

**Standing Commission on Ministry Development**  
**Minutes of the Meeting**  
**February 27 – March 1, 2008**  
**Church Divinity School of the Pacific**  
**Berkeley, California**

**In Attendance:**

The Rt. Rev. Larry R. Benfield  
The Rev. Barbara Bender-Breck  
Dr. Luisa Bonillas  
Canon Stephanie T. Cheney, Secretary  
Mrs. Jane R. Cosby, Vice-chair  
Mr. Jack Finlaw  
Dr. Rosemary Gooden  
The Rev. Lynne A. Grifo, Office for Ministry Development  
The Rev. Dr. Melford "Bud" E. Holland, Office for Ministry Development  
Dr. Donn F. Morgan  
The Rt. Rev. C. Wallis Ohl, Chair  
The Rev. Joseph Pae  
The Rev. Dr. Gregory S. Straub, General Convention Office  
Mr. Bruce T. Swan  
The Rev. Deacon Sherry Young

**Absent:**

The Rt. Rev. Charles vonRosenberg

**Invited Guests in Attendance:**

The Rev. Valerie Bailey-Fischer, Standing Commission on Lifelong  
Christian Education and Formation  
Ms. Adair T. Lummis, Office for Ministry Development  
The Rev. Miguelina Espinal, PLSE Project  
The Rev. John Van Sicen, Province I COM Representative (Maine)  
Ms. Constance L. White, Province II COM Representative (New Jersey)  
The Rev. David W. Lovelace, Province III COM Representative (Central  
Pennsylvania)  
The Rev. Canon Gayanne Silver, Province IV COM Representative (Florida)  
The Rev. Canon John F. Keydel, Jr., Province V COM Representative  
(Michigan)  
The Rev. Canon Sandra Holmberg, Province VI COM Representative  
(Minnesota)  
The Rev. Michael P. Milliken, Province VII COM Representative (Western  
Kansas)  
The Rev. Canon Jenny Vervynck, Province VIII COM Representative (San  
Diego)

## **Wednesday, February 27, 2008**

Bishop Ohl opened the meeting with a prayer and welcomed the group. The evening session was devoted to reconnecting and welcoming new member, Jack Finlaw, and the invited guests.

## **Thursday, February 28, 2008**

Mrs. Cosby opened the meeting with a prayer. The morning session was spent listening to the COM Provincial Representatives and discussing a set of questions sent to them prior to the meeting.

### 1. How are the current Title III Canons working in your province?

Province IV:

- Only one diocese feels Title III is going well.
- Florida is changing to fit the canons.

Province VII:

- Had to shift gears.
- There has been some resistance to change, but dioceses are beginning to make changes.
- Having a terrible time with communications among dioceses. Maintaining a decent contact list is difficult.

Province III:

- Lynne Grifo went through the Canons with them at a provincial meeting.
- There needs to be more accountability in educational requirements where local ministry is concerned.

Province I:

- There is a lot of adaptation going on.
- The COM chairs are asking for support.

Province VIII:

- Frustration.
- While there is now greater flexibility, there is also great flexibility with regard to educational standards.
- Changes have diminished the diaconate – there is a sense that it has been gutted.

Province VI:

- How do you deal with transfers in and out as it relates to standards of learning? We don't know the training processes elsewhere.
- The role of the Standing Committee is at issue in terms of interpretation of what they can do.
- There is tension between locally trained and seminary trained clergy.
- It's foggier rather than clearer.

Province II:

- COM chairs are meeting on a regular basis, and they are working well together.
- Most dioceses have restructured. New Jersey has established an overarching COM with three sub-heads. They have also set up a Ministry Institute.
- There is consideration of discernment issues.
- There are issues with the role of the Standing Committee.
- Most don't like the word "nominee," and most don't like the definition of postulant. They don't want to make someone a postulant if they're not going to be a priest.

