

<p style="text-align: center;">REPORT OF THE COMMISSION ON REGIONAL BOUNDARIES</p>

INTRODUCTION

By letter dated 2012 July 12 the Lord Bishop of Jamaica, the Rt. Rev. Dr. Howard K.A. Gregory, advised that *“at the 142nd Annual Synod of the Church in Jamaica and the Cayman Islands in the Province of the West Indies, [he] the then Diocesan Bishop-Elect, stated that there are decisions which have to be made concerning the vacant Sees, adjustments within the leadership structure of the Diocese, and issues concerning governance of the Diocese which need to be re-visited”*. He further stated that at a meeting of the Diocesan Council held on 2012 May 24 he called for a re-establishment of a Boundaries Committee *“to re-visit and evaluate the effectiveness of the creation of a fourth Region under the leadership of the Diocesan Bishop, functioning in that See as a Regional Bishop”*.

APPOINTMENT OF COMMITTEE

In furtherance of the Lord Bishop’s request, the Diocesan Council at its meeting held on 2012 June 21, named and approved a re-constituted Boundaries Committee as follows:

- Dr. Vincent Lawrence – Chairman
- The Ven. Archdeacon Patrick Cunningham
- The Ven. Dr. Archdeacon Edmund Davis
- The Very Rev. Canon Hartley Perrin
- The Very Rev. Franklyn Jackson
- The Rev. Canon Georgia Jervis
- The Rev. Ralph M. “Jim” Parkes
- Lady Rheima Hall
- Mr. Patrick Lawrence
- Mrs. Monica Bucknor
- Dr. Trevor Hope
- Mrs. Pamela Whittingham

TERMS OF REFERENCE

The Committee was asked to consider the following:

1. *Whether the creation of a fourth Region is the most effective way to deal with the challenges which the Diocese currently faces including declining membership; a significant reduction in the number of candidates for Confirmation; an adequate cadre of clergy and church workers; the deepening financial crisis facing congregations and the Diocese; and the need for a Mission-driven structure of episcopal leadership and governance.*

2. *That the review pays primary attention to the ecclesiastical returns in determining the way forward in the demarcation of boundaries rather than the national census data.*
3. *That due regard be paid to the demands for ministry in emerging residential communities across the island in addition to demographic changes which are resulting in population contraction in some traditional communities and the mushrooming of new ones.*
4. *That consideration be given to the re-introduction of the three-Region division of the Diocese with some re-alignment of boundaries or that the previously designated Kingston Region be re-established under the episcopal supervision of a Regional Bishop assisted by two Archdeacons.*
5. *That issues raised in the last Report which have not been addressed, be re-visited for further deliberation and action.*

SOURCES OF INFORMATION and METHODOLOGY & APPROACH OF THE COMMITTEE

The Committee was informed in its deliberations by reference to the following sources:

- The Lord Bishop's letter of 2012 July 12.
- The 2011 Ecclesiastical Returns with respect to membership.
- The Report of the Commission on Regional Boundaries 2004 (the 2004 Commission).
- The Constitution and Canons of The Church in Jamaica & the Cayman Islands in the Province of the West Indies (the Canons).
- The STATIN 2011 Census Report.
- Consultation with the Diocesan Bishop; the Suffragan Bishop of Kingston, The Rt. Rev. Dr. Robert Thompson; and the Suffragan Bishop-elect of Montego Bay, The Ven. Archdeacon Leon Golding.

The Committee was of the opinion that it was not necessary to consult with members of the Church as the findings and recommendations of the 2004 Commission which were based on dialogue and consultation are still relevant and could not yet be evaluated as the recommendations, other than the establishment of a fourth Region, have not been implemented.

It was also noted that the 2004 Commission reported on the fact that the need for organizational adjustments were recommended from as long ago as 1969 in The Ernst & Ernst Report which was the product of an "organizational analysis of the Diocese of Jamaica" with the primary objective being "to assess the effectiveness of the organization in accomplishing the objectives of the Church". Among the findings of the Commission was the fact that "several key recommendations of the Ernst & Ernst Report were

not implemented, and this has contributed significantly to many of the continuing problems being experienced in the Diocese”.

