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Foreword

For the last seven years, we have, as a Diocese prayed the MAP prayer which ends:

‘Inspire, enliven and empower us so that along the Way
we may be sustained by the life of Christ in ourselves,
in one another and in the world’

This Report, which we shall call ‘The Burnley Report’ is offered to the whole
Diocese to ensure that in the years to come we may continue to be ‘inspired,
enlivened and empowered’ in ministry for our mission to the world.

I am deeply grateful to Bishop John who has chaired this Task Force and to the
members of the three groups – the Theology Group, the Ministry Group, and the
Deanery Group, and to all who have assisted them. Please remember they have not
done this work for the Report to sit on a shelf, but for us all to engage with it, and to
help us to see what is positive in what we already have, to welcome fresh patterns
and ideas, and to be open to ‘bearing each others’ burdens’.

No one is saying, least of all those who have produced ‘The Shape of Things to
Come’ that it is possible to draw a blueprint of the future of Mission and Ministry in
this Diocese, because God the Holy Spirit is always good for a surprise! In these
pages I think you will find He has shown us some of the challenges we face, many of
the opportunities that lie before us, and some of the issues which we, His pilgrim
Church need to address in the 21st century.

With my prayer that this Report will help us to spread the Word and pass it on, and
so witness more faithfully to the world for justice, reconciliation and peace.

+ Nicholas Blackburn
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## Abbreviations and Glossary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CME</td>
<td>Continuing Ministerial Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cluster</td>
<td>We have used the word ‘cluster’ in this report to cover a variety of patterns of parishes working together, including multi-parish benefices, formal team ministries as well as informal clustering of parishes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DBF</td>
<td>Diocesan Board of Finance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DDO</td>
<td>Diocesan Director of Ordinands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HID</td>
<td>House for Duty Priest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IME</td>
<td>Initial Ministerial Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LCTP</td>
<td>Lancashire and Cumbria Theological Partnership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAP</td>
<td>Mission Action Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MDR</td>
<td>Ministerial Development Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSE</td>
<td>Minister in secular employment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-retired PTO</td>
<td>Permission to Officiate – not retired</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OLM</td>
<td>Ordained Local Ministry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OPM</td>
<td>Ordained Pioneer Minister – charged with planting churches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PA</td>
<td>Pastoral Assistant – commissioned lay minister of pastoral care</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCC</td>
<td>Parochial Church Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reader</td>
<td>Licensed lay ministry of preaching and pastoral care</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retired PTO</td>
<td>Permission to Officiate - retired</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SM</td>
<td>Stipendiary Minister</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSM</td>
<td>Self Supporting Ordained Minister</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSM (Local) or SSM(L)</td>
<td>Self Supporting Ordained Minister fostered by the Parish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stipendiary</td>
<td>In receipt of a Stipend</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UPA</td>
<td>Urban Priority Area</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
INTRODUCTION

1. The Church faces many challenges and opportunities in its life and structures. This is not limited to our own Church of England (See Appendix 1), nor even to our Diocese, deaneries and parishes, for we now face new and pressing challenges as to the effective distribution and deployment of our ministerial resources as we seek to engage in the mission and ministry of Christ.

2. However, the ordained should not be seen as the sole resource for the mission and ministry of the Church, but rather as enablers for the ministry of the whole people of God, the royal priesthood. Ordained and lay are interwoven under the authority of Christ. For it is within the ministry and witness of the royal priesthood of all believers that Christ calls some to exercise specific ministry relating to authorised lay people, while yet others to be ordained.

3. These ministries are called to serve the whole body. Such a tapestry of collaborative ministry has been a growing reality within our Church and yet its development is not yet complete. Still too frequently the laity can perceive their role as supporting the vicar in assigned tasks. Yet surely it is better to see the ordained as the one who facilitates, encourages, equips and liberates the laity to fulfil their call received in the baptismal covenant. For the church to advance such concepts of ministry, a strong ordained ministry, both stipendiary and self-supporting, is required; and a recognition as a pilgrim people of God that we are called to face the challenges and the opportunities which lie ahead of us.

4. In 2000, when I became Bishop of Burnley, we had at our disposal approaching 250 parochial stipendiary clergy. This situation has been continually changing. Initially we had to face the hard issue of finance and over the past few years the numbers of stipendiary clergy have dropped. In 2006, we had 168 stipendiary incumbents, with a further 31.5 stipendiary curates. This was seen to be financially sustainable, assisted by the deaneries and parishes engaging in pastoral reorganisation, the development of a building audit, a readiness to meet parish share and other actions in order that the Church may remain effective in our mission and ministry.

5. Now we have a new reality to face. The stipendiary clergy deployed within our Diocese is projected to fall to 106 incumbents, with additionally 20 stipendiary curates in training by 2019 (this may be on a good day!) This will have a dramatic effect on church life. The main cause for this change is the
decrease in the number of stipendiary vocations (SM) nationally. Of course, new ministries have been developing – self supporting ordained clergy (SSM), pioneer ministries, lay ministries etc. However, it is noticeable that the number of SSM vocations, despite encouragement, is also dropping nationally. In addition, over the next few years, the Church of England will face a large number of retirements from both SM and SSM ministries (40% nationally of stipendiary clergy will retire over the next ten years).

6. While we commit ourselves to continue to encourage and to pray urgently for candidates to offer themselves for ordination, the reality of these figures must surely be taken seriously. For if clergy numbers diminish below a critical mass, how will we be able to maintain and develop effective collaborative ministry and mission, and engage with our national responsibilities?

7. The Task Force, who compiled this report, was formed because as a Diocese we need, under God, to plan strategically for the reality we face. It has worked for a year to bring you this document. We hope it will encourage the Bishop’s Staff, Council and Diocesan Synod to reflect and develop appropriate policies and strategic planning regarding the review and deployment of ordained ministry as the needful response for evolving shared collaborative ministry, within the present and future context.

8. While the clergy numbers (SM and SSM) bring a focus to this report, we are actually aware of the challenges facing all who are ordained. The nature of their ministry requires them to act and lead collaboratively. In the 21st century, those involved in the formation and training, initial and continuing, of our clergy will need to emphasise this aspect of ministry in order that the clergy can deliver appropriate models of leadership.

9. The members of the Task Force represented a wide spread of theological understandings, ministerial experience and responsibilities within the Diocese. We met regularly in order to complete the work within the year and felt it best to divide into three sub-groups to consider: a) theology and ecclesiology b) ministry and c) Diocese, Deanery and Parish.

A. **The Theology Group** reflected on a theological and ecclesiological understanding, which could assist us with wrestling with the issues before us. Such an understanding was multi-faceted and rooted our discussions as we debated the consequences of the dramatic changes which lie ahead of us.

B. **The Ministry Group** offered suggestions for the Bishop’s Staff, Bishop’s Council and Diocesan Synod to develop and build into policies of clerical deployment and possibilities of resourcing such and the strategic planning to deliver them.

C. **The Deanery Group** felt that the key to the future was the necessity to change the nature of the deaneries. They offer the view that, if the deaneries, working collaboratively with parishes,
are to be effective instruments, they need to have the ability to discern the ministerial and mission resources required locally, in harmony with the Diocesan vision and strategy. Such discernment will require an accompanying deanery strategic plan for the deployment of clergy, the ability to determine the means for effecting this financially, and the means to encourage effective working between parishes.

10. If as a Church, we are to continue to maintain that we have a responsibility under Christ – a charge – to proclaim the Gospel to and in our nation and likewise to offer pastoral ministry to all in our Parishes, then pastoral reorganisation, though vital, is not enough. We cannot have fewer clergy and continue as we are; this will mean burn-out for clergy and possible withdrawal into a hoped-for survival as a ghetto church. This is not, in our view, a way forward. Such is not a vocation for disciples of Christ, whether lay or ordained.

11. The missional vocation of the Church is increasingly enacted within a culture of unbelief and aggressive secularism. This demands a greater resilience of both lay and ordained. Church growth is hard won. So resources must be committed to developing the skills of evangelism and apologetics within the church.

12. I believe the questions that the Task Force report raises – the challenge it lays before you – is to develop a strategy based on reasoned theology and ecclesiology, taking seriously the reality we face of planning for policy and pragmatic implementation for 2020.

13. I commend not only the reading of this report, but also a wrestling with the information and concepts which it contains.

14. My thanks to all the members of the Task Force for their readiness to engage in breakfast meetings, for collaboratively working in sub groups and for delivering this report in the prescribed period.

15. Finally, I am convinced that we can face these difficult challenges, although I recognise some decisions will be painful; but as a people who embrace a theology of death leading to resurrection and whose hope rests upon Jesus Christ, our Lord, who died and was raised to victory, we can move ahead with faith and courage.

+John Burnley
November 2011
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Executive Summary

16. Chaired by Bishop John, the remit of the Task Group was to look at how in the diocese we sustain parochial ministry whilst experiencing reducing numbers of parochial stipendiary clergy. The drivers are not simply financial, despite reducing budgets; our main concern has been to contemplate how the considerable resources at our disposal, both lay and ordained, may be responsive to the challenges which face us.

i. Falling numbers of parochial stipendiary clergy (see Appendix 3, table 10 below)
ii. Reducing budgets
iii. Expectations of clergy and lay communities
iv. The optimum structures to support clergy and lay at Parish, Deanery and Diocesan levels

17. Key parochial stipendiary clergy statistics

In 2006, we had 168 parochial stipendiary clergy, with a further 31.5 stipendiary curates (IME 4-7)

In 2019 we are projected to have 106 parochial stipendiary clergy, with additionally 20 curates (IME 4-7)

18. The Task Force was allocated into 3 working groups, each considering the issues, challenges and opportunities according to their remit (p6 above). A summary of the issues they identified, their observations and recommendations follow.