Province V:

- We knew this was coming, and for the most part it is working well.
- It's hard to comply with the Canons if you don't read them.
- There is concern over training – are we creating a class of "mass priests?"
- The COMs approve each learning plan.
- There are questions regarding total ministry and how it's done. Feel pretty good that those in total ministry comply with training standards.
- Michigan's COM no longer functions as a committee of the whole. They had significant work to do in separating out responsibilities.

Other responses:

- We are so busy just keeping up within our dioceses, that they don't have time to do more.
- We are all on overload.
- Province IX participation is needed in this conversation.
- The old Canons didn't work.

2. What areas of the Canons still need work?

- Keeping records on continuing education. A database needs to be constructed to facilitate the con ed requirement. Or it should be added to the parochial report.
- Discernment committees differ greatly. How do you create congregational discernment committees if the members haven't done discernment themselves?
- I hope we don't make any more changes.
- There's not that much that changes what we do.
- COMs keep turning over so you have to reinvent the wheel.
- Some dioceses hold clericus days on the discernment process, because the clergy don't know what to do.
- There is a cognitive step here – they want to understand why and the thinking behind it.

- Do a flow chart. Not all people respond to words. They need pictures.
- New Jersey has discernment shepherds. They go to the parish and meet with the discernment committee when someone bubbles up. They serve as a resource.
- In Michigan, the COM names an advisor who is with the person all the way through.
- The COM Handbook: It offers resources and is available on the website. It is being translated into Spanish. The Rev. Mr. Holland encouraged COM reps to send in additional resources.
- The Listserve could also be a resource.
- The first few canons in Title III could be interpreted as the program arm of the diocese (Michigan).
- Some COMs are not doing what the canons call for because they can't do it all. It doesn't all have to be done by the COM. Some of what is in the canons has to do with organizational issues.
- Florida has a Diocesan Center for Christian Living, and it is the umbrella, subject to the canons, but over the COM.
- How can COMs be a part of the overall support to the Bishop and not be the program arm?
- Concern was expressed over making the M.Div. Degree mandatory.
- Let's have a single canon for the priesthood and let the dioceses make the decision over training programs. The old canons had a higher level of training requirements.
- Why were the Canon 9 Clergy done away with? Because of the feeling their training was inferior.
- Transferability question was the issue (portability of Orders). With the old Canon 9, there was only the possibility of Letters Dimissory.
- Seminaries have also raised the issue of "raising the bar" with locally trained priests.
- Rigor around diaconal training is lacking.
- Lack of leadership preparation in the Canons.
- How do we accommodate bi-vocational careers? Those who can't go to seminary.
- NAAD works on standards for educational training and has tried to raise the bar.
- There are lots of people who have good academic training, but they can't lead a congregation.
- What is the opposite of a leader? There isn't agreement about what leadership means.
- The old model assumed curacy was training for leadership.
- With the average age of seminarians in the 40s, what do we need to teach about leadership? It has to be both/and – from the ground up and adaptation to the world of the Church.

- Many young people in seminary don't want to be rectors. Their interpretation of carrying out the Gospel is more action oriented.
- Community organizing is important to teach – whether organizing within a congregation or outside of one.
- There are different values and styles attached to leadership. There needs to be more conversation about that.
- There are leadership skills that are particular to the Church. They could be named and values attached to them.
- The whole area of continuing education needs to be polished. There is no specificity. Dioceses need to understand how to be responsible for this. It may be a question of administration. The information goes into the diocesan office, but gets lost. This may be the bottleneck.
- There is a searchable database on con ed opportunities: faith and wisdom.org.
- Clergy need direction on what is and is not con ed. How do you define it?
- Candidacy: Some dioceses have a candidacy subcommittee of the COM that is composed of members from the COM and the Standing Committee.
- In Michigan, the Standing Committee attends the Ministry Retreat. It is mandatory attendance. Their retreat lasts 48 hours.
- Have we made the process friendlier? It depends on the kind of relationship commissions have with the candidates.
- Age? Not particularly any issue.
- The Rev. Ms. Espinal talked about the work being done through PLSE with young people, given the aging of ordained ministry.
- Canon 8, Sec. 5 (b): baccalaureate degree. Is this an issue? Seminaries can waive a bachelor's degree and grant a master's. The question is where is the Church on this issue? There is wiggle room in the Canons that allow for total ministry candidates. What you are looking for is the ability to reflect on and learn from life experiences. The Canons talk about "formation" – not "education" – in both deacons and priests Canons.
- The Canons don't allow for team ministry.
- The emerging church looks very different from the traditional church – GenX, Millennium Age. Liturgy is not planned for them, but planned by them. The Creeds are their basis. They don't buy a whole lot of other stuff until they check it out. It's context – what is authentic in this place?
- "Meeting on New Ground": Is it being used? Some are using it. The question is do we wish to be a Church that welcomes broad cultural realities? Where is it in fact that we can meet on new ground – not my ground? A positive is that the DVD doesn't