Whilst the Committee did pay some attention to the Ecclesiastical Returns in respect of membership the members were of the view that there are other very important factors such as demography and topography which are relevant to the demarcation of boundaries. In addition it was concluded that the reliability of the Ecclesiastical Returns was questionable and in several cases could be exaggerated.

DELIBERATIONS

In their deliberations there was strong consensus among the members of the Committee that there is an urgent need to address the following matters:

- Recognition of the fact that a restructuring of the regional boundaries to determine the number of Regions is not the critical issue in addressing the challenges which the Diocese currently faces, but instead, the need to make that decision with specific reference to the mission of the Church and in the concept of a strategic plan for getting the Diocese mission-oriented.
- The critical need to establish an organizational structure which allows for the effective management/administration of the Diocese and the achievements of its core mission, which is obedience to the Great Commission.
- The degree of authority and responsibility vested in the office of the Diocesan Bishop which has proven to stymie the initiative of the Suffragan Bishops.
- The problems resulting from the frequent absence of the Suffragan Bishops from their Regions on Diocesan business and the establishment of an organizational structure in which the Regions enjoy substantial authority to manage regional affairs.
- The absence of job descriptions for Suffragan Bishops and the lack of a system of accountability, assessment, appraisal and evaluation of performance and results achieved and the fact that the matter of a lack of accountability has been a common factor in all the studies commissioned with respect to the management and administration of the Diocese.
- The inability of the Archdeacons to effectively undertake their duties as provided in the Canons while having the responsibilities of a parish Priest.
- The role of the Archdeacons in the Regions and the lack of a system of accountability, assessment, appraisal and evaluation of performance and results achieved.

- The failure of the Diocese to adapt new strategies in light of increased urbanization and emerging communities nationwide and in dealing with communities where there is a decline in population.
- A review of the boundaries within the ecclesiastical districts to make them more rational and manageable taking into consideration factors such as demography, topography and decline in membership.
- The relevance of many of the Canons which the Committee consider to be anachronistic and restrictive to the growth and development of the Diocese.
- The interpretation of “**membership**”, in particular, as it affects Ecclesiastical Returns.
- The attitude among some members of the clergy and laity that the Church is a clerically-focused organization which is negatively impacting the development and mission of the Church.
- The public perception of the Anglican Church as being insensitive to the needs of the people, particularly with respect to how the Gospel is transmitted and the need to implement a strategy to connect with persons with no affiliation to a particular denomination.
- The continued ineffectiveness of the Diocese operating with four Regions and the role of the Diocesan Bishop functioning as a Regional Bishop in spite of the strong disagreement and arguments presented in the Report of the 2004 Commission.
- The failure of the Diocese to implement the recommendations of the 2004 Commission save and except the establishment of the fourth Region, particularly in light of the 2004 Commission’s findings that *“there is a strong view that the proposed restructuring will only be meaningful if it is undertaken within the context of how it can contribute to enabling the Church to re-focus on its mission, and to address the crisis of declining membership and non-actualization of the Church’s mission which currently exists in the Diocese”*.
- The need for an appropriate organizational structure taking into account the size of the membership.
- The need for consideration to be given to convening Church Hall Meetings with members and the wider community as a means of engagement and providing and obtaining information.

SUMMARY OF ISSUES/VIEWS GLEANED FROM CONSULTATION WITH BISHOPS

1. The unreliability of the Ecclesiastical Returns as they tend to be exaggerated.
2. The work of the Diocese/Bishops to be informed by MISSION and implemented in accordance with an agreed Strategic Plan.