The Theology Group

19. **The Theology Group** set the context for the challenges facing the Diocese by identifying that, throughout its 2000-year history, the Church has changed in its structures and worship. The Group examined the implications of this in terms of:

i. the responsibility of all the baptised to be a people of God and through the Church to live the vocation to be faithful disciples of Christ
ii. the nature of ordained ministry is to liberate the royal priesthood of all the baptised
iii. to live out the meaning of local witness as expressed through the parish and the diocese, whose structure is not an administrative convenience but a way of expressing shared discipleship and ministry
iv. the changing nature of what it means to speak of and belong to communities
20. The Theology Group in its report, pp 15-19, concluded that we need

i. bishops (including their immediate staff), priests and deacons who are
equipped to engage missionally with a post-Christian society
ii. a diocesan structure that is slim, adaptable, flexible, quick to respond
and ‘fit for purpose’
iii. strategies that enable mission in a context which is serious about the
rich possibilities suggested by the word *local*.
iv. theologies for ministry underpinned by the ecclesiology we have
outlined and
v. reflect these changes in culture

21. One of the most encouraging things to come out of our discussions has
been the realisation that our different theologies need not be in
competition. The fact that we all come to discussions like this with
significantly different ecclesiologies and theologies of ministry is a
challenge to be as radical as the times require. For some, the main
focus of church life is the witness of a worshipping community to a local
community, while others see the diocese as embodying all that is most
meaningful in the idea of the local church. For some, ordination to the
threelfold Orders of bishop, priest and deacon is not as central as the
ministry of all the baptised. Taking these differences seriously allows us
to learn from each other. Refusing to be bogged down by these
differences allows us to recognise the underlying truth that God calls us
all to mission.

22. Ultimately, it takes courage to acknowledge the underlying insight here,
that there is no one theology, but rather mutually enriching and authentic
*theologies*, that offer ways of uniting in witness, while acknowledging real
difference over a range of issues: such is being the Church of England.

**The Ministry Group**

23. The section of the report produced by the Ministry Group (pp 20 - 33)
starts by examining the implications of doing nothing to produce a
strategic response to the projected drop in the number of parochial
stipendiary clergy (p 9).

24. It then suggests a number of detailed and practical recommendations
aimed at mitigating the adverse effects of the ‘Do nothing’ scenario (pp 30
- 33)

25. At the heart of this section is a concern to enable the ministry to which the
whole people of God are called, and within that to use the increasingly
scarce resource of as effectively as possible. A full list of recommend-
dations is included within the report (pp 22 – 30); these recommendations
deal with the following areas:
i. Involving parishes in strategic discussion about pastoral reorganisation and facilitating change

ii. Encouraging Collaborative Ministry (lay and ordained) in parishes, teams and groups

iii. Developing strategies for putting together new patterns of parishes to produce effective units for mission and ministry, and avoiding clergy burn-out

iv. Maximising vocations to formal lay and ordained ministries, and retaining and making the best use of those who are ordained

26. “We need not stumble backwards into the future, casting longing glances at what used to be; we can turn around and face the changing reality. It is after all a safer position if you want to keep moving”. (Charles Handy, The Age of Unreason, 1992)

The Deanery Group

27. The Deanery Group examined the current and potential role of the Deanery within the Diocese and how a Deanery might play its part in the mission and ministry of the Church of the future.

28. The Group considered the detail of how the Deanery can provide structure and energy to develop mutuality, being ‘better together’, by

- affirming and nurturing relationships in and between parishes
- providing vision releasing the wealth of resources in a deanery – people, money, skill, local knowledge and information, facilities and buildings
- oversight beyond that of a single parish

29. The questions posed by the Deanery paper sought to explore how the extraordinary potential and gifts within our communities can be released. It identified a range of functions which would be more effective at Deanery level. It was noted that these could include

- Mission planning
- Training events and programmes
- Management of resources (office and/or skills)
- Relationships with local ecumenical partners

30. Certain functions would require decisions or authorisation from the Diocese

- Authority to contribute to management of ministry deployment
- Distribution of parish share and delegation of share allocation
- Envisioning and resourcing Fresh Expressions
- Advising Bishops re deployment of assistant curates
- Facilitation of Deanery wide training of curates
31. To make this possible for our Deaneries, each Deanery should have a real, recognised and accountable identity, but with a uniform structure across the Diocese. The role of the Area Dean would be more rigorously defined, with appropriate training and support, both for the Area Dean and staff.

32. The present Deanery Divisions could be redrawn to make each a more workable and sustainable unit in pursuit of the vision set out in the Introduction (paragraph 9) above. The Group considered that an optimum size of deanery should be determined which takes into account a wide range of factors, including, inter alia, geographical profile, established relationships, buildings and ministerial resources.

33. Following detailed analysis and desk work, the Group concluded with two recommendations.

   **Recommendations**

   i. Sheffield formula is used as an initial basis for allocating the number clergy with final deployment to take account of local opportunities
   
   ii. Reduce the number of Deaneries from 14 to 10 or fewer.

   **Report Conclusion**

34. In conclusion, I would commend the report and appendices to you.

35. You will have now perceived that the Report, rather than being prescriptive as to action, points towards the necessary development of policies and strategies which need to be in place in the next five years, in order that the Church will be prepared for 2020. There may be those who would have wished the Report to deal with every aspect of the Church’s life. Again, I would ask for patience, for such comprehensiveness would have required much more of the precious time than could be devoted to the task, but also such comprehensiveness requires the engagement of the whole Church rather than just one group.

36. However, some comments may assist:

37. **Distinctive areas of ministry**: The issues raised regarding the changes needed in ministry have necessarily been generic. This was the task set before the group. The application of these generic issues to the distinctive areas of urban, rural or sub-urban must rest at the agreed level of subsidiarity, e.g. Parish / Deanery / Diocese where the appropriate action for specific outcomes will be effected.
38. **Mission and Ministry**: Some may note that mission and ministry have deliberately been held together within this report. Indeed, while church growth is rightly of the highest priority within our Diocese, and such growth can only be realised when driven by effective discipleship, ministry and mission. These are not ends of the spectrum, but rather an interwoven whole.

39. **Expectation for Change**: What has become clear over the past few years is a readiness within the Diocese to recognise the requirement of pastoral reorganisation. However, the spirit of ‘nimbyism’ (not in my back yard) is raised in parishes time and time again. Unless there is real sharing of ministry, we will not be able to tackle the issues outlined in the report. This impacts not only upon pastoral reorganisation, but also the sharing of financial and ministerial resources.

40. Finally, I believe as a Diocese we can be ready for the challenges of 2020, if the vision of theology, philosophy and integrated mission and ministry contained within this report is implemented, along with an energetic thrust for growth in the Church sustained by the power of the Holy Spirit.

+ John Burnley
41. Chaired by Bishop John, the remit of the Task Group was to look at how in the Diocese we sustain parochial ministry whilst experiencing reducing numbers of parochial stipendiary clergy. The drivers are not simply financial, despite reducing budgets; our main concern has been to contemplate how the considerable resources at our disposal, both clergy and lay, may be responsive to the challenges which face us

   i. Falling numbers of parochial stipendiary clergy (see Appendix 3, table 10 below)
   ii. Reducing budgets
   iii. Expectations of clergy and lay communities
   iv. The optimum structures to support clergy and lay at Parish, Deanery and Diocesan levels

42. Key parish parochial stipendiary clergy statistics

   In 2006, we had 168 parochial stipendiary clergy, with a further 31.5 stipendiary curates (IME 4-7)

   In 2019 we are projected to have 106 parochial stipendiary clergy, with additionally 20 stipendiary curates (IME 4-7)

43. Three subgroups were formed, each of which has produced a report with its own recommendations and conclusions. These were the Theology Group, the Ministry Group and the Deanery Group.
Theology Group Report

44. “The Church of England is part of the One, Holy, Catholic and Apostolic Church, worshipping the one true God, Father, Son and Holy Spirit. It professes the faith uniquely revealed in the Holy Scriptures and set forth in the catholic creeds, which faith the Church is called upon to proclaim afresh in each generation. Led by the Holy Spirit, it has borne witness to Christian truth in its historic formularies, the Thirty-nine Articles of Religion, *The Book of Common Prayer* and the Ordering of Bishops, Priest and Deacons.” (Common Worship, p xi)

45. This quotation from the Declaration of Assent, made by all those in licensed forms of ministry before they are ordained or commissioned, licensed, gives a summary of the Church of England’s understanding of the foundations of its ecclesiology. It is true to say that the Church of England does not have a confessional document as such, akin to the Westminster Confession, or indeed the Code of Canon Law, but we do have what are termed ‘historic formularies’. It is of note that of the three ‘historic formularies’, two are liturgical texts: namely the *Book of Common Prayer*, and the Ordinal. So it might be said that we as a Church identify ourselves primarily in praxis and especially the way in which we worship.

46. It might be argued that the compilers of the *Book of Common Prayer* were at great pains to establish some form of conformity in the worship of the Church of England, emphasising in the text ‘Concerning the Service of the Church’, that ‘whereas heretofore there have been great diversity in saying and singing in Churches…, now from henceforth all the whole Realm shall have but one use.’ (*BCP*, p ix) However, in recent years, with the development of the Liturgical Movement, and ultimately with the publication of the *Common Worship* library such a single use may appear to have passed by the wayside, with each Church adopting its own ‘use’ from the options contained within the texts.

