

Assistant Ministers Ordinance 2017 Amendment Ordinance 2019 45/18 Appointment of assistant ministers and employment of stipendiary lay workers

46/18 Committee to review the Ministry Standards Ordinance 2017 and the Assistant Ministers Ordinance 2017

(A report from the Standing Committee.)

Key Points

- Synod resolutions 45/18(c) and 46/18 request consideration for mechanisms to address failures to comply with the processes in the *Assistant Minister's Ordinance 2017* and to follow proper practices regarding staff management.
- The Standing Committee appointed a subcommittee to consider and bring recommendations in relation to these resolutions.
- The Committee recognises that failures to follow the processes in the AMO and failures in staff management can have significant adverse impacts. There are few existing options to address or remedy such failures, and limited consequences for non-compliant rectors and wardens.
- The Committee proposes the establishment of a Review Panel to consider instances of alleged non-compliance with the processes under the AMO. The Panel for each application will comprise three members drawn from the Synod Pool established by the *Parish Disputes Ordinance 1999*.
- The Panel will produce a report, in respect of an application, which sets out its view on whether there has been any non-compliance with the AMO process, and may make non-binding recommendations.
- The report will be issued to the applicant, the rector and wardens, the regional bishop and the Archbishop. The Archbishop will have the discretion to release the report to other parties, such as the Parish Council.
- The Committee also recommends that all rectors be encouraged to participate in staff management training, that Safe Ministry and Ministry Training & Development provide training on staff management and the ordinances, that consideration be given to providing an option for time-limited licences for assistant ministers, and for the further review of the *Ministry Standards Ordinance 2017*.

Purpose

1. The purpose of this report is to respond to –
 - (a) paragraph (c) of resolution 45/18 regarding appropriate measures for dealing with failures to comply with due process under the *Assistant Ministers Ordinance 2017* (the **AMO**); and
 - (b) Synod resolution 46/18 regarding failures to follow proper practices in respect of staff management more generally.

Introduction

2. The committee appointed by Standing Committee to respond to the above Synod resolutions (the **Committee**) acknowledges that the expectation in paragraph (c) of resolution 45/18 was for Standing Committee to enact any changes required to the AMO to deal with non-compliance with due process. However, the view of both the Committee and Standing Committee is that the proposed changes to the AMO are sufficiently significant as to require consideration and approval by Synod.

3. To avoid confusion and to appropriately distinguish between types of assistant minister, this report will use the term 'Assistant Minister' (**AM**) to refer to a member of the clergy licensed to the office of Assistant Minister or Senior Assistant Minister. The terms and conditions of the AMO do not apply to a 'Lay Minister' employed as a member of staff in a parish and holding an authority under the *Authorisation of Lay Ministry Ordinance 2015*. Lay Ministers are employees under the *Fair Work Act 2009* (Cth) (the **FWA**).

Recommendations

4. Synod receive this report.
5. Synod pass the Bill for the Assistant Ministers Ordinance 2017 Amendment Ordinance 2019.
6. Synod consider the following motion to be moved at the forthcoming session of Synod, "by request of the Standing Committee" –

'Synod –

- (a) notes that while many rectors have participated in staff management training, the majority have not;
- (b) encourages rectors who have not already done so, to participate in staff management training as a matter of urgency;
- (c) requests the Safe Ministry Board, regularly include items relating to staff management in the content for the mandated triennial Faithfulness in Ministry training, noting that the 2020 Faithfulness in Ministry training will focus on staff management, and bullying in particular;
- (d) requests Ministry Training and Development to include appropriate training on the Ordinances relevant to Assistant Ministers as part of the post-ordination Ministry Development program for deacons;
- (e) recommends to the Archbishop that licences for Assistant Ministers, issued at the request of a rector, have an option for a specified term, with the minimum term being two years; and
- (f) requests the Ministry Standards Ordinance Review Committee to further review the Ministry Standards Ordinance 2017, particularly as it pertains to accusations of bullying, to ensure that rector development or other measures are recommended prior to more serious action.'