attempt to answer questions. It lets you answer your own. A good teaching tool; good for clericus; can be a catalyst.

3. How culturally diverse is leadership and are efforts being made to raise up leadership from diverse ethnic backgrounds? Is there an effort to seek out culturally diverse persons for ordained ministry? Do dioceses have a line item in their budgets for ethnic ministries?

- Dioceses of Washington and Virginia are most active. Recruiting through campuses. Both have money for that. Others say it is not applicable.
- There is a lot of leadership in Native American populations. There is a growing population of Latino migrant workers in the Dakotas as well as Sudanese populations.
- Some dioceses are just starting conversations within the COM.
- Diverse cultural leadership is spotty – there is a long way to go.
- There are 28 Sudanese priests in the U.S. that we know of. A Sudanese Leadership Institute is being developed.
- Deployment: How is it working? Relative mobility is good in terms of need. However they don't want to move.
- CDO is working to develop a Hispanic clergy list. The current system is color blind.
- Some programs are going on that were start up for ethnic congregations. (San Diego, Arkansas, Easton, Western Kansas). It takes a long time, but it doesn't have to be expensive.
- New Jersey has \$40,000 in the budget for anti-racism training. Done by Crossroads Institute. Any congregation in a search process must do anti-racism training for the committee – after the Profile and before the actual search.

4. What about intentional recruitment for leadership in under age 35 category?

- Province VIII: Focus is on campus ministry as a source of recruitment.
- Too often, the budget is balanced on the back of campus ministry. We pay the price, because, since the 60s as a protest to the Vietnam War, we have lost a generation of people.
- Province II: There are active youth ministries of all sorts, but there is not any recruitment going on. However, young people are in the ordination process.
- Province IV: There are active youth programs, but the focus is on camps.
- Province VII: In rural areas, the kids are leaving – there is no reason for them to be there.

Other comments:

- PLSE challenges clergy leadership to be identifiers. Clergy need to be the exemplars – not victims – of the system for which you expect them to recruit. PLSE is a resource to all dioceses and provinces, and dioceses need to communicate this to rectors.
- Mentorship is a key part of recruitment.

5. What about seminary debt?

- How can we expect the people in the pews to help solve a problem they don't even know we have?
- The sub-group on theological education is approaching this problem by putting together bulletin inserts on 1) ordination trends; 2) what are our seminaries; and 3) what is the cost to the seminarian.
- B-006 requires that we report annually to the House of Bishops.
- There is a need of \$30 million per year to support 1,000 students in eleven seminaries. In response, it was stated that the economics of maintaining eleven seminaries for less than 100 students in each is bad stewardship of resources.
- The 3-year seminar residential program is only one model.
- From a deployment perspective, you can't place them. (It doesn't do any good to produce 3,000 new clergy if you have no where they are willing to go.
- "I would rather see us strengthen a few seminaries and look for new models."
- The reality is that bishops direct where someone is trained.
- The seminary deans are looking at flexible learning options. All seminaries are not going to keep offering the same things, but changes are not going to happen overnight.
- We have a private school mentality, and the seminaries are set up that way.
- The question was raised regarding whether bulletin inserts are the best way to deliver the message.