47. The truth is that the aims of the compilers of *Common Worship* envisaged a different emphasis on common forms of worship than seemed to be the case previously, in that the common forms are more to do with the underlying structures – the building blocks, as it were – than with the texts themselves. Far from being at odds with the aims of the *Book of Common Prayer*, these building blocks allow a variety of expression, whilst keeping a common framework for the liturgy across the Church. This would seem to be very much in keeping with the Preface to the *Book of Common Prayer*, where it states that ‘It hath been the wisdom of the Church of England, ever since the first compiling of her Publick Liturgy, to keep the mean between the two extremes, of too much stiffness in refusing, and of too much easiness in admitting any variation from it.’ (*BCP*, p v)

48. This attempt to achieve in liturgical forms some form of unity in diversity through the underlying structure can be seen as a metaphor for our understanding of the nature of the Church of England itself. In our theological discussions regarding the nature of the Church and her ministry, we naturally came across some seemingly insurmountable differences of understanding. But if we see
those differences as being undergirded by the overall structure of the Church, then perhaps we can achieve some notion of unity in those diverse understandings.

49. In a very minor way, this serves to remind us that, throughout its 2000-year history, the Church has had to deal with issues of change – in both its structure and in its worship. While we acknowledge that for many, this proves difficult, it is worth keeping in mind as we look towards a time which will inevitably see changes in our understanding of what the Church is. Just as Common Worship allows a rediscovery of a flexible approach to our worship, perhaps a similarly flexible approach to some of our structures is necessary if we are to bear witness the Christian truth in the 21st century.

50. While the Church of England is governed by Bishops in Synod, it is often said to be ‘Episcopally led and Synodically governed’. Although this may not tell the whole story, it does say something serious about the role of the whole people of God in the governance of the Church. Our synodical system includes at all levels the voice of all people, both lay and ordained, and charges them with important decision making tasks on all aspects of the Church’s life. This emphasises the fact that, through baptism, the whole people of God are a part of the Church, and share in the responsibility for bearing the message of Christ to the people of this generation.

51. In our own diocese, whilst we are bound by the laws of the Church to uphold the synodical system, and the voice of lay and ordained in the decision-making bodies, there appears to be a feeling on the ground that the work of the Church is primarily the work of the ordained. We reflected that this perhaps is due to some of the last remnants of ‘Christendom’ within our society at large, and perhaps due to a reluctance from some to ‘tread on the toes of the vicar’, or indeed of the vicar not being prepared to share some of his or her ministerial responsibilities.

52. If we are serious about the obligations placed upon us at our baptism, then we must be prepared to engage in the mission of Christ’s Church. Far from reserving this to those in officially commissioned roles of ministry, we emphasise, through our baptismal liturgy itself, that it is very much the responsibility of us all. At the commission of the newly baptised, a minister asks the following questions to the newly-baptised:

a. Will you continue in the apostles’ teaching and fellowship, in the breaking of bread, and in the prayers?...
b. Will you proclaim by word and example the good news of God in Christ?...
c. Will you seek and serve Christ in all people, loving your neighbour as yourself? (CW: Cl, p.91)

The answer to each (and indeed two more) is ‘With the help of God, I will’.

53. As a Church, then, we ought to seek ways in which we can encourage the whole people of God in discharging the vocation received at Baptism, to be
faithful disciples of Christ. From that discipleship flows the call to forms of ministry within the Church, whether ordained or lay, and whether officially authorised or not. The imperative is there, then to emphasise that Church is something we ‘are’ for the whole of our lives, rather than what we ‘do’ or ‘go to’ on a Sunday morning.

54. Alongside this understanding of the church as the whole baptised people of God, exercising their vocation to discipleship, and to ministry which flows from that needs to be laid our understanding of just what the local Church is. Indeed, in the Ordinal, we are reminded that the ministries of Bishop, Priest and Deacon are there to serve the royal priesthood of all the baptised. Anders Bergquist in God’s Transforming Work (SPCK 2011) reminds us that ‘the ministry of the ordained exists to articulate, to structure and to serve the ministry of all the baptised.’ In other words, there is a distinctiveness to the ordained ministry within the body of the Church which goes beyond structure, and which strikes at the heart of what it means to be Church, while at the same time, that ordained ministry finds its roots in the ministry of all the baptised.

55. Again, within the Church of England, there are a variety of views on this, ranging from the understanding that the local Church is the parish, ministering to people of the locality, to the view that the church is the baptised people of God gathered around its bishop. Whilst in its structures, the Church of England appears to emphasise the latter (i.e. that the diocese is the essential local focus of the Church, it would appear that there is a more general feeling around the Church that the essential local focus is the parish itself. This understanding, though widespread, has its drawbacks theologically and practically. First, from a Church of England point of view, it could be argued that it undermines the understanding of the third of the ‘historic formularies’, in that, for the most part, it makes no acknowledgement of the role of the bishop, if we are a Church which believes the faith to be borne witness to in the ordering of Bishop, priest and deacon. Further, from a practical point of view, it makes no acknowledgement of what is going on a few miles down the road in the neighbouring parish or parishes.

56. From a social point of view, it is the case that in secular life many people ‘shop around’ for their services and for their entertainment. And yet the church maintains a parochial system which assumes that all people will attend their local parish church, and must be ministered to by their local parish priest. While we acknowledge the advantages this has, particularly expressed in the theological conviction that the Church of England is a Church which exists for the whole of the nation and thus everyone living in a parish has a ‘right of access’ to the parish priest, it can serve to entrench the view that the local church in its current legal reality is the only focus for mission and ministry.

57. In this reflection, we would want to emphasise a theological view that the very being of the Church ought to be focussed on God, since it is He who brought it into being, it is by His lifegiving Spirit that the Church exists, and it is through the sacrifice of His Son that He has won a people for his own possession. Oversight of His church is exercised by God himself. YET he shares it without
surrendering it with the church, with its ministers, and in a particular way with the Bishop, as the chief pastor of his diocese (and described in our liturgies as a ‘Father in God’). This is given practical expression in that all clergy within a diocese exercise their ministry either by deed of institution/collation, licence, or permission to officiate signed by the Bishop. At the Institution and Licensing service, the Bishop emphasises this by handing the document to the priest with the words ‘Receive this Cure which is both yours and mine’, thus reminding the newly appointed priest that the ministry he or she exercises is shared with the Bishop. In emphasising that a priest’s ministry is at all times shared with the bishop is not to downplay the belief that the authority for all ministry should and must come from an understanding of the apostolic gospel. It is that gospel which gives us the flexibility to express the priestly ministry in a number of ways, in order for the Church of God to flourish, while at the same time holding to the truths of that gospel.

58. If, then, we are truly to acknowledge the local Church as in a real sense and in its essence the diocese, not seen primarily as an administrative convenience but expressing this shared discipleship and ministry, then this may give us freedom to rethink how we present the Gospel to the people of Lancashire. It may help to break down some of the barriers of suspicion that currently exist when thinking about the diocesan office. If, when talking about ‘the diocese’ we can be reminded that we are the diocese, perhaps we may be able to recognise that those in other parts of the diocese (and even in our neighbouring parishes) are indeed our brothers and sisters in Christ.

59. If we are able to acknowledge our brothers and sisters in Christ across Lancashire, then there will be opportunities to collaborate with them in bringing the message of Salvation to those in our communities. It requires courage, and it requires determination, for it will involve us viewing differently and more creatively the differences of expression which that currently form the basis of a great deal of suspicion. If we can see these differences, however, in the terms in which the Common Worship texts are used, we should be able to identify the underlying structures which form the bedrock of our Church. It should be possible to be united in the common task of ‘worshipping the one true God, Father Son and Holy Spirit’, and professing ‘the faith uniquely revealed in the Holy Scriptures and set forth in the catholic creeds’.

60. These theological reflections around the central role of the bishop as the sign of the church as a local and catholic reality also link in with missiological concerns about the changing nature of contemporary society. The English parochial system developed at a time in history when locality was very much the determining factor in personal and community identity. The development of modern communication and consequent changes in social behaviour has led to more dynamic and in many cases non-geographical communities. So, just as we need churches who are led by presbyters and deacons who are equipped to engage missionally with a post-Christian society, so we need bishops, archdeacons and a diocesan structure that is slim, adaptable, flexible, quick to respond, and, to use an increasingly familiar term, ‘fit for purpose’. That is to
say we need strategies that enable mission in a context that is serious about the rich possibilities suggested by the word local.

61. Our hope is that any theology for ministry will be underpinned by the ecclesiology we have outlined and reflect these fundamental changes in culture, especially the increasingly pluriform nature of our communal networks.

62. One of the most encouraging things to come out of our discussions has been the realisation that our different theologies need not be in competition. The fact that we all come to discussions like this with significantly different ecclesiologies and theologies of ministry is a challenge to be as radical as the times require. For some, the main focus of church life is the witness of a worshipping community to a local community, while others see the diocese as embodying all that is most meaningful in the idea of the local church. For others, ordination to the threefold Orders of bishop, priest and deacon are not as central as the ministry of all the baptised. Taking these differences seriously allows us to learn from each other. Refusing to be bogged down by these differences allows us to recognise the underlying truth that God calls us all to mission.