Background

7. At its 2nd Ordinary Session on 23 October 2018, Synod passed resolution 45/18. The resolution addressed specific concerns as to the processes for the appointment, management and termination of church ministry staff, particularly AMs.
8. Relevantly, paragraph (c) of resolution 45/18 requested that Standing Committee –

"give further consideration regarding options for mechanisms for appropriate consequences when there is a failure in the termination of an Assistant Minister to follow due process specified under the Assistant Ministers Ordinance 2017, to enact such changes by amending the ordinance if thought appropriate, and to report back to the next session of Synod."
9. The same session of Synod also passed resolution 46/18 in the following terms –

"Synod, in light of the recommendation at point 4 of the Explanatory Report on the Ministry Standards Ordinance 2017 Amendment Ordinance 2018, requests the Standing Committee to appoint a committee to consider if further mechanisms are required to deal with issues of failure to follow proper practices with regard to staff management, and make any appropriate recommendations."

10. At its meeting on 12 November 2018, the Standing Committee appointed the Committee to address paragraph (c) of resolution 45/18 and the request of resolution 46/18. The Committee comprises Bishop Chris Edwards (Chair), the Rev Anthony Douglas, the Rev Dr Raj Gupta, Ms Yvette McDonald, Mr Mark Streeter, the Rev Malcolm York, the Rev Susan An (as the representative appointed by Archdeacon Kara Hartley) and Ms Susan Duc (Diocesan Legal Counsel).
11. Another committee was appointed to assist the Standing Committee to consider paragraph (f) of resolution 45/18, regarding the provision of appropriate human resources expertise to support bishops, rectors, wardens and church staff.
12. The Committee met five times, on 16 April 2019, 7 May 2019, 11 June 2019, 9 July 2019, and 2 August 2019.

Context

13. Synod passed resolution 45/18 following its consideration of 'Supplementary Report 22/17 Appointment of Assistant Ministers and Stipendiary Lay Workers'. The report outlined a range of matters pertaining to the appointment of AMs and stipendiary lay workers, including recruitment, appointment, performance management, dispute resolution and termination.
14. The subsequent passing of resolution 46/18 reflects Synod's broader concern to address failures of proper practice in staff management within parishes, which occur not just in relation to termination but also during the course of ministry relationships.
15. As a starting point, the Committee considered the complexity of ministry relationships, including –
 - (a) the power imbalances that exist, most relevantly between rectors and AMs which give rise to certain vulnerabilities for AMs in their role;¹
 - (b) the non-intuitive lines of authority in AM positions, which see such ministers paid by wardens but managed by rectors;
 - (c) the difficulties that can arise when there are differing expectations around roles and the length of the appointment of an AM;
 - (d) the difficulties that can arise as the needs of a parish change, combined with the reality of limited resources;
 - (e) the need to constantly develop ministry staff, rectors and AMs;
 - (f) the reality that many rectors lack training in staff management skills;
 - (g) the existence of a range of different ordinances, policies and guidelines, as well as the received wisdom that relate to ministry staffing within the Diocese; and
 - (h) the challenge of applying biblical ethics evenly across hundreds of parochial units, each with its particular needs and unique characteristics.
16. The challenges associated with ministry relationships, particularly in relation to rectors and their AMs, are becoming more well-known. For example, the Committee has received correspondence from the Gospel Workers' Advocacy Group (**GWAG**), a voluntary association that represents a group of AMs and other gospel workers. In its letter to the Committee, the GWAG expressed concerns regarding what it perceived to be the lack of options and support available to AMs who have been allegedly mistreated by rectors.

Scope of work

17. Resolution 45.18(c) explicitly relates to the termination process under the AMO, which applies only to AMs.
18. This report primarily considers options to deal with failures by a rector and/or wardens to comply with the due process requirements of the AMO in implementing the termination of the appointment of an AM.

¹ See paragraphs 19-22 of Supplementary Report 22/17.

19. The classification of AMs as officeholders means that the protections afforded to Lay Ministers, who are employees under the FWA, regarding any termination of their employment, do not also apply to AMs.² This report seeks to consider avenues of recourse for an AM where the termination of their appointment has not been properly effected under the AMO.
20. As noted above, resolution 46/18 has a broad scope. There is a range of people who may be adversely impacted when the appointment of an AM is terminated, such as the family of the AM, other members of the relevant parish ministry team, the wardens and the congregation(s) of the parish. The Committee envisages that its recommendations will provide benefits, not only to AMs, but also to this wider range of people.