3. The role of the Bishops in reality are Administrative, Pastoral and meeting Community/Civil Society demands.
4. Activities at the Diocesan level are very demanding and much of the Bishops' functions/responsibilities are centered in Kingston to the detriment of the activities of the Suffragan Bishops in the Regions.
5. The duties of the Suffragan Bishops should be pastoral and administrative with respect to the development of the Clergy within their Regions and involvement in outreach within the communities in their Regions.
6. Restriction on the authority of the Suffragan Bishops result in limited opportunity for them to contribute to the mission at the parish level.
7. The Canons need to be revised especially with regards to the governance regulations of the Diocese, for example, the assignment of specific responsibilities to Suffragan Bishops and the role of Suffragan Bishops versus Archdeacons at the parish level, including the management of vacant cures.
8. The Canons do not allow any autonomy to the Suffragan Bishops which result in limited responsibility. Greater autonomy is granted to the Archdeacons who themselves have no resources.
9. The limited resources which are available, in particular that which is required to perform administrative expectations of the Archdeacons and Bishops.
10. The Diocese needs to re-examine its method of operation as a result of the changing demographics. With increased urbanization, the Church's connection with emerging communities and its treatment of declining communities needs attention.
11. The deficiency of previous reports/studies was their failure to recommend a review of specific regulations governing the Diocese and instead dealt only with systematic issues.

ISSUES & FINDINGS ARISING FROM DELIBERATIONS

Arising From the deliberations of the Committee the members concluded that the main issues which contributed to the challenges which the Diocese currently faces are as follows:

1. The concentration of authority as stipulated in the Canons.
2. *"The need for authority linked to responsibility at the regional level and the related system of accountability, assessment, appraisal and evaluation or performance and results achieved"* as stated in the Report of the 2004 Commission.
3. An ineffective organizational structure which needs to strengthened at its middle management level by way of a diffusion of authority in

each Region and the provision of resources to facilitate a more effective administration of the Region.

4. The adherence to the Canons which determine the governance of the Diocese but which are in effect, more restrictive than progressive.
5. The absence of a mission-oriented strategic plan which identifies a single vision for the Diocese whilst facilitating a separate but supportive strategic plan for the respective Regions.

As stated before, it is the consensus of the members of the Committee that the findings and recommendations of the 2004 Commission are extremely relevant to the current situation within the Diocese. We quote here an excerpt from that Report:

“The recognition of these issues provides the context for the restructuring of the Diocese, initiated by the redefinition of the regional boundaries and the organization of the work of the Church’s mission within the Regions. This could become the start of a full scale programme to address the issues, concerns and challenges which currently affect the Church. This could lead to the forging of a unified, focused and dynamic Church.

There is a need to create a climate of vibrancy and dynamism which underscores the relevance of the Church. The Diocese needs to establish systems through which each Region, each Deanery, each Cure and each congregation can attain the objectives and targets leading to effective performance. The system should include mechanisms for monitoring and evaluation.

The Church’s approach to addressing this situation should not start from the proposition that its options are limited by what appears to be immediate resource limitations. Rather, it should proceed from a [position of re-allocation of the limited resources] to accomplish the desired objectives.

The role of the Suffragan Bishops in Diocesan administration has resulted in frequent absence from their Regions. This situation has led to concerns by congregations. The Ernst & Ernst Report addressed the matter thus: *“The function of the Bishops should be to expand the activities of the Diocese in [their Regions] as opposed to assisting the Diocesan Bishop with central administration”*. The following were specific recommendations concerning the office of Suffragan Bishop:

“The offices of these Bishops should not duplicate centralized administrative services, but they should have administrative authority within their guidelines.

These Bishops should function within specified goals, policies, and budgets. Synod should specify the major philosophies, objectives,

and goals of the Diocese. These specifications should be further refined by the Diocesan Council and Financial Board to programs of action and policies". It continues, "The Suffragan Bishops should be responsible for the implementation of these policies and procedures within their regions. Each Bishop should have executive decision making authority and should be responsible for the activities in his region". Further, "The Suffragan Bishops should assist in the development and coordination of yearly plans and budgets for the Cures in their regions. These budgets and plans should be submitted for review, necessary revision, and approval by Synod. The Bishops should then function from these specified plans with the authority to implement them on an independent basis, working in coordination with the Cures in their respective Regions.