63. Ultimately, it takes courage to acknowledge the underlying insight here, that there is no one theology, but rather mutually enriching and authentic theologies, that offer ways of uniting in witness, while acknowledging real difference over a range of issues, such is of being the Church of England.
Ministry Group Report

“We need not stumble backwards into the future, casting longing glances at what used to be; we can turn around and face the changing reality. It is after all a safer position if you want to keep moving”. (Charles Handy, The Age of Unreason, 1992)

Introduction

64. This section of the report examines the implications for the Diocese of a gradually reducing number of available parochial stipendiary clergy and offers some strategic guidance on how a re-shaped pattern of ministry may provide not just a sustainable but revitalised church into the future. To help concentrate the minds of the Ministry Sub Group, the following vision of our task was developed:

65. The Vision

Following God’s call arising from our contemporary context, we need to re-imagine the church to produce a healthy pattern of ministry for all its members to facilitate the breadth of its mission.

66. The history of the church maps out a journey of continual change and evolution. We would be naïve to think that change was only necessary in the past and arrogant to believe that what we have now is perfect or irreplaceable. Let there be no doubt, over the next 8 to 10 years, significant reductions in parochial stipendiary clergy numbers are going to occur and as they do, the impact will be felt throughout the Diocese. We now have two choices; either to wait and see, the ‘do nothing option’ or alternatively, to take advantage of the time we have before the downturn in stipendiary numbers reaches a critical point; to plan and deliver a new pattern of ministry with which to take forward God’s church.

67. If we choose the second of these options, the journey will not necessarily be an easy one and obstacles will have to be overcome. Many are suspicious of change, particularly when the call for change comes from the Diocese and some will certainly suspect that the motivation is purely financial. We also find ourselves in a Diocese which is strongly traditional and conservative in its outlook. In many Parishes there is a lack of enthusiasm for lay involvement and gender issues are still quite profound. At a local level, these barriers will make change difficult to achieve, but equally important is that they could adversely influence the perception of those we seek to attract and recruit into the Diocese. For instance the recent report of the Dioceses Commission on the Yorkshire Dioceses1 picked up evidence of people and/or parishes not wanting to be part of Blackburn Diocese because of perceived differences of style and

---

1 Dioceses Commission Review Report no.2, Dioceses of Bradford, Ripon & Leeds, Sheffield and Wakefield
outlook (paragraph 9.2.4); however, this situation was seen to be unreal when we met them.

68. Before moving into a more general discussion on what might be necessary if change is going to occur, it is worth sparing a few moments to contemplate the probable consequences of the ‘Do Nothing Option’.

69. **The Implications of Doing Nothing**

   i. Clergy numbers within the Diocese gradually fall to **126 or fewer**. This occurs randomly across the Deaneries.
   ii. Stress levels amongst remaining clergy rise significantly as their individual workloads increase.
   iii. Vacancies start to become more difficult to fill; they get longer and eventually become simply impossible to fill.
   iv. Parishes with harder to fill posts will be hit first but few will be immune in the long run.
   v. Parish ‘mergers’ will be forced by circumstance – i.e. not necessarily those which are best fit.
   vi. A minimum of 40 parishes may be at risk through mergers.
   vii. In a restricted market where demand exceeds supply, the Diocese will find out whether or not it is attractive to potential candidates for stipendiary posts. (Recruitment into any sector within the North West is problematic, initial soundings appear to predict that we are likely to attract less than our ‘fair share’ of the resource pool i.e. 126.
   viii. Pockets of parishes (either the ones attractive to new incumbents or those where young incumbents have freehold) will remain outside the stress bubble for some time!
   ix. The use of trained laity will have to increase, but without an increase in recruitment, training and flexibility of movement, this could prove difficult.
   x. Self-supporting / retired / house for duty clergy will be at a premium, but they will not necessarily be in the optimum locations.

70. At the end of this section, we will return the ‘Do Nothing Option’ for comparison purposes.

71. **Throughout the remainder of this section, we will be examining the following:**

   i. *Managing expectations / changing cultures*
   ii. *Working Collaboratively / Collaborative Ministry*
   iii. *Models for uniting Parishes / sharing clergy*
   iv. *Selection, recruitment, retention and deployment within all forms of ministry.*

---

2 See paragraph 42, and Appendix 3 Stipendiary Clergy and Curates
I. Managing Expectations / Changing Cultures

72. Changing patterns of ministry and the falling numbers of parochial stipendiary clergy requires a change in culture. If expectations remain the same, clergy will find themselves trying to live with both a new and an old pattern of ministry, which can only lead to failure and burnout. There needs to be an equipping of both clergy and laity for this development of ministry. There also needs to be an openness to tell as it is, acceptance that it is nobody’s fault and that God is in this.

73. Working to change the culture is about empowering laity and clergy alike; to give them confidence. There needs to be a killing of the myths, i.e. over finance. There is no hidden issue; it is not simply that we can’t pay the clergy it is because they are not there. In future clergy will need to have more of an oversight role (it has been described as episcopal), enabling the ministry of others rather than trying to do it all themselves, holding on to the vision and encouraging others in their ministry. This will impact on all in leadership roles in the church. Readers are also facing a change and a development in their role and need to be supported in managing expectations on them, particularly in vacancies and multi parish benefices.

74. There needs to be a move to great leadership within the church.
   “Good leaders produce followers. Great Leaders produce leaders”

Pastoral Reorganisation

75. When necessary change looms, parishes should be involved from a very early stage, when they are ‘safe’. If there is a Diocesan wide overview of what ministry in the Diocese might look like, discussions with parishes could begin at an early stage. By working things through from a safe position, when the inevitable happens, the culture will have already begun to change. Hopefully this will stop the blame game and people will feel that they have a say in their future. With a Diocesan overview in place, Deaneries via the Area Dean can then begin to work with this in their own areas. A move towards a people led change will ensure that Pastoral Reorganisation is seen as a positive rather than a negative move and will make the best use of all the resources of the Parish/Deanery. It is essential that all types of ministry are valued and taken into account, Lay, stipendiary and self-supporting ordained ministry.

Recommendations

76. The Diocese should create an overview of what the Diocese might look like as the numbers of stipendiary clergy reduce. There should be an overall plan of the distribution of stipendiary clergy giving fair shares to each deanery.

77. Deaneries, given the Diocesan overview, should encourage Parishes to talk to each other well in advance of any clergy reductions taking place.
Interim Ministry / Facilitating Change in Parishes

78. This is not simply about vacancies but facilitating any change. Change needs to be couched in positive terms and not negative. Difficult tasks in putting parishes together could be dealt with by interim ministers who could work with parishes through these challenges so that a new or existing Incumbent can work with the parishes rather than having to fight difficult battles particularly in regard to service time changes and where the Incumbent resides.

Recommendation

79. That the Diocese examines ways of facilitating change and investigates the possibility of employing Interim Ministers with the appropriate people skills and organisational change experience.

II. Working Collaboratively / Collaborative Ministry

“Collaboration is encoded into the way God creates and acts...when the church acts in a collaborative manner it actualizes its own deepest reality” (Stephen Pickard, Theological Foundations for Collaborative Ministry, 2009)

Collaborate – work jointly on an activity or project (OED online)

Collaborative ministry – a way of relating and working together in the life of the church that expresses the communion (of) the church (Catholic Ministries for Church Renewal, www.catholicministers.org/prophetic.htm)

80. In recent years the church has seen the growth and development of a variety of ministries that have brought a healthy challenge to traditional models of ministry and the ways in which it is exercised and experienced in the diocese and the Church of England at large. Within the diocese there is now a wide range of lay ministries, both formal either licensed or commissioned voluntary ministry i.e. Readers (licensed) and Pastoral Assistants (commissioned), as well as more informal voluntary ministry such as membership of pastoral visiting teams, leading youth and children’s work, bereavement support etc. as well as the more classic lay ministries such as Churchwardens, PCC members etc.

81. However, there are a small number of parishes where lay ministry is exercised in a paid capacity funded either directly by the individual parish, or by contributions from churches across deaneries, or by a combination of contributions from various funding bodies. Alongside this development in lay ministry there has continued to be significant numbers of women and men being called to exercising Self-Supporting Ordained Ministry (SSM), while the ordained ministry in the diocese continues to benefit from sector ministries exercised in chaplaincies and/or non-parochial stipendiary roles.

82. Recently, the diocese has also experienced the ‘first shoots’ of Pioneer Ministry with the appointment of at least one Curate with this as a specific ministry focus. Inevitably the changes in variety, scope and responsibility in the make-
up of the ministry of the diocese brings into focus the ways in which the diocese and individual parishes work collaboratively as a team or teams. The concept ‘collaborative’ ministry has become something of a ‘buzz phrase’ in the church in recent times resulting in a rather vague definition of what it is and how it is exercised, resulting in an almost inexorable drift towards “delegated” rather than truly “collaborative” ways of working. Consequently, the term itself has now been questioned (e.g. “shared” rather than “collaborative” ministry as suggested by a recent clergy focus group) as people seek to find a more appropriate description and definition. Whatever the nomenclature it is vitally important to recognise that this way of being and working cannot be imposed in a “top-down” manner but needs to be grown and nurtured at the “grass-roots” if it is to be truly an owned and successful transformation towards a renewed (new?) vision of what the Church is and can become.

83. As a consequence of these developments and the ways in which this both enhances and challenges the way in which ministry has been exercised and experienced in the diocese, the sub-group identified a range of factors that may suggest the ways in which the diocesan strategy might usefully support and further collaborative ministry in parishes and across the diocese.