Due process requirements for termination under the AMO

21. The AMO sets out the process which must be undertaken in order to terminate the appointment of an AM. Specifically, the AMO requires that –
 - (a) the AM be given notice of termination, paid their stipend and provided with any other benefit or allowance to which they are entitled (clause 3(1)(b)); and
 - (b) the period of notice be no less than 3 months unless otherwise agreed between the AM, rector and wardens (clauses 3(2), 3(2A)).³
22. The AMO stipulates that certain steps must be taken prior to issuing the notice of termination to the AM –
 - (a) the regional bishop must be notified of the proposal to issue the notice (clause 3(3)(a));
 - (b) the notice must be given for a prescribed reason, being unsatisfactory performance or capacity, lack of funding (as determined by the parish council), or other reasons determined by the rector due to the parish's ministry needs (clause 3(3)(b));
 - (c) the AM has been given a written statement of the particulars of the prescribed reason, and has had a reasonable period to respond in writing to the statement (clauses (3)(3)(c)-(d));
 - (d) the rector and wardens have considered any response given by the AM within the period (clause 3(3)(e)); and
 - (e) the rector and warden have given due regard to any guidelines issued by the Archbishop-in-Council in relation to the AMO (clause (3)(3)(f)).
23. Both the written statement issued to the AM setting out the particulars of the reason for termination (see paragraph 22(c)) and the record of the rector and wardens' consideration of the AM's response to the written statement (see paragraph 22(d)) must be lodged by the rector with the Registrar (clause 5).
24. Further, the rector must consult the regional bishop regarding any public announcements or the communication of any termination of the AM before making any communication to the parish about the termination (clause 4).
25. Anecdotally, failures to follow the set procedures of the AMO occur for a variety of reasons, including a lack of awareness of the requirements stipulated by the relevant diocesan ordinances, policies and guidelines, a lack of the necessary skills, a lack of will, or even ungodliness. Examples include failure to give the requisite period of notice, or to provide reasons for the termination. In other cases, the AM has had no opportunity to provide a response to the reasons for termination, or to discuss any performance issues prior to receiving the termination notice.
26. While the Committee recognises that a failure by any party to adhere to the requirements of an ordinance means the ordinance has not been effected, it does little to change the personal circumstances of someone who has been told they have lost their ministry position.
27. The Committee understands that there have been occasions where regional bishops have not been engaged by rectors in the termination process, notwithstanding the AMO's requirement that the bishop be notified prior to the issuance of the notice and prior to any communication of the termination to the parish (clauses 3(3)(a), 4). Again, if a bishop only becomes aware of the termination after the fact, it is difficult to provide assistance or help to resolve the underlying issues.

² See paragraph 17 of Supplementary Report 22/17.

³ Clauses 2(b)(ii) and (iii) of the AMO provide that a senior assistant minister may have a notice period of up to 9 months, or such other period of notice if agreed between the senior assistant minister, and the Archbishop, the rector and the parish council.

Consequences for failure to comply with due process requirements

Current environment

28. A failure to follow the procedures in the AMO can cause significant pain for all the parties involved, especially to the AM and their family.
29. Currently, there are few options that would remedy a failure to comply with the AMO. Relatedly, there are few consequences for rectors and wardens who have failed to comply with the AMO procedures.
30. In certain circumstances, an AM can make a complaint against the rector and/or warden(s) under the *Ministry Standards Ordinance 2017* (the **MSO**). The possible outcomes, however, can be severe.
31. Further, in making a complaint against a rector or warden, the AM could risk damaging not only their own reputation, but that of the rector, the wardens, or the parish in relation to the wider diocese and the local community. The desire of any of the parties involved to maintain confidentiality in relation to the termination of the AM's appointment can increase this risk when silence gives rise to gossip and speculative or presumed imputations, compounding the adverse impacts on the AM.
32. The Committee received testimony that the "high stakes" nature of making a complaint under the MSO was itself a barrier to complaints being made, which further limits the AM's options for recourse. In the event that a complaint is made, the lodging of the complaint itself prevents the kind of reconciliation that is desired.
33. Likewise, some rectors have reported that the MSO process can prevent them from pursuing reconciliation, particularly when the process itself prohibits conversations with the AM about the matters at hand. Whilst the MSO process is appropriate for serious offences, it would be prudent to develop alternatives that assist in resolving cases where there has not been wilful or deliberate disregard of process, but which has arisen from a lack of awareness or the appropriate skills, with a view to encouraging development, reconciliation and vindication.
34. A systematic approach could deal with these issues effectively. As such, this report contains a range of recommendations which provide for intervention at different points in the termination process. The aim is to avert the breakdown of staff relationships, to prevent the escalation of tensions, and to work towards a just resolution. It is hoped they will also address perceived inadequacies in the current system. However, the Committee acknowledges that no set of procedures can ever fully deal with the diversity of cases that may arise.