- * The Suffragan Bishops should be a part of the Diocesan Council and Diocese policy, goals, and budget development activities. Their participation in these activities is vital to insure [sic] that regional representation is maintained and that they participate in the formation and approval of programs that they must later carry.*

Important to maximizing the mission and ministry of the Church are the following strategies:

- a. Developing a programme and strategies for attracting young Anglicans to offer themselves for full-time ministry.
- b. Empowering the laity to assume a greater role in ministry by finding ways to convince members in their several congregations that their duty as Christians is not confined to regular attendance at Church, but extends to their full participation in, and responsibility for, accomplishing the mission of the Church.
- c. Drawing upon the wealth of talent available from the Church's membership and Jamaica in general.
- d. Training of the Clergy in human resources development and other management skills.

The matter of authority linked with responsibility and accountability at all levels within the Diocese and the need to evaluate, assess and appraise the performance and results achieved is a necessity. The Diocese's failure to implement some of these major recommendations of the Ernst & Ernst Report has significantly contributed to the inability to arrest the decline of the Church.

It is instructive and significant that many of the problems identified in the findings of the Report mirror the problems which are now adversely affecting the mission of the Church. In our consultation with the membership within the Regions, the concerns voiced echo the following which were addressed in the Ernst & Ernst Report and from which we quote:

- * *... The complexity of the Jamaican society and the Church are such that no one person will ever again be able to manage the Diocese independently. The Bishop of Jamaica is in a position requiring knowledge, skills, and time far beyond the capabilities of any single person.*
- * *To a certain extent the Diocese is fragmented and not functioning as a total cooperative organization. This disunity or lack of real cooperative spirit prohibits the Diocese from functioning effectively and utilizing its resources. In regard to this, the question should not be: 'What caused the problem, pressure from above versus local withdrawal?' but, 'What do we do about it?'*
- * *The Clergy do not seem to have exerted the effort necessary to develop the spirit of the Diocese and general concern within their Cures. This has led to Cures acting more like isolated units rather than a part of a Diocese with concern for all of the problems of the Church.*
- * *The Diocese needs to have goals, policies, and programs set forth for everyone. At present there is no unity of direction with priorities to serve as guidelines for the Diocese and all members.*
- * *Subordinate units of the Diocese feel their involvement and responsibility is very low. It is necessary that all members of the Church are involved in the progress of the Church.*
- * *There are mechanisms in the Canons for central assistance at all levels. These mechanisms have not been fully implemented and sometimes are viewed strictly as control from above. Many of these mechanisms which are viewed as controls should be utilized throughout the Diocese to assist the individual Cures and other units in more effective operations.*
- * *There is excessive committee activity and a lack of individual decision making responsibility or authority."*

RECOMMENDATIONS

The Committee, after due consideration of the mandate from the Lord Bishop, makes the following recommendations:

1. That the Diocese be divided into two (2) Regions with the configuration of each Region being as follows:
 - The Kingston Region – consisting of the parishes of St. Catherine, Kingston, St. Andrew, St. Thomas, Portland and St. Mary (Congregation: 139; members:19,242; population:1,468,050).
 - The Montego Bay Region – consisting of Westmoreland, Hanover, St. James, Trelawny, St. Ann, Clarendon, Manchester and St. Elizabeth (Congregation: 148; members: 13,951; population: 1,229,056).

