple parishes.

Alternative Models

103. The idea of enablers being contextualised in two parishes was widely (though not universally) rejected on the grounds that the ESM model would inevitably break down with the enabler becoming a “de facto rector” and possibly the ministry support team being by-passed by parishioners.

104. A number of respondents commented that any alteration of the model that confuses the clergy model and the enabler model will rob the parishes of the freedom to develop strong local ministry support teams.

105. The idea of enablers being teamed to share responsibility for all ESM parishes was widely (though not universally) rejected on the grounds that:

- ◆ enablers would be unable to relate effectively with all ministry support team members statewide;
- ◆ enablers would be unable to effectively ‘exegete’ each community, and

- ◆ enablers would face additional travel and meetings.

106. Nevertheless some folk saw some advantages in some aspects of the team approach. Possibly:
- ◆ enablers could meet more often for mutual support and stimulation;
 - ◆ ESM parishes could occasionally call upon the particular expertise of enablers other than their own;
 - ◆ the use of technology (eg videos and tapes etc) could supplement the face-to-face training of enablers; and/or
 - ◆ some ESM parishes may over time be able to offer assistance to other ESM parishes.
107. A strategy of employing a minister as a part-time rector in one parish and a part time enabler in other parish(es) has potential for widespread application if it proves effective. However possible dangers suggested by respondents included:
- ◆ Can the minister 'cleanly' change roles on a daily basis? The enabler role could easily suffer from lack of clean role-change. This strategy may work best were the rector-role involves a significant commitment to equipping lay ministry and leadership.
 - ◆ There may be economic pressure to convert clergy in failing parishes to a joint role with neighbouring parish(es). Yet not all clergy may be effective trainers nor committed to the ESM ministry philosophy. Those being considered as enablers should ideally have a record of effective parish ministry.

Other Issues Not Addressed

108. One respondent questioned the adequacy of training for enablers.
109. Issues relating to enablers not addressed by this review (but raised by respondents) include:
- ◆ How are enablers selected and trained?
 - ◆ Can enablers be recruited from beyond clergy ranks and from outside the denomination?
 - ◆ What range of time is the optimum period for an enabler to be engaged with any one parish?
 - ◆ How does the enabler role change as a parish becomes fully established in ESM? Does the role need to be more tightly redefined as parishes gain ESM experience.
 - ◆ Can an enabler minister to a parish for too long?

Recommendations

The Consultant recommends:

1. That the diocese distributes the main body of this Report to each enabler, each ESM ministry support team and each ESM parish council.
2. That the diocese distributes appendices only to the relevant enablers, ministry support teams and parish councils.

The ESM model

General

3. That the diocese continue to endorse, encourage and resource the ESM model.
4. That the diocese plan the next developmental steps of the ESM model possibly including:
 - a. How to best bring new parishes into the ESM model;
 - b. How to exit parishes from the ESM model with sensitivity to local needs and giftings;
 - c. Reflection on the optimum term for an enabler;
 - d. The possible future need of locum enablers for ESM parishes;
 - e. The training of new enablers;
 - f. In-service training of ministry support teams and enablers;
 - g. Will ESM parishes require less enabling over time as teams mature?
 - h. The recasting of the ESM vision to congregations and parish councils where they have been operating in the ESM model for more than five years; and
 - i. The development of resources to integrate newcomers into ESM parishes.
5. That the diocese considers the provision of Lenten studies to every parish every five years that affirm and expand upon the principles of the ESM model.
6. That the Diocesan Mission Enabler and the current enablers meet to:
 - a. discuss the Observations and Findings and Recommendations of this Report; and
 - b. make suggestions to the diocese wherever any Observations and Findings require a further response to those found in the Recommendations.