**Recommendations**

84. **Encourage Collaborative Ministry as a rediscovery of the calling of all Christians to serve God in the church and the world, rather than allowing it to be seen as a knee-jerk reaction to the shortage of stipendiary clergy**

85. **Encourage discernment of vocation in its widest sense (not just lay people taking on roles previously perceived as clerical) as well as recognition that the vocational journey is an on-going dynamic process frequently experienced as a “call within a calling” or even a “calling out” from an existing vocation and ministry.**

86. **Recognise that ‘one-size’ does not fit all and each expression of collaborative ministry will need to be developed from within local settings:**

   “Collaborative ministry involves a gradual, mutual evolution of new patterns of communicating and ministering. Working collaboratively doesn’t happen automatically”

(www.catholicministers.org/prophetic.htm)

87. **The journey towards collaborative ways of working requires on-going and long term:**

   - Resources
   - Finance
   - Encouragement
   - Vision
88. The recognition and encouragement of the varieties of ministry i.e. PA, Reader, SSM, Sector, as well as less formally defined areas of service, are ministries ‘in their own right’ and not simply a way of ‘plugging the gaps’ in the liturgical and pastoral life of the parish.

89. The group recognised that the most significant barrier to effective collaborative ministry and working is patchy administration and communication, at all levels i.e. parish, deanery and diocese. Consequently, for any team (parish or diocesan) to be effective good administration and effective communication must be seen as foundational to the collaborative life of any ministry team.

III. Models for Uniting Parishes/Sharing Clergy

90. We have used the word ‘cluster’ in this section – to cover a variety of patterns of parishes working together, including multi-parish benefices, formal team ministries and informal clustering of parishes.

91. Discussion with those who have attempted it suggests that putting together new ‘clusters’ of parishes is time-consuming and needs careful planning. There is evidence of parishes that are beginning to share resources effectively (aiming to achieve more by working together than they could achieve separately, rather than simply producing a ‘fair share’ of limited resources) but one opinion is that such good working relationships can take decades to achieve. We have also had an opinion that expecting too much close working of parishes that are reluctant to work together can be perceived as bullying.

92. The challenge is to produce working arrangements which will enable parishes to share ordained ministry effectively, and will offer the opportunities for them to work together in other ways, while respecting their differences but also being able to work together without clergy being stretched across different situations in unreasonable ways.

Workloads

93. We need to accept that our clergy already face a hard job and we need to do something that manages workload particularly as we move forward into new patterns of Parishes, where the imbalance between workload and staffing will be even worse.

94. There is a need therefore, to establish what is acceptable. We must ask the question what duties should the clergy drop? What things would be better done by other people so that all our resources are used in the best way possible? What ought not to be done at all?

95. **Question:** How do we ensure that the workload expected of clergy is manageable both at present and when they find themselves working within new patterns of parishes? The size of parish is not always the best indication of
workload or expectation. Occasional Offices, Church School etc also need to be taken into consideration as do resources and capabilities of the congregation/parishioners.

**Recommendations**

96. That we should work towards having ‘time-costed’ Role Descriptors. We will need to develop an effective tool for this, and for clergy to monitor their working patterns, and we recommend that research be done in this area. (‘Affirmation and Accountability’, The Society of Mary and Martha, 2002, para 4.2.3, contains advice on how these might be used, but not on achieving the time-costing.)

97. That once a clear definition of duties has been arrived at, consideration should be given to which duties could be done by other people and are they equipped to take them onboard and also, which duties should not be done at all.

98. The outcome of these 2 recommendations could and should influence Parish reorganisation.

99. **Question:** At what level do ‘clusters’ anticipate working together? Should they continue to run as separate parishes but with reduced input from stipendiary clergy, or ought they to aim to work together at a deeper level, sharing more of their activities and eventually their PCC structure?

100. The answer will depend on a number of factors, including

i. how far the ‘cluster’ is a natural unit for mission and ministry

ii. the timescale – developing new ‘clusters’ takes time. Unless the ‘clustering’ is envisaged as a long-term arrangement developing joint working in any depth is unlikely to be possible

iii. their ‘outlook’. we should look at possible tools for describing outlook (cf ‘How to develop your local church’, Richard Impey, SPCK 2010) while being cautious about how far such tools are descriptive rather than determinative

iv. to what extent it has been possible to develop a genuinely shared vision for joint-working in the ‘cluster’

**Recommendation**

101. That we should work on possible models of ‘clustering’ and resource discussions, along with the offer of facilitation to enable fruitful discussion between parishes.

102. **Question:** how far are discussions about ministry in ‘clusters’ limited to ordained ministry? How do we build effective ministry teams? Should such ministry teams be focussed on individual churches or the ‘cluster’ as a whole? (or should it be both – local teams for pastoral care, running local services etc,
coordinated by a benefice-wide team?) If there is more than one clergy-person do they work in particular churches in the ‘cluster’ or offer particular expertise more widely? The answer to this set of questions will depend on how closely parishes could reasonably be expected to work together.

103. It is unrealistic to expect parishes (whether ‘clustered’ or not) to develop ministry teams and lay ministry generally without adequate support.

**Recommendation**

104. That we continue to invest in lay ministry and its developing role as a priority, alongside support for clergy.

**Practical suggestions**

105. At the most basic level a ‘cluster’ can only function if it can sustain its pattern of Sunday services with the clergy, Readers, etc, available. Before a priest moves into a newly-forming ‘cluster’ this pattern should be agreed with facilitation from diocesan level if necessary (archdeacon or suffragan bishop might be the appropriate person to do this, but if there is conflict a more neutral facilitator might be more effective). ‘Faith in the Countryside’ recommended that a priest should lead no more than two major services on a Sunday morning, in addition to an early, said, service, and ideally that the pattern should allow space for contact with the congregation after the service.

106. There should also be discussions about the workload of clergy in such a ‘cluster’ – how many PCC meetings will be involved? What about involvement in church schools? (See above on time-costed Role Descriptors.) Such discussions ought also to include priorities – do we want clergy time, especially in the evenings, so taken up with meetings that there is no space for pastoral care, or indeed family life or involvement in community activities? (Of course, such discussions ought also to look at the ‘load’ on lay people in the ‘cluster’!)

107. In one diocese the Bishop will only license a new priest to a ‘cluster’ if there is appropriate admin support available (paid or voluntary). This issue ought to be addressed.

108. Drawing together a new ‘cluster’ is a challenging clergy post. Some way of flagging up the seniority of the post (possibly by associating it with an honorary canonry for the first holder of the post?) might help attract experienced clergy to such demanding posts (at present ‘senior’ posts are often seen as involving significant city parishes).

109. Given that developing new ‘clusters’ requires significant time to develop new patterns, any ‘cluster’ which is to work together at anything beyond the most basic level of sharing a priest needs a measure of stability – we mustn’t change ‘clusters’ every 5 years.

110. The most vital recommendation is that in setting up new ‘clusters’, Bishops and Archdeacons must be realistic in their expectations (taking into account the possible variety of models for a ‘cluster’ of parishes) and
to articulate those expectations simply and honestly. In recognising the challenging nature of setting up new ‘clusters’ they must offer affirmation and support, especially when progress appears slow.

IV. Recruitment & Retention of Clergy
The issue: How to maximise vocations to (Lay and) Ordained Ministry and to retain and make best use of those who are ordained.
The strategy: ‘Re-imagining ministry for the 21st century’

111. To promote and make use of the breadth of Ordained Ministry, making the best use of the mixed economy (which, in an era with sufficient stipendiary clergy, was often been overlooked); we have Stipendiary, SSM, SSM (Local), MSE, HfD, Retired, non-retired PTO; are we making the best use of them in a planned way or is it just piecemeal?

112. Lay Training: for effective discipleship, training is the key for various forms of Lay Ministry and Lay: since lay ministry is the largest and most effective source of ordained ministry.

Recommendations
113. We need to emphasise the continuity and complementarity of our training programmes for different ministries
114. We must continue to upgrade and promote our lay training courses, including God Our Rock, Called to Serve and Mission Shaped Ministry and to promote vocations to PA and Reader ministry.

Lay Recruitment
115. Recruitment into vocations such as PA and Reader is patchy across the Diocese, with some Parishes producing no ‘home grown’ candidates for many years. It is clear that both the numbers and locations of these and other vital lay ministries are going to become more critical as we move towards less ordained ministers being available.

Recommendation
116. The Diocese in conjunction with Area Deans should lead a campaign to significantly increase numbers coming forward into the lay vocations. Particularly emphasis should be made to target those areas within the Diocese where few already exist.

SSM
117. Deployment (Peter Shepherd’s 2011 survey indicates that the majority of SSMs are prepared to be deployed elsewhere ‘if needed’, the vast majority willing to consider it.)
Recommendation
118. There should be an Episcopal interview around end of year 3 with SSM’s to consider possible deployment after curacy. The diocese needs to be proactive in this.

SSM (Local)
119. The absence of a dedicated Ordained Local Ministry scheme does not mean that we don’t welcome candidates to serve in ordained ministry in their home parish (now known as SSM(L)), indeed, it should make identification and selection of potential SSM(L) candidates more straightforward and training more high quality than in other dioceses with a separate OLM scheme.

Recommendation
120. The profile of SSM(L) needs raising, (e.g. as at Primary Visitation, 2010)

Retired Clergy
121. How do we make the best use of retired clergy who wish to be more involved in ministry than at present?

Recommendations
122. Give thought to a scheme for enabling this (eg inclusion of retired clergy in benefice/cluster/deanery ministry teams where appropriate), and find out what other dioceses do to effectively deploy their retired clergy.

123. The scheme should include provision for ongoing review and re-evaluation, not just at the point of retirement.

Recruitment
124. Our recruitment of SSM’s is highly encouraging considering problems many other dioceses are having in this area. Recruitment of stipendiary clergy from outside the diocese is more difficult due to distance from London and misconceptions about the North West.