6. GOEs: How are they being used in your province, if they are being used?

- Province V: Mixed use. They have other forms of testing as well. The problem with GOEs is that there is no national curriculum that they are tested against.
- Province VII: They are not used for locally trained clergy.
- Province III: Most dioceses use it. Candidates must have it to go forward.
- Province IV: Some dioceses use it. If candidates score 2 or below, they meet with examining chaplains.
- Province II: Similar situations. New Jersey has not held anyone back, and all were eventually ordained.

- Province I: All dioceses use it with the exception of for vocational diaconate.
- Province VI: GOEs are used as a diagnostic instrument. They are not used at all with total ministry candidates.
- Province VIII: Mainly diagnostic.

Other comments:

- We have a mandate from General Convention to set up a task force that will look at whether GOEs meet the needs of the Church.
- The questions are not always good. There seem to be bad years for questions and bad years for readers.
- Michigan has developed a portfolio system: they have built a file on how candidates have responded to questions over time.
- We need to consider how and why GOEs came into being 38 years ago. They were created to meet a need – there was greater mobility and GOEs responded to a need for standardization across diocesan lines.
- There are currently no agreed-upon standards between dioceses for total ministry testing.
- Michigan has developed an assessment program of total ministry competency over time.

As the meeting with the Provincial Representatives drew to a close, it was noted that the connection between the reps and Commission has grown weaker. There were requests that this connection be strengthened by including the reps as invited guests who pay their own way.

## **Friday, February 29, 2008**

### **Discussion of General Ordination Exams**

After Morning Prayer, the Commission welcomed guests to a broadened discussion on General Ordination Exams. Guests included Len Johnson, Chair of the General Board of Examining Chaplains; Jan Wood, Dean of Admissions at Church Divinity School of the Pacific; Rod Douglas, Dean of the School for Deacons; Linda Clader, Dean of Academic Affairs at CDSP; and David Gortner, Director of the Center for Leadership.

Dr. Morgan discussed the text of Resolution C-036, which calls for the Presiding Bishop to convene a task force to review the purpose of the General Ordination Exam, including how the examinations are constructed, administered, evaluated and scored. He reminded the Commission that this resolution was referred to SCMD and that the Commission is charged with reporting to the 76<sup>th</sup> General Convention.

Dr. Johnson stated that C-036 is based on a false premise because part of what the resolution calls for is outside the mandate of GBEC. The job is canonically defined. He noted that there was a thorough study of GOEs ten years ago (September 1998, *Anglican and Episcopal History*). He emphasized that the GBEC is ready to cooperate and that they operate in total transparency. He informed the Commission that the Board is comprised of four bishops, six priests, six seminary professors and six laity. Regarding the cultural diversity of the Board, no one is under 30 years of age, there is one Hispanic member, everyone else is Caucasian, and about one-half of the Board is female. The readers, all of whom are volunteers, are chosen by the Executive Secretary, Dr. Richard Tombaugh. He also noted that the purpose of the GOEs is to determine proficiency in the seven canonical areas.

He talked about the process of the review of exams, noting that there are increasing numbers of people without seminary training or English background. For these people, special arrangements are made, but as the numbers increase, this will become more problematic. All exams are anonymous, and the emphasis is on the exam, not the person.

Regarding internal reviews, the readers and chaplains evaluate the exam. The average number of exams given annually is between 200 and 300. Scoring ranges from 5 as excellent to 1 as unsatisfactory. If a question seems to have lower scores across the board, it is considered to be potentially not a good question. Questions must be approved by all members of the Board. The twenty-two member Board divides the seven canonical areas to write the questions. He noted that all seminaries teach ethics differently, so it is difficult to write questions in this area.