Ministry Standards Ordinance and reconciliation of relationships

35. In 2017, the MSO was introduced to establish a complaints process that examined the fitness of church workers, including rectors and wardens, for their office. The MSO is understood to be the only option available to deal with alleged non-compliance with the AMO process when the Grievance Policy⁴ does not assist to resolve disputes or to deliver satisfactory outcomes. This can occur when one or more of the participants do not engage with the processes available under the Grievance Policy.
36. Following the Grievance Policy can be helpful in circumstances where participants engage in good faith and are committed to the restoration of their relationship. Reconciliation is a gospel imperative that ought to be encouraged. Indeed, in a number of cases considered, the desire of the parties was for reconciliation. This should be encouraged and pursued, even if it is difficult.
37. The MSO option is appropriate when there are repeated, serious failures of process or where there is evidence of behaviour by a rector or warden that appears inconsistent with their holding office or carrying out the responsibilities attached to their office. However, it is important that these circumstances are distinguished from those arising from a lack of awareness, or where training and development is likely to prevent a recurrence. Occasions where the requirements of the AMO are not met due to a lack of awareness should not be overlooked but would not, in the Committee's view, constitute the kind of misconduct addressed under the MSO.

⁴ Otherwise known as the 'Diocesan policy for dealing with allegations of unacceptable behaviour'.

38. The existing definition of 'misconduct' in the MSO can accommodate serious or repeated failures to comply with the requirements of the AMO.⁵ This means that if an AM's complaint against a rector or warden is substantiated, the Professional Standards Committee may make recommendations which could include, for example, an apology, and instruction to undertake training, and, potentially, a recommendation for the removal of the rector's licence.
39. In addition, the Committee notes that wardens can have a significant impact on the experience of an AM in a parish, and particularly when serious difficulties arise. This is reflected in the wardens' role in the AMO, whose concurrence is required for the rector's decision to terminate the appointment of an AM to take effect.⁶
40. The Committee is aware that there are wardens, as well as rectors, who fail to comply with the AMO's due process requirements and proper staff management practices in dealing with AMs (although such cases are less common). The Committee considers that the proper mechanism for dealing with serious cases of warden misconduct is to seek the warden's removal from office, and if necessary, through the MSO. The Committee notes the honorary nature and limited term of the warden's office, as well as the rector's primary responsibility in any staff management process.

Other measures to address due process failures and poor management practices

Training for Assistant Ministers

41. As noted above, there are cultural and reputational factors which may influence an AM's decision not to utilise the MSO mechanism. Lack of awareness regarding the availability and purpose of the MSO may also be a factor, as AMs are provided little training on ordinances, including the AMO and MSO.
42. Given this, the Committee considers that more work is required to educate AMs regarding the policies and ordinances of the Diocese, their processes, as well as their mechanisms and especially the Grievance Policy, the AMO and the MSO as these have significant relevance to their roles and may be possible avenues of recourse against rectors and wardens for failures of process or staff management practice.
43. It should also be understood that, in our church polity, AMs are not tenured in the same way as rectors. However, the Committee recognises that the right of a rector and the wardens in a parish to terminate the appointment of an AM must be balanced with:
- (a) the reality of the significant commitment that an AM is expected to make in accepting an appointment, including relocating their home and family to be part of the local parish community; and
 - (b) the AM's particular interest in having fair access to reasonable timeframes with regard to the circumstances to seek out a new appointment and relocate in the event of the termination of their appointment.
- Other important considerations include the changing and emerging development needs, parish needs and family needs.
44. The Committee considers that AMs should be provided with training to understand staff management practices and their own development, to equip them with skills in "managing up", and to navigate the ordinance framework and administration of the Diocese. Such training will facilitate more informed interactions with rectors and wardens in all matters, including the difficult termination process (if necessary).
45. Accordingly, Ministry Training & Development (**MT&D**) should be requested to provide such training as part of the Ministry Development program, which is compulsory for all new AMs in the first three

⁵ This will depend on the circumstances of each case. In addition, the Committee considered whether the definition of 'misconduct' in the MSO should be amended to explicitly identify non-compliance with the AMO as grounds for misconduct. However, the Committee's view was that this specific identification of the AMO may have the serious but unintended consequence of creating ambiguity as to the application of the MSO in relation to non-compliance with other ordinances.

⁶ See clause 3(1)(b) of the AMO.

years following completion of their studies at Moore College. It may also be possible to invite the Centre for Ministry Development (**CMD**) to provide workshops for AMs.