Recommendations
125. Promote the North West, and particularly Lancashire, by making use of existing materials, ie links to high quality websites (don’t undersell Lancashire by just mentioning the Lakes and the Dales!). Emphasise our unique selling points – food and drink, coast, countryside & canals, moors and mountains, wildlife, excellent communications by road, rail and air.

Retention
126. Having acquired clergy to serve in the Diocese we need to keep them here!
Recommendations

127. Emphasise ongoing ministerial development and develop CME and MDR so clergy feel supported and affirmed.

128. Bishops should consider future deployment of curates (with an interview after two years to flag up preferences & options) so places are ready for them as their curacy ends and they need not be tempted (or forced through lack of internal opportunities) to leave the diocese. (NB this needs careful dovetailing with IME 4-7 and End-of-Curacy Assessment).

129. There should be clarity of communication with the curates on this matter (in writing)

130. Make good use of the flexibility between different categories of ordained ministry and be proactive in encouraging transfer where appropriate.

Summary of Recommendations

131. To bring this section to a close, we once again visit the earlier discussed consequences of the ‘Do Nothing Option’. Against each of the potential do nothing outcomes we list our recommendations which, we believe will at worst assist us to avoid the outcome and at best take us forward into new more participative era in the life of God’ Church within the Diocese.

‘Do Nothing Option’ versus ‘Doing Something Proactive’

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Consequences of a ‘Do Nothing Strategy’ (wait and see)³</th>
<th>Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>132. Clergy numbers gradually fall to 126 or fewer on a random basis throughout the Diocese</td>
<td>The Diocese should create an overview of what the Diocese might look like as the numbers of stipendiary clergy reduce. Deaneries, given the Diocesan overview should encourage Parishes to talk to each other well in advance of any clergy reductions taking place. That we should work towards having ‘time-costed’ Role Descriptors. We will need to develop an effective tool for this, and for clergy to monitor their working patterns, and we recommend that research be done in this area. ³The Do Nothing Option, above, represents the effects of a continuation of current practices without taking any special action to offset the implications of reducing clergy numbers or the limitations of other existing resources. ³</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

³ The Do Nothing Option, above, represents the effects of a continuation of current practices without taking any special action to offset the implications of reducing clergy numbers or the limitations of other existing resources.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Consequences of a ‘Do Nothing Strategy’ (wait and see)³</th>
<th>Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>133. Stress levels amongst remaining clergy rise significantly as their individual workloads increase</strong></td>
<td>Accountability’, The Society of Mary and Martha, 2002, para 4.2.3, contains advice on how these might be used, but not on achieving the time-costing.) That once a clear definition of duties has been arrived at, consideration should be given to which duties could be done by other people and are they equipped to take them onboard and also, which duties should not be done at all.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>134. Vacancies start to become more difficult to fill; they get longer and eventually become simply impossible to fill.</strong></td>
<td>Emphasise ongoing ministerial development and develop CME and MDR so clergy feel supported and affirmed. Bishops should consider future deployment of curates (with an interview after two years to flag up preferences &amp; options) so places are ready for them as their curacy ends and they need not be tempted (or forced through lack of internal opportunities) to leave the diocese. (NB this needs careful dovetailing with IME 4-7 and End-of-Curacy Assessment). There should be clarity of communication with the curates on this matter (in writing). Make good use of the flexibility between different categories of ordained ministry and be proactive in encouraging transfer where appropriate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>135. Parishes with harder to fill posts will be hit first but few will be immune in the long run.</strong></td>
<td>That the Diocese examines ways of facilitating change and investigates the possibility of employing Interim Ministers with the appropriate people skills and organisational change experience. That we should work on possible models of ‘clustering’ and resource discussions, along with the offer of facilitation to enable fruitful discussion between parishes. Encourage Collaborative Ministry as a rediscovery of the calling of all Christians to serve God in the church and the world, rather than allowing it to be seen as a knee-jerk reaction to the shortage of stipendiary clergy Encourage discernment of vocation in its widest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>136. Parish ‘mergers’ will be forced by circumstance – i.e. not necessarily those which are best fit.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>137. A minimum of 40 parishes may be at risk through mergers</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consequences of a ‘Do Nothing Strategy’ (wait and see)³</td>
<td>Recommendations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sense (not just lay people taking on roles previously perceived as clerical) as well as recognition that the vocational journey is an on-going dynamic process frequently experienced as a “call within a calling” or even a “calling out” from an existing vocation and ministry. Recognise that ‘one-size’ does not fit all and each expression of collaborative ministry will need to be developed from within local settings – “Collaborative ministry involves a gradual, mutual evolution of new patterns of communicating and ministering. Working collaboratively doesn’t happen automatically”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The journey towards collaborative ways of working requires on-going and long term - Resources, Finance, Encouragement and Vision. The sub-group recognised that the most significant barrier to effective collaborative ministry and working is patchy administration and communication, at all levels i.e. parish, deanery and diocese. Consequently, for any team (parish or diocesan) to be effective good administration and effective communication must be seen as foundational to the collaborative life of any ministry team. In setting up new ‘clusters’ Bishops and Archdeacons must be realistic in their expectations (taking into account the possible variety of models for a ‘cluster’ of parishes) and to articulate those expectations simply and honestly. In recognising the challenging nature of setting up new ‘clusters’ they must offer affirmation and support, especially when progress appears slow</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consequences of a ‘Do Nothing Strategy’ (wait and see)³</td>
<td>Recommendations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>138. In a restricted market where demand exceeds supply, the Diocese will find out whether or not it is attractive to potential candidates for stipendiary posts. &lt;br&gt; (Recruitment into any sector within the North West is problematic, initial soundings appear to predict that we are likely to attract less than our ‘fair share’ of the resource pool i.e. 126)</td>
<td>Promote the North West, and particularly Lancashire, by making use of existing materials, i.e links to high quality websites (don’t undersell Lancashire by just mentioning the Lakes and the Dales!). Emphasise our unique selling points – food and drink, coast, countryside &amp; canals, moors and mountains, wildlife, excellent communications by road, rail &amp; air. &lt;br&gt; The profile of SSM(L) needs raising, (e.g. as at Primary Visitation, 2010)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>139. Pockets of Parishes (either those attractive to incumbents or those where young incumbents have Freehold) will remain outside the stress bubble</td>
<td>Consideration must be given to how these clergy can be ‘guided’ towards locations where the need is greatest as determined by the Strategic Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>140 The use of trained laity will have to increase, but without an increase in recruitment, training and flexibility of movement, this could prove difficult.</td>
<td>That we continue to invest in lay ministry and its developing role as a priority, alongside support for clergy. &lt;br&gt; We need to emphasise the continuity and complementarity of our training programmes for different ministries &lt;br&gt; We must continue to upgrade and promote our lay training courses, including God Our Rock, Called to Serve and Mission Shaped Ministry and to promote vocations to PA and Reader ministry. &lt;br&gt; The recognition and encouragement of the varieties of ministry i.e. PA, Reader, SSM, Sector, as well as less formally defined areas of service, are ministries ‘in their own right’ and not simply a way of ‘plugging the gaps’ in the liturgical and pastoral life of the parish. &lt;br&gt; The Diocese in conjunction with Area Deans should</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Consequences of a ‘Do Nothing Strategy’ (wait and see)³

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Recommendations</strong></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lead a campaign to significantly increase numbers coming forward into the lay vocations. Particularly emphasis should be made to target those areas within the Diocese where few already exist.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 141. Self-supporting / retired / house for duty clergy will be at a premium, but they will not necessarily be in the optimum locations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Recommendations</strong></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Give thought to a scheme for enabling this (eg Inclusion of retired clergy in benefice/cluster/deanery ministry teams where appropriate), and find out what other dioceses do to effectively deploy their retired clergy.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There should be an Episcopal interview around end of year 3 with SSMs to consider possible deployment after curacy. The diocese needs to be proactive in this.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consideration must be given to how these clergy can be ‘guided’ towards locations where the need is greatest as determined by the Strategic Plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Deanery Group Report

Introduction
What is a Deanery For?

142. At the formal level, a Deanery is an intermediate administrative and synodical entity between Parish and Diocese. It is, therefore, taken as read that a Deanery exists to fulfil certain statutory and formal requirements within the life of the Church of England.

143. However, this report is asking how a Deanery might play its part in the mission and ministry of the church of the future. In other words, how can a Deanery live and not just exist? If Deaneries are worth sustaining, then they ought to enable their constituent communities to achieve more than the sum of their parts, without being so big that flexibility and responsiveness and a sense of locality is lost. So a Deanery should be about being ‘better together’, and having a bigger vision and perspective than is always possible in a Parish.

144. But this vision can go deeper. In emphasising relationships (and not necessarily the ones people and parishes would choose!) it points us to the centrality of mutuality – across barriers of economic standing, size of community, or tradition and culture. At its best, the Deanery should affirm both through its formal and informal relationships that all have something to contribute to and something to receive from one another. In other words, a Deanery ought to be more like a family than a voluntary organisation.

145. As such, Deaneries have a wealth of diverse resources – people, money, skills, experience, local knowledge and information, facilities and buildings. Within their churches they have licensed ministers, but also those working with children, youth, the bereaved, hospital visitors, community workers and many more.

146. Therefore the questions the rest of this paper addresses seek to explore how the extraordinary potential and gifts within our communities can be released.