The GOEs were created 38 years ago out of a perceived need. They were an attempt to create standards in an evolving mobile society. The exam has evolved over time, but there has been no systematic review except by the Board itself. Dr. Johnson stated that the integration of academic preparation with anticipated pastoral responsibilities was never the goal, noting that there is a difference between evaluating the answer versus evaluating the person.

A question was raised regarding whether there is a divergence between what the GOEs do now versus what they were perceived to do. Dr. Johnson noted that there are entanglements around inconsistencies in how they are used, in the preparation for them and in the results.

In discussion, the following points were made:

- It is a closed system of evaluation.

- We are in a period where having a book list is not the basis of learning. GOEs fly in the face of this. They want to know what books you have read.
- Faculty members are required to do evaluations. The middler year is all about the person and integration. GOEs end up being a test that is not aimed at the learning process. It is irrelevant to the context in which you are learning.
- There is some sense of guarding the reliability of the readers. There are a large number of people who make 1s and 2s on the questions. This raises questions about the reliability and validity of what is being evaluated.
- The average score in 2006 was 2.97.
- Maybe it is time to go back fundamentally to look at a different way of assessing. We're in a very different time.
- Records are kept on which dioceses use them. Most do, but dioceses use them in vastly different ways.
- The Board is responsible for the questions, and the criteria comes out of the questions. There is no outside input unless there are responses to Dr. Tombaugh. It is an informal method.
- If GOEs continue, they need to be evaluated in terms of what God is calling us to be.
- The exam tests the ability to write under pressure.
- This past year, the exam was almost an entirely paperless exam, which worked very well.
- Regarding the cost of GOEs, does the Board take into consideration how it uses its funding? The budget was reduced last year.
- The GOEs were created with importance on the "national standard." Now we're in a time where we can't agree on anything. In light of a changing Church, is it possible for a common exam to be sensitive to a variety of ministry models?
- The GOEs should not ever by a make or break for pastoral go ahead.

### **Discussion of FOCUS (Families of Clergy United in Christ)**

Bishop Ohl informed the Commission of a request received from FOCUS to be included in the SCMD resolutions presented to the General Convention. The group is seeking funding at an amount of \$12,000 annually. The Rev. Dr. Holland stated that the group was founded in 2000 with assistance from the Office for Ministry Development and from the Church Pension Group. He noted that the issues they address are important. However, they are at a crossroads, and they will either continue as they are or will need to blend in with another organization. There was concern regarding whether there was duplication of efforts between FOCUS and other groups in the Church dealing with clergy

wellness. The request was referred to the Leadership Development sub-group for further review.

### **Discussion of A-125**

The Rev. Dr. Holland stated that this resolution was submitted by the Executive Council to look at employment practices in the Church and to consider if lay pensions should be mandatory. If so, should there be a single supplier. The Church Pension Group was authorized to do a study. A task force on employment practices was formed by the Presiding Bishop and the President of the House of Deputies, which has been working for four years. The result is a Workplace Values document which will be distributed in the near future. Some of the findings include:

- The Episcopal Church is a good place to work.
- Employees generally make less than they would if they worked elsewhere.
- Employees are worried about their retirement.
- 70% are women, and 70% are Episcopalian.

The task force discovered that there is only about a 25% compliance with the mandate to offer pension benefits to all working over 20 hours per week. This raises the issue of whether pension benefits should be put in the Canons. And if so, who does it cover?

The Commission then reviewed the work and topics to be covered for the remainder of the meeting. Topics included:

- Canon 15 of Title III
- GOE revisions
- Commission on Ministry handbook
- Relationship between SCMD and SC on Lifelong Christian Education and Formation
- Resolutions referred to SCMD by the General Convention (C-030, D-009, D-034)
- Review of meeting with the Provincial Representatives

### **Report on A-147**

Mr. Tim Vanover and Mr. Jim Morrison of the Church Pension Group reported on the work being done on the Healthcare Coverage Feasibility Study.

The Commission then divided into its sub-groups for continued work and discussion for the remainder of the afternoon.

