

ASSISTANT BISHOPS: MODE, MODEL AND MINISTRY

(An exploration by  
William B. Spofford, Bishop, retired)

Published by the Office for Ministry Development  
1986

Thanks and shalom to:

.... the Fifth Bishop of Eastern Oregon, and the people of that diocese, for allowing the Fourth Bishop to resign with honor and joy;

.... the Bishop of Washington, John T. Walker, and the Family of God in all their great diversity in that place for taking us on as assistant bishop, with special thanks to the Church House staff (top to bottom floors) for making summer heat bearable and winter life exciting;

.... the Dean, Trustees, Faculty and Students of the Seminary of the Southwest, Austin, for letting me share their life, tennis courts, student gathering place and worship as a Visiting Fellow... a much appreciated 'gift'; and special thanks to Dr. Robert Cooper, mentor and innovator;

.... Bp. David E. Richards, of the Committee on Pastoral Development which he serves as 'staff', who said: "For heaven's sake, don't you want to test new--or re-cycle, old muscles" ... and who has always been interested and helpful;

.... the dispersed members of the "Old Dogs" who, on many occasions, discussed and debated bishops and their role(s); and, of course,

.... Polly who is herself and, at the same time, loves to make me me!

### An Introductory Note:

We may have written more about this subject than anyone really wants to know. If, in the future, it helps some bishops and dioceses make creative decisions more easily (either pro or con), that's fine. For me, putting it together feels like a 'closure' of a personal vocational period and, in and of itself, that is valuable.

I am one who has a strong and 'high' view of the episcopacy... that is, I think it is important, traditional and, as it turns out, fun. At the same time, we maintain a continued sense of wonder, fright and amusement that persons such as myself can be elected and ordained to that Order. I take it all seriously, but try always to 'sit loose to the saddle' in God's bucking arena of history.

We are sure that there always have been--and ever will be--different modes and models for ministry and mission in God's 'workshop' (as Walter Rauschenbush categorized history!) and, of course, the episcopate functions in that arena. The hope is always that we are good, honest and faithful artisans and workers in that 'workshop' so that the community (Kingdom) of reconciliation, peace and justice may come with bells and trumpets, incense and dancing, so that the young can always see visions that are reflective of it and we older ones never deny the dream.

Others have, can and will write theological tomes about it. Not me! Here you get some brief history in a very small corner of Christendom; some experience which has been reflected upon; the summation of some surveys and consultations, together with some supportive documents which, perhaps, may help others make creative decisions, tomorrow and tomorrow.

### Some History and Movement:

Assistant bishops, as persons, offices and functions, are a recent reality in the Episcopal Church. Other provinces of the Anglican Church, notably the British Isles, have recognized and used them for a longer period. There, however, they have generally been appointed/elected suffragans who, through assignment by the diocesan, are 'designated' to oversee a smaller region or neighborhood, generally in a metropolitan area and, frequently, the incumbent is given the title of the territory (such as Southwark, etc.)

So, also, bishops who have retired or resigned jurisdictions have long served in the American church. They have had no

particular official status, although continuing with seat and vote in the House of Bishops. In an attempt to clarify, we may say that such bishops are 'assisting bishops' who fulfil episcopal actions and offices at the request of the diocesan, with or without the approval of the diocesan structure. So, too, such bishops have often served extra-jurisdictionally, in service to the national or world-wide church; in Canterbury, National Church headquarters or ecumenical councils.

The interest in developing and permitting a designation such as 'assistant bishop' appears to have risen from both systemic and pastoral concerns; from issues of mission strategy and delivery to vocational integrity and wholeness. There were and are corporate and individual issues involved.

From the systemic perspective, with the changes in human society world-wide, and most intensively in western and European nations (perhaps best identified by John Naisbitt's code-word, MEGATRENDS), bishops and others were concerned with the complexity and 'stress' levels of episcopal work. So much to do and so few to do it. Especially in large metropolitan jurisdictions, the harvest seemed plentiful and the episcopal laborers felt few.

Given the complexity of the expectations that persons and systems have of bishops and their office (and which, undoubtedly, they have of themselves), there was recognition or fear that there might be a built-in 'failure syndrome'... i. e. no one person could, as such, fulfil the expectations, real or unreal as they might be.