Location & Smaller Parishes

7. That the diocese introduces the ESM model in new parishes as purely as possible, making adjustments and variations only after prayerful consultation between the ministry support team, parish council, enabler and Diocesan Mission Enabler.
8. That the diocese does not implement ESM in parishes that have shrunk below the point of viability.
9. That the viability of parishes be not determined in terms of the ability to pay a clergy's stipend but rather in terms of the giftedness and passion measured by the ability to form a viable ministry support team.
10. That the viability of a proposed ministry support team be measured against the size and particular needs of the parish.
11. That the criteria listed in Observation and Finding 52 determines whether and when parishes adopt ESM and the type of subsequent training and enabling offered.
12. That rural parishes being considered for ESM be normally asked to agree either to reduce their number of centres to three or less, or to normally hold just one adult worship service in the parish each week.
13. That models other than ESM also be considered in small rural locations by the diocese, including (but not limited to):
 - a. House churches;
 - b. ARC;
 - c. Church planting;
 - d. Ecumenical cooperation in one form or another;
 - e. "repotting" (ie closing down a parish and planting a completely different model) and
 - f. Some form of "palliative care", allowing a parish to die gracefully where that is appropriate.

Visionary Leadership & Missional Churches

14. That the diocese continues to give a strong lead in encouraging a missional approach to church life.
15. That each ministry support team be encouraged and trained by their enabler to seek the release of formal and informal ministries within the wider community, both on and off church property.

Theological Basis and Training

16. That over time training resources be made available and updated by the diocese to meet the needs of:
- a. On going ministry support teams;
 - b. On going parish councils;
 - c. On going enablers;
 - d. New members of ministry support teams;
 - e. New members of parish councils;
 - f. Ministry support teams commencing ESM;
 - g. Parish councils and congregations commencing ESM; and
 - h. New enablers.

Ministry support teams

Formation and Maintenance of Teams

17. That the diocese provide user friendly written training manuals for:
- a. new teams commencing ESM;
 - b. new members joining existing teams; and
 - c. on-going in-service training every 3-5 years.
18. That in-service training be offered in a variety of ways by the diocese possibly including:
- a. Manuals and other resources that provide local-based training within local teams;
 - b. A Certificate IV course through the Australian College of Ministries;
 - c. Development of small specialist ministry resource centres in each parish or region. These could be developed in cooperation with resources already available within the wider Christian community (eg Tabor, WEC, Deeper Place Ministries)
 - d. Conferences and training sessions in Tasmania; and/or
 - e. Funding to attend conferences elsewhere.
19. That the diocese offers basic suggested guidelines to ESM parishes for the reimbursement of some ministry expenditure where the parish is able to do so.
20. That the diocese strategises how to assist ministry support teams in smaller parishes to enlist new and younger team members.

Equipping the Body

21. That, where appropriate, enablers give greater attention to developing a leadership development strategy in the ESM parishes beyond the ministry support teams.

Enablers

General

22. That the diocese review its policy regarding enablers also being asked to serve as MSOs.

Sustainability

23. That criterion for the selection of enablers be determined by the diocese. Such criteria may include:

- a. Is ordination a mandatory requirement?;
- b. The personhood issues listed in Finding 86; and
- c. The capacities listed in Findings 87 and 88.

24. That the enablers meet together at least four times per annum preferably with the Diocesan Mission Enabler.

Travel

25. That the diocese encourages creative strategies to minimize the amount of travel by enablers wherever possible (whilst retaining the integrity of the model).

26. That the diocese reviews the adequacy of clergy travel allowances with particular awareness of multi-parish enablers and other clergy who travel extensively.

Family

27. That the diocese continues to monitor the impact of ESM on the families of enablers.

Number of Parishes

28. That the diocese develops a flexible policy regarding the number of parishes an enabler may serve based on the Findings 98-102.

Alternative Models

29. That the diocese does not adopt the 'two parish contextualised' model of enabling.

30. That the diocese does not adopt the statewide team model of enabling.

31. That, where the diocese considers the model of a part-time rector enabling an ESM parish, great care be taken in the selection of the joint rector-enabler and the transitions by both parishes.

Other Issues Not Addressed

32. That the diocese evaluates the initial training given to enablers to date.

33. That the diocese reflects upon the issues detailed in Finding 109.