147. What could a Deanery facilitate / be responsible for more effectively than at either Diocesan or Parish level?

i. Mission planning – Synods and Chapters are not always well equipped for this.

ii. Training Events – e.g. safeguarding, children’s leaders, Back to Church Sunday, etc.

iii. Managing resources – do some churches have spare capacity which others could benefit from (e.g. sharing office resources, helping a neighbouring parish to run a holiday club)

iv. Working creatively with local ecumenical partners

v. Contributing to managing ministry deployment – what Deanery body has the authority to speak into this process?*
vi. Distribution of parish share. Could delegation of share allocation to Deanery level enable better 'ownership' and a better commitment to its payment?*

vii. Envisioning and resourcing Fresh Expressions. This can happen already, but may require Diocesan decisions, e.g. deployment of Pioneer Ministers.*

viii. Providing input to the Bishops with regard to the deployment of assistant curates*

ix. Facilitating some deanery-wide sharing in the training of curates (different parishes being able to provide different types of experience)*

* areas which require decisions/authorisation at Diocesan level

148. What would need to be done to make this possible for our Deaneries?

i. The strategic decision at Diocesan level for some of these decisions and responsibilities to be delegated to Deaneries.

ii. A more rigorous job description for Area Deans, with their Deanery role becoming recognised as a factor in their overall responsibilities - not an add-on.

iii. Ongoing training and support for Area Deans to equip them for the role.

iv. Devolution of some resources and budgeting powers to Deanery, e.g. to enable Deanery administrative support etc

v. Guidance and training for Deanery admin staff – bad admin is worse than no admin!

vi. A recognised, uniform Deanery Structure across the Diocese, with properly accountable committees to enable:
   i. financial / deployment management.
   ii. communication and consultation with Diocesan structures.

149. The aim is not to increase meetings and administration for the sake of it, but rather to give each deanery a real, recognised and accountable identity. If Deaneries are to be given more responsibility, clear channels for accountable consultation must be forged, thus enabling trust to be built and maintained.

How might our present Deanery Divisions be redrawn to make each a more workable and sustainable unit in pursuit of the vision set out above?

150. In other words, is there a critical mass for Deaneries to begin to fulfil some of this vision? A ‘broad-brush optimum’ size and shape would need to be established (ie X Stipendiary clergy covering an area of Y square miles responsible for Z parishes), but in practice this would need to be modified for each Deanery by reference to a number of factors, including:

   i. Geographical Profile – eg population density
   ii. Natural centres / groupings
   iii. Established relationships – between parishes
   iv. Established relationships – with ecumenical partners
   v. Number of buildings
   vi. Number of congregations
vii. Potential for growth / Fresh Expression / Ecumenical development
viii. UPA weighting
ix. Ministerial resources – unpaid (eg SSMs, Readers, any other licensed ministries)
x. Ministerial Resources – paid (eg youth workers)
xi. Ministerial Resources – non-parochial (Sector ministers)
xii. Ministerial resources – ecumenical partners

151. In Blackburn Diocese we currently have 14 deaneries with significant differences in relation to a variety of data measurements.

152. The basis of the ‘Sheffield formula’ considers area, churches, membership, electoral role and population and it is used to determine the number of clergy allocated to Blackburn Diocese based on its share of the national pool. To this list it is relevant to include the rolling average RWA as used as part of our parish share allocation.

153. When we consider our current 14 deaneries in relation to these factors we can see that:

154. Table 1 – Deanery Statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Range</th>
<th>From</th>
<th>To</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Area – square miles</td>
<td>19.84</td>
<td>142.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of churches</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Membership</td>
<td>852</td>
<td>2,748</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electoral roll</td>
<td>1,141</td>
<td>3,932</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regular Weekly Attendance</td>
<td>708</td>
<td>2,156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated Population</td>
<td>28,134</td>
<td>140,167</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Detailed information is shown at Appendix 2.

155. Of course, this is only a starting point and to the mix should be added in the first instance stipendiary clergy, SSM clergy and Readers.

156. Having looked at the current data and ranges we have given consideration to how a closer balance might be possible in order to establish a ‘broad brush ideal’ size.

157. As an illustration of what might be possible a desk top exercise was conducted which sought to reduce the variance and provide a greater consistency across the deaneries.

158. The result of this exercise was a reduction in the number of deaneries from 14 to 10 through the alteration of some deanery boundaries. This reduction to 10 deaneries shows that the following is possible:
Sheffield Allocation of Stipendiary Incumbents and Actual Allocation of Stipendiary Incumbents both by Deanery Population (See Appendix 2 Tables 2 and 3)

159. As stated, the Sheffield allocation is based on factors including deanery area, number of churches, parish population and church membership. This information is used to determine the Blackburn Diocese share of stipendiary clergy based on the national pool.

160. The Sheffield allocation includes bishops, archdeacons, cathedral clergy, the bishop’s chaplain, sector ministers, curates and university chaplains.

161. Within the Sheffield allocation the formula can be applied to the number of stipendiary parish incumbents to assist in considering deployment. This method can be applied at both Deanery and Parish level and compared to actual numbers.

162. Using the Sheffield formula applied to stipendiary incumbents the allocation indicates that 2 deaneries would have an average population per allocated stipendiary incumbent of less than 4,500 people and 2 deaneries with an average population per allocated stipendiary incumbent of over 10,000.

163. When looking at the allocation of stipendiary incumbents using the Sheffield formula, reducing the number of deaneries could result in there being no deanery having an average population per allocated stipendiary incumbent of fewer than 5,000 and only one deanery above 10,000.

164. Similarly, when considering the actual allocation of stipendiary incumbents is 2 Deaneries with an average population of less than 5,000 per stipendiary incumbent and 5 deaneries with an average population per stipendiary incumbent of over 10,000, with the highest being over 13,000.

165. The allocation of Deanery populations to actual stipendiary incumbents shows that 10 of the 14 Deaneries have average populations per stipendiary incumbent of between 7,000 and 14,000 people, with 4 Deaneries having average populations of between 4,000 and 7,000 people per stipendiary incumbent.

166. A reduction in the number of deaneries could result in 1 Deanery having a population of fewer than 6,000 people and one with a population of 12,500. The remaining 8 of the 10 Deaneries fall between 7,000 and 11,000 average populations.
**Allocation of Clergy Not in Training by Deanery Population**  
(See Appendix 2 Table 4)

167. (Clergy = All Parish Clergy - Stipendiary and Self Supporting Clergy not in training. Clergy numbers are based on people numbers rather than allocation of time)

168. In the existing structure there are 2 Deaneries that have an average population of less than 3,000 people per clergy post, with the majority falling in the range of 5,000 to 11,000 per clergy post. There is only 1 Deanery with an average population to clergy of more than 13,000.

169. Reducing the number of Deaneries means that the spread of all clergy by Deanery can be reduced, thus making more clergy available in each Deanery, with the population ranging from 5,000 to 11,000 with no extremes.

**Allocation of Readers to Deanery Population**  
(See Appendix 2 Table 5)

170. When considering the actual number of Readers licensed in each deanery compared to population, at one extreme there are 2 deaneries with Readers supporting a population of less than 4% of the total population and, at the other, 1 deanery with Readers serving 12% of the total population. The remainder fall within 5% to 12% of the population.

171. Deanery reduction could result in the number of deaneries with Readers supporting between 5% and 11% of the population with only 2 deaneries having Readers serving a higher percentage.

**Deanery Population as a percentage of the Total Diocesan Population**  
(See Appendix 2 Table 6)

172. In the existing Deanery structure the Deanery population ranges from less than 3% to 11% of the total diocesan population, with 2 Deaneries having less than 3% of the total population each. The reduction in Deaneries moves this range from 5% to 13% of the population, with the majority in the range 8% to 13% (9 out of 10).

**Regular Weekly Attendance as a percentage of Total Diocesan RWA**  
(See Appendix 2 Table 7)

173. Currently, the range of RWA per Deanery is from less than 5% to 13% of total RWA with 8 of the 14 Deaneries in the range of less than 5% to 7% and 11 in the range of less than 5% to 9% of total RWA.

174. A reduction in the number of Deaneries spreads RWA more evenly across the range 6% to 15%, with 9 of the 10 Deaneries in the range 6% to 13%.
Deanery Electoral Roll as a percentage of Total Electoral Roll (See Appendix 2 Table 8)

175. In the current 14 Deaneries the range of Deanery ER as a percentage of total ER ranges from less than 4% to 13%. Deanery reduction could narrow this range with 10 Deaneries being in the range of 6% to 13% and only 1 Deanery with in excess of 15% of total ER.

Churches per Deanery (See Appendix 2 Table 9)

176. Currently 1 Deanery has less than 4% of the churches in the Diocese, with the remainder in the range 6% to 10% of the total. Reduction in Deaneries reduces this so the majority of Deaneries are in the range 7% and 11%, with only 2 Deaneries having 16% of the total.

177. Reducing the number of Deaneries will never produce a perfect balance, but greater similarity for the majority of Deaneries is achievable across a range of factors.

178. Applying the Sheffield formula to a reduced number of Deaneries is the first step and needs to be weighed in relation to the other factors listed at the beginning of Section 4.

Recommendations

179. Sheffield formula is used to initially allocate clergy not in training.

180. Reduce the number of Deaneries from 14 to 10 or fewer.

181 Note: Curates in training have not been included in the analysis as they are placed by the Diocesan Bishop.
Conclusion

182. I would commend the report and appendices to you.

183. You will have now perceived that the Report, rather than being prescriptive as to action, points towards the necessary development of policies and strategies which need to be in place in the next five years, in order that the Church will be prepared for 2020. There may be those who would have wished the Report to deal with every aspect of the Church’s life. Again, I would ask for patience, for such comprehensiveness would have required much more of the precious time than could be devoted to the task, but also such comprehensiveness requires the engagement of the whole Church rather than just one group.