Guidelines for development and training of rectors

46. As both the MSO and AMO were introduced in 2017, the requirements of the AMO and MSO are relatively new and potentially unfamiliar. In addition, with the relatively recent move from more traditional parish structures to staff teams with specialisation, leaders may not necessarily be equipped with the proper skills in staff leadership and management to respond to the changes introduced with the two ordinances.
47. It is likely that a reasonable portion of the occurrences of non-compliance with the AMO's due process requirements may be attributed to a lack of awareness by rectors and wardens of those requirements. This can be compounded by a lack of management experience in dealing with both ordinary and more challenging staff issues. These issues can include the stresses associated with recruitment, the ongoing development of staff, and the very significant burdens and time pressures on rectors for general ministry and strategic leadership. Such demands are in addition to a range of compliance issues which go well beyond matters associated with conflict or issues around termination. Proper management practices are likely to create aligned expectations, and identify and resolve many of the issues which arise in ministry relationships before they become more serious.
48. At the same time, the Committee is aware that there is a spectrum of reasons for non-compliance with the due process requirements of the AMO and proper staff management practices. These range from lacking knowledge or skills and inadvertent breaches, through to a lack of will or desire to comply with the prescribed obligations, or with appropriate management practices. The issues are complex, and often underlying them are differing expectations.
49. There are training programs which could be used to improve staff management practice within ministry staff teams, such as the CMD's two-day "Leading Staff" workshop. In addition, MT&D runs a more abbreviated half day workshop for conducting staff reviews. It is estimated that, by the end of 2019, 66 rectors will have completed the CMD workshop, and 14 rectors will have completed the MT&D workshop. Given the significance of the issues in this area the Committee recommends that all rectors who have not participated in these courses (or an equivalent) do so as a matter of urgency.

Guidelines for development and training of rectors

50. Rectors and AMs (and Lay Ministers for that matter) can avoid much of the difficulty in this key area by adopting a mindset of continuous development. The Committee recommends ministry staff teams supplement the formal diocesan staff management training (such as those mentioned above) with less formal ongoing development aids such as regular team discussions on the topic, having team discussions with the regional bishop, arranging coaching and mentoring for the ministry staff, reading relevant books and guides, and taking up other training opportunities.
51. To increase the current level of awareness and implementation around best practice staffing practices, as well as awareness of the current ordinance framework, the Committee requests that Safe Ministry incorporate a component on staff management training into the mandated Faithfulness in Ministry training that occurs every three years. This may be supplemented with brochures and instructional videos to train rectors and wardens regarding the AMO procedures.
52. The Committee notes with thanks that Safe Ministry is currently planning for the Faithfulness in Ministry training for 2020 to focus on bullying and staff management (including staff review processes).

Review of AMO termination process

53. The MSO could be described as a "blunt instrument" which reflects the fact that it exists to deal with matters which go to the fitness of church workers to hold office or responsibilities attached to that office. It responds to serious allegations and envisages serious consequences, such as the removal of a church worker from their office.