At the same time, there was concern that the church, nationally and otherwise, could become administratively top-heavy. More dioceses would mean, for instance, larger and more expensive General Conventions and other meetings. The issue, on the national level, had more pertinence for the House of Clerical and Lay Deputies which, it is said, is one of the largest deliberative bodies in existence. But it is also a concern in respect to the House of Bishops, which seeks to maintain a collegial atmosphere.

In 1970, the Joint Commission on Structure presented a draft which tried to be comprehensive about structural issues in the Church (Appendix IV at end of this report.) Except for a few 'cosmetic' changes, it went no where. In that report, was a section on the episcopacy. When that section was offered to the House of Bishops, it was called by one veteran suffragan:

"This most inadequate and stupid report is the poorest one presented to this House during the tenure of my membership."

It was quickly tabled, without debate or discussion.

And yet the issues remained. Bishops of larger jurisdictions required assistance and desired help. There was a reluctance to increase the numbers of suffragans and, also, some believed that election did not always surface the required skills, talents or experience that a given diocese needed.

So, too, there was an increasing recognition that, together with the World Anglican Communion, the constituency of the Episcopal Church was changing. An increased constituency of persons from different cultures, races, language other than English were noticeable. Also, due to internal migrations in the country, thanks to post W. W. II opportunities, industrial patterns, increased sensitivity in re. need for racial reconciliations, etc., many urban dioceses were facing significantly new pastoral and mission concerns.

Concurrently, there was the sense that areas and groups, and other sub-groups within a nation and other nations overseas, had a right of self-determination in respect to leadership and, on occasion, (then and now), an election of a suffragan did not effectuate this. It was generally agreed that, like Gertrude Stein's rose: "A bishop is a bishop" but, in the generic mix, there were particular challenges or needs to which, at times, an election could not be completely responsive.

Using the authority of the Presiding Bishop's office, and working through a House Committee on Pastoral Development (nurtured and staffed so far only by a 'resigned' bishop, David E. Richards), varied explorations were made. This committee conducted time-studies of episcopal work and management; did intensive interviews with bishops and diocesan councils; established 'peer consultation' programs and opportunities for new bishops; set up various regional and national continuing education programs of high quality for all bishops; and issued several 'pastoral papers' exploring certain pastoral crises which most bishops seem to confront.

There was a developing awareness that, from time to time, some bishops had (a) become ill; (b) were 'locked in'; (c) could benefit from a different setting or challenge or (d) had served a jurisdiction well for a significant time but, because of changed conditions and the

development of new missionary strategy, the church (the diocese), as well as the particular bishop, might benefit from a change of venue.

The General Convention had made a canonical amendment which allowed any bishop, after having served a jurisdiction for five years, to be translated by election. (Up to that moment, only suffragans and missionary bishops could be easily translated, and not much of that had occurred.) Even with a more open canon, mobility did not seem to happen or, at least, not in sufficient numbers to make the system responsive, either to the diocesan or to those who might be ready and fit for a change.

Thus, after appropriate discussion and debate of both canonical, structural, historic, theological and assorted issues, a new Title III, Canon 24 called OF ASSISTANT BISHOPS was enacted. There were reservations in both houses, with the Deputies passing the matter on a Vote by Orders, and it was not a significantly high majority. The major issues seemed to center on whether 'assistant bishops' would break with the Episcopal 'tradition' of having bishops by ballot, and give too much control or power to the diocesan and, in a similar strain, whether assistant bishops should have vote, along with seat and voice in the House of Bishops. At any rate, the Canon was adopted (cf. Appendix III).

During and since that time, there have been a number of ASSISTANT bishops. They are CANONICAL, not constitutional, and, as the Presiding Bishop John M. Allin stated at the interim meeting of the House in Chattanooga, Tenn., in 1981:

"Assistant bishops are like bumble-bees. Aerodynamically, they should and are constitutionally incapable of flying... but there they are amongst the flowers."