At the opening of the evening session, Bishop Ohl agreed to be the liaison between SCMD and the Standing Commission on Lifelong Christian Education

and Formation. The Leadership Development sub-group suggested that representation at the Meeting on New Ground Conference would be beneficial.

### **Theological Education Sub-group Report**

Dr. Morgan discussed issues facing seminaries and how they are seeking to solve them. The question is what does theological education look like in the evolving new configurations. Issues such as space usage, duplication of efforts, and rising costs are affecting all mainline seminaries. The Church is changing and therefore so is theological education. He stressed that the seminaries can't solve this alone and they will need partners. The seminaries are saying that they cannot continue to do all the same things, and therefore they have decided to work together to offer different programs in four key areas:

- Local ministry development
- Distance learning
- Hispanic/Latino ministry preparation
- Anglican Communion initiatives

He noted that there seems to be a new energy among the deans. They are also discussing the option of an on-line Episcopal seminary.

### **Office for Ministry Development Report**

The Rev. Dr. Holland reported the following:

- Adair Lummis has joined the staff on a part-time basis.
- OMD has been instrumental in assisting with the PLSE Program
- The Office for Ministry Development will be closed as of March 31<sup>st</sup> as a part of the reorganization of the Church Center. Staff members will either be going to the new divisions or to other employment.

### **House of Bishops Report**

Bishop Ohl reported the following:

- A draft of the bulletin inserts on seminary debt was taken to the September meeting.
- At its last meeting, the House spent considerable time dealing with issues related to the dioceses of San Joaquin, Fort Worth and Pittsburgh, as well as discussions on the Anglican Communion Covenant.
- The Bishops on the Theological Education Committee propose to continue to facilitate a dialogue between the seminaries and the HOB. Bishop Bruce Caldwell chairs the committee.

### **Standing Commission on Lifelong Education and Formation Report**

The Rev. Mrs. Bailey-Fischer talked about the work of the Commission and their efforts at finding out what is going on in formation across the Church.

### **Title III Sub-group Report**

Mrs. Cheney reported on the conversation with the Rev. Valerie Bailey-Fischer concerning the relationship between the Standing Commission on Lifelong Christian Education and Formation and SCMD. Specifically discussed was a resolution to fund a joint conference hosted by the two commissions that would include Christian educators, youth and young adult ministers, and provincial representatives for Commissions on Ministry and Adult Education. The purpose would be to consider and discuss formation at all stages of life and ministry.

Regarding GOEs, the sub-group felt that the language in Title III, Canon 15 is not accurate to what is actually taking place from GBEC down to COMs and dioceses. As a member of the Board of GBEC, Bishop Benfield will discuss with the Bishops on the Board the language that will clarify the canon. This sub-group will then review their comments and suggest a resolution to address any necessary changes to this canon.

Regarding Resolution D-009 on Continuing Education requirements, it was felt that dioceses should be provided with sample best policies and suggested areas of continuing education.

Regarding the Commission on Ministry Handbook, it was decided that a copy needs to be provided to every Diocesan Bishop with a cover letter explaining the benefits of the handbook. The letter should go out over Bishop Ohl's signature. Mrs. Cheney will write the letter and will ask for the assistance of OMD in distributing the handbook.

Mrs. Cheney moved to table Resolution C-030 which called for amending Title III, Canon 1, Sec. 2 on access to the discernment process. After discussion, the motion was adopted.

Mrs. Cheney then moved to table Resolution D-034 which called for amending Title III, Canon 4 on Licensed Ministries. The motion was adopted.

### **Leadership Development Sub-group Report**

Dr. Bonillas reported the following:

- Ms. Lummis will assist them with developing surveys.
- The Rev. Ms. Bender-Breck has volunteered to attend the "Meeting on New Ground" conference to see if the DVD is being used and how it is being used. Ms. Bonillas moved that SCMD authorize payment for the cost of her conference attendance. The motion was adopted.
- The sub-group is drafting a resolution mandating a line item in all diocesan budgets for ethnic ministries. In discussion, the following comments were made:
  - Contact EBAC for a list of all Finance Administrators in dioceses.