2. That Canon XXII be amended with respect to the role, functions, responsibilities and accountability of the Suffragan Bishops providing them with job descriptions and giving them local autonomy within the respective Region with accountability to the Diocesan Bishop and Synod.
3. That, in the context of the recommendation at paragraph 2 above, the concept of a **Suffragan Bishop** be re-visited and substituted with the designation **Regional Bishop**.
4. The Regional Bishops should be assigned portfolio responsibilities at the Diocesan level, consistent with their respective expertise, at the discretion of and after consultation with the Diocesan Bishop, nevertheless such responsibility may be assigned to a suitably qualified member of the laity.
5. Each Region should be administered by a Regional Bishop with the assistance of two Archdeacons, one of which may be a member of the laity. In the case of ordained Archdeacons due consideration should be given to their role and responsibilities as a parish Priest and their ability to adequately perform their regional duties and responsibilities.
6. The Regional bishops should be given a substantial degree of authority which should be reflected in their job descriptions. The concept of decentralized authority and clearly defined areas of responsibility and accountability should be extended to the offices of Archdeacon and Rural Dean, and ultimately to all other members of the Clergy and Church workers and to the individual cures/congregations. This should enable personnel at all levels of the Church to exercise more initiative in responding to the challenges which they face, and opportunities which present themselves, to advance the mission of the Church within their jurisdiction.
7. It is essential to recognize the need for the Church to be re-energized to live mission and *“to build a living active organization that is accustomed to change to meet changing conditions according to pre-determined plans and policies”* (Ernst & Ernst Report). In this regard the Diocesan Bishop should continue to maintain responsibility for a Diocesan mission-oriented strategic plan and the growth of the Church. The Regional Bishops should be mandated by the Diocesan Bishop to prepare strategic development plans within defined policies for implementation in their respective Regions with emphasis on matters such as spirituality, worship, liturgy and evangelism.
8. It is essential to the effective mission of the Church that the right leadership is positioned at both the Diocesan and Regional levels in persons who will at all times ensure that priority and precedence are given to the mission’s growth and development.
9. The implementation of administrative policies at the Diocesan level which recognize the need for a Human Resource Department; a strategy

- for the assignment of personnel to Cures based on a profile of the person and the parish; and the need for an appraisal system.
10. Despite the age of the Ernst & Ernst Report those areas which are relevant and appropriate in addressing the concerns raised in this Report should still be adopted.
 11. In light of the deepening financial crisis facing congregations and the Diocese and the limited available resources it would be prudent to re-allocate funds ear-marked for a third or fourth Regional Bishop to support the mission, work and administration of the Archdeacons.
 12. The time is appropriate to restore the Trelawny Deanery to those congregations in the Albert Town Cure which fall within the parish of Trelawny.
 13. Canons XXII. OF SUFFRAGAN BISHOPS; XXIII. OF ARCHDEACONS, COMMISSARIES AND THE CHANCELLOR; and XLIV. OF ECCLESIASTICAL BOUNDARIES be amended as is necessary and Canon LII. OF DIOCESAN REGIONS be repealed, to make effective the recommendations of this Committee.
 14. The Canons Committee be mandated to undertake a fundamental review of the Canons with a view to making them relevant and appropriate to the governance structure and systems of the Diocese which are required at this time.
 15. In view of the gravity of the challenges which the Diocese currently faces, the Committee recommends the urgent implementation of the following:
 - (a) The establishment of the new Regional Boundaries;
 - (b) A mandate from the Diocesan Bishop to the Regional Bishops to undertake with urgency the preparation of a strategic mission plan for the advancement of their respective Region. Features of such strategic plans should include:
 - Establishing a special team, comprising Clergy, Church Army, Jamaica Church Missionary Society and Laity, to be led by the Regional Bishop/Archdeacon, which shall spearhead the revival of the Church in the Region, and initiate an evangelistic drive to bring in new members.
 - Formulation of an appropriate mission strategy for the Region, designed as a ten year plan with a five year review and which should guide the approach to ministry in the Region with emphasis on matters such as spirituality, worship, liturgy and evangelism.
 - Formulation of an appropriate strategy to establish an adequate Anglican presence in major, new and fast growing communities.
 - Attracting young people to come into and remain in the Church, and to recognize the call to service in full-time ministry.

- Revision of the existing structure of Cures in the Region, to make these more rational and manageable.
- (c) The establishment of a thorough on-going system of monitoring, appraisal and evaluation to ensure accountability and effective stewardship in respect of personnel at all levels in the Church. Periodic assessment of the new structures and arrangements being put in place should be undertaken, to ensure that these are functioning in the desired way, and are fulfilling the purpose for which they were established.
- (d) A mandate from Synod requiring an expanded annual report to reflect the performance of the Regions and the development in the mission of the Church.
16. Other than the matter of the number of Regions and their associated boundaries, the Committee endorses all the recommendations of the 2004 Commission and concluded that, for real progress to be made, it is essential that the recommendations herein be implemented without further delay.

Dated 2012 November 08

Signed by: _____
Vincent M. Lawrence
Chairman

Signed by: _____
A. Pamela Whittingham
Secretary