184. However, some comments may assist:

185. **Distinctive areas of ministry:** The issues raised regarding the changes needed in ministry have necessarily been generic. This was the task set before the group. The application of these generic issues to the distinctive areas of urban, rural or sub-urban must rest at the appropriate level of subsidiarity, e.g. Parish / Deanery / Diocese where the appropriate action for specific outcomes will be effected.

186. **Mission and Ministry:** Some may note that mission and ministry have deliberately been held together within this report. Indeed, while church growth is rightly of the highest priority within our Diocese, I believe such growth can only be realised when driven by effective ministry and mission. These are not ends of the spectrum, but rather an interwoven whole.

187. **Expectation for Change:** What has become clear over the past few years is a readiness within the Diocese to recognise the requirement of pastoral reorganisation. However, the spirit of ‘nimbyism’ (not in my back yard) is raised in parishes time and time again. Unless there is real sharing of ministry, we will not be able to tackle the issues outlined in the report. This impacts not only upon pastoral reorganisation, but also the sharing of financial and ministerial resources.

188. Finally, I believe as a Diocese we can be ready for the challenges of 2020, if the vision of theology, philosophy and integrated mission and ministry contained within this report is implemented, along with an energetic thrust for growth in the Church sustained by the power of the Holy Spirit.

+ John Burnley
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Article 1

‘Whatever happened to the northern Catholic heartlands?’, Paul Wilkinson, The Tablet, 29 October 2011, pp8-12 – © The Tablet http://www.thetablet.co.uk

Follows on page 43
Paul Wilkinson

Whatever happened to the northern Catholic heartlands?

The Catholic Church once thrived in the north of England, serving a population that was part Irish, part recusant. Today, parishes are merging, churches are closing and Catholic culture is changing. In a special report, we examine the forces behind these changes and discover how church life is being reconfigured.

A sea change is washing through the parishes of north-west England as demographic movements, a dearth of new priests and changes in people's attitudes to faith challenge Roman Catholic traditions.

In dioceses such as Liverpool and Lancaster, where churches are often less than a mile apart, parishioners are faced with having to share their priest with a neighbouring congregation, the amalgamation of parishes and the sale of churches. In Lancaster Diocese, 22 parishes have merged since 2000 and 10 others have been linked. Two churches and four chapels have been closed. There has been just one ordination this year and there are currently only four seminarians. Yet the reaction from worshippers and priests is optimism for the future and a quiet determination to make the new regime work.

Fr Tony Walsh, 58, is presiding over the amalgamation of three parishes in central Preston - once jokingly described as Priest Town because it had so many Catholic churches. "I am absolutely convinced that the approach of the priest makes a significant difference as to how the people adjust and accept things," he said. Three years ago he took over the parishes of St Teresa and St Joseph, and after a year was given a third, St Augustine's. He has since successfully united the first two at St Joseph's and will incorporate the third on the first Sunday in Advent.

"Sometimes I feel like Miss Havisham, sitting alone, staring at a crumbling wedding cake," said Fr Walsh. "But I put it across that this is an exciting time and these communities have a lot to offer. We will pool our resources and have the skills we didn't have as individual communities, move forward together, live the Gospel and preach it."

Fr Walsh acknowledges that practising Catholics are getting fewer in number. "It's happening for many and varied reasons, to do with society and finance and the numbers of clergy. There probably are just as many Catholics now as there used to be, but they aren't practising. They haven't had the example of going to church from their parents, who indeed did not have the example from their parents - there are three generations to this problem. But I am not pessimistic about the future. We are a resurrecional Church, we believe in the life, death and resurrection of Jesus Christ. It is a reality of our faith that you cannot have resurrection without death and so these developments might look like doom and gloom to some people, but to me they look like part of the process."

One of Fr Walsh's parishioners, Ron Davis, 60, a former parish council official at St Augustine's, agrees. "The church isn't the building," he said. "It's the people. We have taken the change in our stride, the community has come together. We're not worried about the future. There is a life after."

In the city of Lancaster, Canon Dunstan Cooper, 64, amalgamated two parishes in 2009 after a new priest could not be found. "It has all come about quite happily," he said. "People realise that Father cannot do everything. It is more and more important for people to take on some of the jobs a priest would do, freeing him for the things for which he has been ordained."

The combined congregation of Canon Cooper's two churches is steady at around 400. "There has been no bitterness or resentment," he said. "Both groups remain very proud of their church, but we are coming together as one. They pull together and there is a lot of interchangence." The falling numbers of priests and worshippers reminds us that we have got to evangelise — then leave the rest to the Lord. Lancaster Diocese has recently completed a four-year review and its resulting reorganisation plan is much sought after by other dioceses. Fr Robert Billing, the bishop's secretary, said: "The reasons for the decline in congregations and vocations are complex, but are symptoms of a Europe-wide sociological phenomenon that has its roots in the catastrophe of two world wars and the consequent social upheavals and developments in society and in the Church."

"Having said this, we have observed that where parishes have introduced perpetual adoration of the Blessed Sacrament there has been a noticeable increase in the number of young men considering a vocation. Understandably, there is much sadness at the closure of a parish church, but after four years of consultation the vast majority of priests and people are looking for action."

In Liverpool one woman parishioner suggested that the heart of the problem was the shortage of clergy. A retired teacher in her 70s, she helped oversee the merging last April of Our Lady of Good Help with Christ the King and St Paschal Baylon in the district of Wirral. "At first people suggested alternatives, such as bringing priests from Poland or Africa, but it didn't work, and since we joined up we have never volunteered before have come forward. The merger has been a stimulation."

"The faith is still strong; it's the lack of priests that is the problem. Vocations come from Catholic families, and Catholic families don't ever think of their own sons going for the priesthood — it's always someone else's sons. Things have moved on today, young people have far more distractions and opportunities in their lives. But people are well aware of the situation — they realise they will have to become more involved. The Church will be smaller in this country, but the level of commitment will be higher. It will be few and good."

Paul Wilkinson is a freelance journalist based in the north of England.
Appendix 2

Deanery Statistics

Table 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Range</th>
<th>Current</th>
<th>Option</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt;5000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5000 - 6000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6000 - 7000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7000 - 8000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8000 - 9000</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9000 - 10000</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10000 - 11000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Range = 69,493 to 156,097

Table 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Range</th>
<th>Current</th>
<th>Option</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt;5000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5000 - 6000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6000 - 7000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7000 - 8000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8000 - 9000</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9000 - 10000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10000 - 11000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11000 - 12000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12000 - 13000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13000 - 14000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Range = 69,493 to 156,097
### Table 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Range</th>
<th>No of Deaneries</th>
<th>Current</th>
<th>Option</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt;3000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4000 - 5000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5000 - 6000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6000 - 7000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7000 - 8000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8000 - 9000</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9000 - 10000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10000 - 11000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11000 - 12000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12000 - 13000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13000 - 14000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>14</strong></td>
<td><strong>10</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Range = 69,493 to 156,097

Clergy = All Parish Clergy including Stipendiary Clergy, Self Supporting Clergy, incumbents and assistants not in training. Clergy numbers are based on people numbers rather than allocation of time.

### Table 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Range up to</th>
<th>No of Deaneries</th>
<th>Current</th>
<th>Option</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-5%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-6%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-7%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-8%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8-9%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9-10%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-11%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-12%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12-13%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13-14%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14-15%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-16%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-17%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17-18%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>14</strong></td>
<td><strong>10</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Readers = 229
### Table 6

**Deanery Population as percentage of Total Diocesan Population**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Range %</th>
<th>Current</th>
<th>Option</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2 - 3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 - 4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 - 5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 - 6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 - 7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 - 8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 - 9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 - 10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 - 11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 - 12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 - 13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Range = 69,493 to 156,097  
Total Population = 1,281,290

### Table 7

**Regular Weekly Attendance as percentage of Total Diocesan RWA**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Range</th>
<th>Current</th>
<th>Option</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4 - 5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 - 6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 - 7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 - 8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 - 9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 - 10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 - 11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 - 12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 - 13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 - 14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 - 15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

RWA range = 1,243 to 2,546  
Total RWA = 17,854
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Range</th>
<th>Current</th>
<th>Option</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3 - 4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 - 5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 - 6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 - 7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 - 8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 - 9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 - 10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 - 11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 - 12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 - 13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 - 14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 - 15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 - 16</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Electoral Roll range = 2,136 to 5,032
Total Electoral Roll = 32,368

---

Table 9

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Range</th>
<th>Current</th>
<th>Option</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>up to 4%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>up to 5%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>up to 6%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>up to 7%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>up to 8%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>up to 9%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>up to 10%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>up to 11%</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>up to 12%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>up to 13%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>up to 14%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>up to 15%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>up to 16%</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>up to 17%</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Churches = 274
### Appendix 3

#### Table 10 – The decline in numbers of clergy 2006 – 2019

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2011 Current</th>
<th>2019 Projected</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Incumbent</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curates</td>
<td>31.5</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>199.5</strong></td>
<td><strong>156.5</strong></td>
<td><strong>126</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSM Incumbents and Curates</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sector Ministers(^4)</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cathedral(^5)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bishops</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bishop’s Chaplain</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archdeacons</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>18</strong></td>
<td><strong>21</strong></td>
<td><strong>22</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^4\) Sector Ministers include University Chaplains

\(^5\) The Cathedral figure includes the following:
- Diocesan Canon (1) – counted as Cathedral but majority of time spent in Diocese
- Community Canon (1) – funded externally