- A collaborative effort in looking at best practices was suggested.
- Ask for a strategic plan to develop ethnic ministry as a more positive approach rather than asking for a mandatory line item.
- The sub-group is also planning a COM survey which will include a question on the use of GOEs.

### **General Convention Office Report**

The Rev. Dr. Straub gave a brief primer on the work of the General Convention Office. He noted that SCMD has had an unusual level of support from the GC office because it has gone through the most transition. He complimented the Commission on its work and reviewed the GC Office staff assignments.

### **Theological Education Sub-group Report (continued)**

Dr. Morgan reported the following:

- The seminaries are being asked to put up \$7-10,000 per year to fund a new website.
- He encouraged input and opinions on GOEs, and he asked that notes on this meeting be shared. He noted that there is a need for a discussion on GOEs in the House of Bishops. How that can be done is open to question, but it should be compatible with canonical changes.
- Regarding the church offices restructuring, there needs to be a person with theological education attached to SCMD as a resource.
- The seminaries are working in the area of local ministry development.
- With Ms. Lummis' help, the sub-group would like to determine where the 1% for theological education is occurring. He encouraged the entire Commission to be advocates for theological education.

He then discussed the Conant Fund requests and distributed the list of recipients, noting that the sub-group considered two late proposals: 1) from the Rt. Rev. Clay Matthews requesting funding for faculty assistance to further define the episcopate, and 2) from Professor Rich Jones of Virginia Theological Seminary to do research that will help SCOM establish seminary relationships. Including these requests, the total amount of funding requested is \$153,253. He moved that SCMD accept the proposed Conant Grant requests. The motion was adopted.

With regard to B-006 on seminary debt, he stated that the sub-group would like to provide a bulletin insert for March 30<sup>th</sup> through Episcopal Online Services designed to raise awareness of the issue of debt and why it is a problem for the Church. Mr. Finlaw agreed to work with staff at the Church Center to design a feedback loop. Dr. Morgan requested that Bishop Ohl also inform the House of Bishops. He noted that other strategies were discussed by the sub-group. He moved that in order to fulfill part of the request of B-006, SCMD provide a

bulletin insert to Episcopal Online Services to be inserted March 30, 2008. The motion was adopted.

### **Other Business**

The June meeting was discussed. It was agreed that emphasis would be given to committee reports and sub-group time. The Provincial Representatives will be informed of all meeting dates.

Bishop Ohl thanked the Rev. Ms. Grifo for her work with and dedication to SCMD and wished her well in her new employment with The Episcopal Church Foundation.

He informed the Commission that the Committee on Structure has asked each Standing Commission to review its own mandate and make recommendations for possible change. This topic will be included on the agenda for the June meeting.

The Rev. Dr. Holland also requested that a new initiative, Ministry in the Cities, be included on the June agenda.

It was suggested that since the June meeting would be held in Atlanta, Angela Ifill, head of African American Ethnic ministries, be invited to the meeting since she will be in Atlanta and could serve as a resource to the Commission's work.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned.

Respectfully submitted,

Stephanie T. Cheney, Secretary

### **"To Do" List**

- Determine whether to support FOCUS in its request for funding from General Convention.
- Decide on whether to request funding for a joint meeting of SCMD and the SC on Lifelong Christian Education and Formation. If yes, then begin development of a plan for implementation.
- Determine whether Title III, Canon 15 on GOEs needs clarification, and if so, develop language.
- Determine how to proceed on D-009 on continuing education.
- Implement sending Commission on Ministry Handbook to all diocesan bishops.
- Complete resolution on ethnic ministry line item in diocesan budget.

- Review status of bulletin inserts on seminarian debt.
- Review mandate on the structure of the Commission and make recommendations for possible change to the Committee on Structure.