Since Canon III: 24. was adopted, there have been increasing numbers of assistant bishops, all of whom, via canon, and through diverse methods, have 'contracted' with a diocesan bishop. The canon states that a diocesan has the opportunity of employing an assistant bishop only with the appropriate approval of his Standing Committee and Diocesan Convention, which would seem to bring a measure of involvement of the election processes of the diocese, but many still have doubts on that level. (cf. Appendix for list of diocese/diocesan and assistants/resigned jurisdictions or vocations).

Analysis of the relationships in these diocesan/assistant bishop pairs indicates that there is not a great deal of common history, or similarity of procedures:

- a. Some have a clear and time-certain contract; others have what seems to be a 'gentleman's agreement';
- b. Some, together with the diocesan, are the only other bishop in the jurisdiction. Others are part of a broader 'team' consisting of diocesan/suffragan/assistant or diocesan/assistant/assistant and, on occasion diocesan/coadjutor/suffragan/assistant. . . with an occasional retired assisting bishop or so thrown in!
- c. Some vote in the diocese while others, by agreement or conviction, do not;
- d. Some work out of the same office, in the same city, with the diocesan. Others in more divorced areas, and may have a regional charge a la British church (cf. asst. Bishop Wm. Gordon in diocese of Michigan; or Bps. Robert Varley and Wm. Dimmick (\*) in Minnesota, one of whom runs a mission in Spirit Lake and carries regional over-sight and the other resided in a Roman Catholic college/retreat center in Collegetown, where his special talents in areas of spirituality and ecumenics got full play. Since Bp. Dimmick's departure from the diocese, Bp. Robt. Anderson, bishop of Minnesota, has innovatively 'contracted' with the bishop of North Dakota, who lives in Fargo, to 'assist' in the Morehead-Fargo area of both states. Which seems like creative mission and pastoral strategy, as well as good stewardship.

One of the newest 'assistantships' finds the Bishop of Nevada and Navajoland, moving to Tucson, to assist the bishop of Arizona, residing in Phoenix, and maintaining the charge of Navajoland.

The newest relationship finds Bp. Anselmo Carral, executive of the Hispanic Education Center at the Seminary of the S. W. and sometime diocesan of Guatemala, being contracted as the 'assistant bishop' of Texas. He may not even have to change his office since, with mission imperatives in respect to the Hispanic ministry in that diocese, and region, it appears that there will be some correlation between the two positions.

This point is that there seems to be a variety of models and modes . . . most of which seem to be helpful and all of which are dependent on local variables of one kind or another. Canon III: 24. is clear about how one gets an assistant bishop but, respecting the rights and responsibilities of the diocesan, it doesn't deal with structural designs.

Most assistant bishops appear to have definite staff assignments, generally in areas of ministry and pastoral care of congregations, clergy and their families.

Since, inevitably, the jurisdictions which have need and potential for assistants are, economically and sociologically, large and metropolitan, most assistants are in collegial staff relationships. Or, at least, it is hopefully collegial! Since, to this point, most assistants have been diocesans of geographically large and relatively numerically small dioceses, without great numbers of professional or other staff, this may require often, a switch in perceptions, practices and style. For instance, there were as many persons-- professional and sub-professional--working in the Church House at Mt. St. Alban, Washington, as there were members of the clergy in the Diocese of Eastern Oregon when I was diocesan. The latter were spread over 75,000 square miles, with often hundreds of miles between communities and county-seats . . . the former could have staff meetings, birthday observances, regular worship, etc. This, of course, required perceptual changes and the development of some new skills on the part of the assistant. Luckily the facilities of the educational network of Greater Washington were available to me to look at this, and educate or train into it.

Again, some assistants have 'turf' (cf. Bp. Wm. Cox in Oklahoma, a pilot, who living in a different city than the diocesan, is accountable for the Oklahoma Pan-Handle, besides other responsibilities.) While, in geographically more constricted jurisdictions, the assistant is asked to share the whole diocese with the diocesan, especially in the matter of episcopal visitations.

Again, we point out that there is no 'right way' in all of this. What is contracted and established is locally determined, because there are different geographies, numbers of congregations and institutions, sizes of staff, personalities of both diocesans and potential assistants and, of course, diverse 'visions' of what the church is or should be all of which has to be factored into the over-all mission, ministry and maintenance of the particular diocese.