54. However, the MSO was not written to address instances of non-compliance which happen because of a lack of awareness or skill. In addition, to date the MSO has been relatively ineffective in facilitating the reconciliation of aggrieved parties.
55. Therefore a review mechanism should be established to deal with instances of alleged non-compliance with the process requirements of the AMO, along with a Review Panel for this purpose.
56. It is proposed that the review mechanism will operate as follows –
- (a) once notice has been given to the AM which purports to terminate their appointment (including a written notice of termination under clause 3(1)(b) of the AMO), an application may be made by the AM for a review of the process of termination under the AMO;
 - (b) the review will be undertaken by a Review Panel (**Panel**) comprising three members chosen from the Synod Pool (as established by the *Parish Disputes Ordinance 1999*), by each of the AM, rector and regional bishop;
 - (c) an application for review must be made within 6 months after issuance of the termination notice referred to in paragraph 56(a), although the Panel may accept an application made outside this period in exceptional circumstances;
 - (d) the application must be made in the prescribed form, and the rector and/or wardens must respond to the application in the prescribed form no more than 3 weeks after receipt of the application for review (the standard form of application and response to be completed by the parties);
 - (e) the Panel will investigate the termination for compliance with the process mandated in the AMO, for example, if there was a failure to notify the regional bishop about the proposal to issue the termination notice (as required under clause 3(3)(a));
 - (f) the Panel will, in general, decide the application on the papers, but will have the power to inform itself of the relevant facts in whatever way it considers appropriate, will not be bound by legal formalities and the parties will not be represented by lawyers or any other persons (subject to the Panel's discretion otherwise);
 - (g) the Panel cannot consider the substantive reasons for the particular termination (for example, if the reason given for termination was "unsatisfactory conduct" under clause (3)(b)(i) of the AMO, the Panel cannot consider whether there was any unsatisfactory conduct and if such conduct warranted termination);
 - (h) the Panel's consideration will be limited to forming a view regarding compliance or non-compliance with the due process requirements of the AMO, and the nature of any non-compliance;
 - (i) the Panel will set out in a report, its view on whether there has been any non-compliance with such due process, and may make non-binding recommendations in relation to the matter, including any appropriate compensation or recourse; and
 - (j) the Panel will issue the report to the applicant, the rector and the wardens, regional bishop and Archbishop; while it will be in the Archbishop's discretion to release the report to other parties, for example, the Parish Council or the AM's prospective or current rector (not being the rector who is the other party to the application).
57. There would be merit in notices of termination referring to the availability of this review mechanism so AMs are informed of their right of a review under the AMO.
58. Statutory periods of notice for termination, as well as the 21-day window for unfair dismissal claims under the FWA, were taken into consideration in recommending a time limit of 6 months for the making of an application for review. Given reinstatement is unlikely in a parish context, a longer timeframe for applications is appropriate. Typical a three-month notice period is given to AMs, during which they are normally expected to work, and potentially relocate their home and family. An additional three-month window is appropriate, as it would provide time for prayer and reflection following termination, while not being unduly onerous so that the parties could be satisfied that the matter was at an end.
59. In relation to remedies, reinstatement is unlikely to be a workable or desirable remedy in the event of the termination of an AM, given the nature of ministry work and the typically small size of ministry teams.

60. The Panel process has the advantage of providing development opportunities for all parties, and introduces the possibility of compensation, vindication, discipline and even reconciliation without the “blunt instrument” of the MSO mechanism.

Misalignment of expectations regarding length of appointment

61. Anecdotal evidence suggests that one contributing factor to relationship breakdowns between rectors and AMs is the misalignment of expectations between them regarding the “permanence” of the AM’s appointment to a parish.
62. AMs are not tenured in the same way as rectors. This fact is reflected in the AMO, which sets out the mechanism to be followed for the rector (with the wardens’ concurrence) to terminate an AM’s appointment. Nonetheless, there have been instances where an AM has been surprised by a rector’s decision to terminate their appointment, because, they have assumed a longer period of appointment.
63. Historically, it was once the practice of Archbishops to license AMs to appointments (curacies) for a period of two years. Licences were issued to that effect. More recently, with the move to team ministry, the introduction of the permanent diaconate, and the whole-of-life nature of Christian ministry, AM appointments have become more open-ended.
64. The Committee has formed the view that these developments have contributed to a mismatch of expectations which have likely added to some of the difficulties that have arisen in ministry relationships between rectors and AMs, and in the termination process.
65. While recruitment training (such as that provided in some of the courses referred to above) will assist, the Committee also recommends for new appointments of an AM, that a rector consider making a request that the licence for the AM be time-limited, for a minimum of two years. Licences can be renewed and extended if mutually agreed. However, the mechanism itself introduces a healthy discussion of such a review. This rightly assumes a higher level of trust and maturity within the relational dynamic between the rector and AM, which is essential in the increasingly challenging work of parish ministry.
66. If the option was taken to specify an expiry date of a licence, the Registrar would advise the AM and the rector of the impending expiry date at least six months before the expiry of the licence, with the request that the rector indicate whether he will seek a renewal at least three months before the expiry of the licence.

Bullying and rector development

67. The Committee understands that bullying accusations against rectors have become more common and notes the significant overlap between bullying concerns with the issues addressed in this report – namely, the lack of relevant and current staff management skills.
68. The “blunt instrument” of the MSO is currently the only mechanism to deal with such issues. In the same way that the recommendations contained in this report seek to increase the opportunities for the development of rectors in staff management, the Committee believes that the same approach should be adopted with regard to allegations of bullying against rectors. It is important to distinguish between a “lack of skill” and a “lack of will”, particularly when generations can have such varied expectation and work ethics.
69. Accordingly, the Committee recommends that the MSO should be reviewed, particularly as it pertains to accusations of bullying, to ensure that rector development or other measures are recommended prior to more serious action.

For and on behalf of the Standing Committee.

DANIEL GLYNN
Diocesan Secretary

29 August 2019