

## **13/99 Cross Cultural Ministry 23/99 Georges River Region as a “Missionary Region”**

(A report from the Standing Committee.)

### **Introduction**

1. In October 1999 the Synod resolved as follows (resolution 13/99) -

“Synod, recognising the great importance of engaging in cross-cultural ministry and acknowledging that cross-cultural ministry can be costly and slow to develop, and may take years to become self-supporting, requests Standing Committee -

- (a) to examine the details of funding of cross-cultural ministry through the present system of grants to Regional Councils;
- (b) to investigate means of funding which would allow Regions to engage seriously in these ministries and still maintain adequate support for other parish ministry;
- (c) to use its findings in determining the method for future allocation of grants to Regional Councils; and
- (d) to report its findings to the 2000 session of Synod.”.

2. The Synod also resolved as follows (resolution 23/99) -

“Synod requests that Standing Committee -

- (a) give consideration to the Archbishop’s suggestion in his Presidential Address that the Georges River Region be declared a “Missionary Region” which is supported commensurately; and
- (b) advise the next session of Synod on the feasibility and ramifications of implementing such a course of action.”.

### **Consideration of the Resolutions**

3. The Standing Committee appointed a committee comprising Archdeacon Trevor Edwards, Archdeacon Geoff Huard, Mr Clive Ellis, Mr Geoff Kyngdon and Mr Rodney Dredge to consider resolutions 13/99 and 23/99. The committee has reported to the Standing Committee and this report is based on the committee’s

## **2 Report of Standing Committee & Other Reports & Papers**

report.

4. The committee met on several occasions and determined -
  - (a) grants made by Synod to regional councils are not tied as to the application of funds,
  - (b) much of what is termed "cross cultural" is ethnic specific,
  - (c) the level of financial support given to cross cultural ministry ("CCM") in a region reflects a range of imperatives including the need for an Anglican presence and the availability of appropriate ministers,
  - (d) Sydney is progressively moving towards 50% of the population being from a non-English speaking background, and
  - (e) there does not appear to be a strong CCM strategy in place across the whole Diocese, although individual regions show strong commitment and clear strategies toward that ministry.

### **Financing of CCM**

5. The committee identified and considered 3 funding models. It rejected the first 2 models and suggested the 3rd as a possibility.

#### *Model 1 - Establish a new CCM region*

6. In this model, the 5 existing Regions would be retained and a new CCM Region established with boundaries contiguous with the Diocese. CCM funding would be directed through the new CCM Region (probably headed up by an Archdeacon). Existing Regions would concentrate on non CCM ministry.

7. While having some attraction from a focus and speciality perspective, this model was rejected as unworkable. Among other things, managing a work in a particular building, church or parish would be almost impossible with two responsible entities.

#### *Model 2 - Establish a new diocesan department*

8. In this model a new Diocesan organisation would be established (along the lines of Anglican Youthworks) to facilitate CCM.

9. The committee liked the idea of a central resource and a central strategy development process. It also liked the idea of maintaining ministry "delivery" through existing regions.

10. The model failed, in the committee's view, at the point of strategy implementation. While a Diocesan organisation could influence the decisions made by a region on CCM funding, it could

not direct a region to do anything.

11. The committee also considered the variation whereby the new department became the conduit for all CCM funds. In this variant, Synod would exclude CCM funding from regional grants and would vest those funds in the new CCM department for distribution.

12. Again, while having several attractions this model was rejected because of its costs to operate and because it is a backward step in our current practice of moving spending decisions as close as possible to the ministry frontline.

*Model 3 - A form of tied funding*

13. In this model regional grants would be split between CCM and non CCM activities. The Synod would determine the key policy aspects. Of the models identified this one has the greatest chance of working.

14. The steps that would need to be taken each year in this model are -

- (a) Synod would approve a sum for the total of all regional grants. For identification purposes this figure is \$2,018,000 for the year 2000 and appears on page 664 of the 2000 Year Book.
- (b) Synod would then decide what proportion of that grant is to be spent on CCM and what proportion on non CCM activities. This would be a key policy decision.
- (c) The line item committee then determines how the CCM and non CCM amounts will be spread across each region and makes a recommendation to Synod. The proportion going to each region for each category may not be the same. Synod would take this into account in its money consideration.

15. The Committee preferred this model for these reasons -

- (a) It preserves existing regional control of ministry development spending.
- (b) It allows Synod to decide the basic policy, that is what proportion of its funds it wants to go to CCM.
- (c) It allows regional input to the spread of funds across the regions.
- (d) The need for accountability exists in this proposal but it is no different than the need for accountability for regional spending now.

16. The following table approximates the spending intentions of

#### **4 Report of Standing Committee & Other Reports & Papers**

the regions for 1999 and is included to give an idea of the dimensions of the matter. It is not necessarily representative of the likely outcome of the steps described in paragraph 14.

	<b>CCM</b>	<b>Non CCM</b>	<b>Total</b>
Georges River	363	143	506
North Sydney	57	146	203
South Sydney	99	259	358
Western Sydney	71	455	526
Wollongong	<u>118</u>	<u>225</u>	<u>343</u>
	708	1,128	1,936
<b>% of Total</b>	36.6%	63.4%	

#### **Georges River as a missionary region**

17. The committee acknowledged that Georges River Region has a very high CCM demand by nature of its demography and noted a strong mission orientation in the spending patterns of the Georges River Region.

18. The committee could not see a significant benefit from changing the status of Georges River Region. Eventually the question comes down to where, how and on what the Synod's funds are to be spent. A change in status does not need to occur to get the spending decision correct.

#### **Issues arising**

19. The committee's considered that a number of issues arose from its deliberations -

- (a) We need to define CCM and ethnic specific ministry so that strategy questions are easier and clearer.
- (b) Some further thought needs to go into the outcome-for-input question, that is where is the best result achieved for the available funds?
- (c) There appears to be an important part to be played by ethnic specific congregations in higher socio-economic areas. A strategy of funding such units needs to be assessed on the basis that they can quickly become self funding (and so contribute to further CCM activities).
- (d) Further exploration is required in determining likely moves in the population balance and the level of difficulty represented by different ethnic and cultural groups and guiding our work accordingly.
- (e) A tension exists (and needs to be explored) between

CCM and other forms of mission. There appears to be a reasonable argument that great care needs to be taken that adequate attention and funding is being given to more traditional mission pursuits.

20. The committee has suggested that the Standing Committee appoint a new committee to consider the issues referred to in paragraph 19, with a view to reporting further to the Synod in 2001. We have agreed in principle to establish a new committee but the appointment of members of that committee has not yet occurred.

For and on behalf of the Standing Committee

MARK PAYNE  
*Diocesan Secretary*

5 October 2000