As the debate in General Convention indicated, and as some survey responses show, there is still not unanimous agreement that the concept of 'assistant bishops' is synonymous with the tradition and experience of the episcopacy in the Episcopal Church. Basically, there is concern as to what is 'the authority' of an assistant bishop, since he is not elected by the diocese in which he functions. With good Anglican ambiguousness, we suggest the answer is both 'yes' and 'no'. As assistant, he is 'contracted' by the diocesan and, in this sense, his episcopacy is subsumed under the former's. There is a distinction between the persona of the diocesan and the office of the Bishop, both of which have authority. So, too, the assistant has been chosen and ordained as bishop of the church duly. He might be, through resignation or retirement, without jurisdiction and, in such cases, some bishops choose not to function episcopally.

(Note: Indeed, for a period, there was debate in the House of Bishops as to whether retired and resigned bishops should have a vote in that body. Following that, it was decided that all bishops of the Episcopal Church should have seat/voice and vote, on the principle that it was a traditional and collegial Order of ministry and, with or without jurisdiction, the bishop had an accountable and responsible voice and vote in the governance and councils of the living church.)

There is no doubt that an assistant bishop has chosen to give up certain authority and jurisdiction. By 'contract', if you will, he has been chosen by a diocesan and, voluntarily, he has chosen to forego some of his episcopal authority for the sake of the mission and ministry of another brother. It seems to be, basically, a work and office of mission implementation and extension.

PLEASE SEE APPENDIX I. FOR THE SURVEY OF HOUSE OF BISHOPS AND RESULTS

---

Reflection indicates that the bishops who responded have touched on most of the issues and concerns which experience (somewhat limited to this point in time) have surfaced. The basic concerns seem to be:

I. Nature and mode of choosing an assistant bishop: would some other modality be more helpful? If an assistant is logical and appropriate, can the clergy/laity of the diocese be involved helpfully?

II. The whole question of the accessibility of a 'pool' of possible assistant bishops, including those who are ethnic.

III. The issue of time-limitations, leading to flexibility, but which, functionally, makes assistant bishops in a different, and new category, than those with jurisdiction through election.

IV. Contracting: with clarity and sureness, based on prior position description, which is developed by the diocesan, and which includes the expected 'split' between episcopal and staff functions and responsibilities.

V. The whole issue of the 'need' for an assistant bishop in any given diocese, both at present and in short/long term planning. For instance, in many jurisdictions, because of geography, climate, etc., there are often a number of 'retired bishops' who are interested and willing to be 'assisting' bishops. If the need is generally for episcopal visitations, basically for the initiatory sacraments, assisting bishops are experienced, helpful and most adequate. However, if there is an expectation that such visitations include communication and education about the diocesan program/vision and, also, the pastoral care of congregations and regions (including clergy and their families), this may not be done as thoroughly or helpfully because of time-constraints and lack of full-time involvement of the assisting bishop in the life of the diocese. In such cases, there may not be enough 'knowledge' (although often plenty of experiential wisdom!).

VI. A basic, and fundamental, point would be the compatibility and complementariness of the diocesan and the assistant bishop, together with his 'fit' into the other persons who, staff-wise, represent the Office of the Bishop.

VII. Are there issues surrounding the spouses and families of assistant bishops which are significant?

Commenting, then, on these general areas in turn:

I. Most diocesans who have employed assistant bishops have planned and fully involved the diocesan structure, through both formal and informal structures.

In all cases, this was never a sudden and un-processed move and action but generally involved one or two years of assessment, evaluation, the weighing of factors, exploring other such relationships, etc. So, also, it involved developing a position description (the responsibility of the diocesan or 'employer') and, following the search for an assistant bishop, a responding job description. The distinction could be that the position description, which ascertains the total need and its component parts, and the expectations. But some of these, the potential assistant may not be able to do or complete. He, therefore, can respond that he, say, can fill 85 or 90% of the expectations and he may well raise the issue of how the other 15 or 10% might get accomplished, and by whom.

In Washington, for instance, the diocesan and his professional staff (together with diocesan council, via convention) approved the principle of having an assistant bishop. A representative committee of about fifteen, under the chair of the diocesan chancellor, was convened to 'search'. On it were Whites/Blacks/Hispanics; male and female; rectors of cardinal hue and clergy and laity from small, historic, rural Maryland congregations; representatives on non-parochial missions and ministries, such as university chaplains, etc.

This group, following suggestions of the diocesan (who had made evaluative assessment and decisions about who, resigned or potentially so, he might be able to work with) and after sharing of documents, such as needs, the position description, curriculum and vocational vitae and, I am confident, exploring both formal and informal references, interviewed two possible candidates in depth... i. e. a minimum of six formal hours and several more hours in individual contacts and meal discussions.

Then they made a written report, with recommendation, to the diocesan and encouraged him to negotiate a contract. The recollection is that, surely, the process was as--and perhaps more--intensive and thorough as when candidates are assessed for other episcopal

elections. During it, the 'visions' of both the diocesan (and diocese) and assistant bishop aspirants were shared. Life stories were exchanged and feelings touched. For instance, 'how do you think you might feel moving from being No. 1 in a diocese to being staff, and perhaps No. 2 or No. 3 in structure?' or 'What might such a move and transfer mean to your wife and family?' In this case, at least to this person, it felt pastoral and personal--and open. Surely, we felt that the vast majority of the diocesan members were supportive of the diocesan in his effort and, through the Search Committee, representative as it was, the thing was 'legitimized'.

Responses on the questionnaire to the 1984 House of Bishops' meeting indicate that, when there was resistance elsewhere, it generally was from clergy, undoubtedly for any number of reasons having to do with authority, tradition, election procedures, ambition, etc. It would appear that, generally, the laity believed that it was a rational mode for extending the bishop's office. Surely, the nature of the doubt and resistance would be explored and evaluated, prior to any contracting, since there might be a whole host of other issues underlying.

II. The Accessibility of Bishops who represent Minorities: Often, in considering the expansion or extension of the bishop's office, the need is for achieving some ethnic balance in the episcopate. This has many sides. First, the numbers of possible bishops who had eligibility, through resignation, is limited. The majority of Hispanics work in the 9th Province and/or Latin-American provinces and tend to be young, both in age and tenure. Therefore, there is not a large pool.

Most Black bishops have been elected suffragans in metropolitan dioceses. Comparatively, they are few in number. It is surely wise for a diocesan, whose mission involves reconciliation of societies and races and whose diocese represents a rich ethnic mix, to seek an assistant who can help in this effort, among other things. But the accessible numbers are few.

We have found a deep concern among both clergy and laity which lies just as deep. In our communion, to this point in time, only two Black bishops have become diocesans: John Burgess in Massachusetts and John T. Walker in Washington. (I have had the unique, and proud, privilege of having worked under both of them and each helped me in many ways.) Both Johns were initially elected suffragans of their diocese; in another election each was chosen as coadjutor and,

in due time, succeeded to the diocesan role. The expressed concern is (and it has historic legitimacy, on the very small field of two) that if the number of assistant bishops, most of whom are white and experienced, grows, then the classic route of suffragan-coadjutor-diocesan into the House of Bishops will be closed. Most certainly this is an issue that will, and should, be discussed at those moments when a diocesan is evaluating what mode or kind of auxiliary episcopate will best fit his, and the diocesan, need.

III. All assistant bishops appear to have negotiated time-limited contracts. When the hiring diocesan translates or retires or dies, according to canon, the contract is non-operative (except, we presume, for transitional orderliness). This leaves the way open for the new diocesan to make a clean break or to renegotiate. The assistant bishop can have the same privilege. By the nature of things, by and large, assistants are older than their hiring diocesans and generally retire sooner. (In the diocese of Ohio, when the coadjutor became diocesan, he easily re-contracted with the assistant, since they had become colleagues during the year plus since his election and knew each other's skills and personalities.) This seems to be pastoral--although not inevitable. The ball is always in the diocesan's court, in such situations.

In Washington, the diocesan and assistant mandated an initial three-year contract, with one-year renewal options thereafter. This meant that either party could be free to terminate in a reasonable time, and certainly protected the diocesan if the relationship wasn't felicitous or helpful. At the same time, the three-year initial agreement made the cost and stress of moving, in this case from an intermountain diocese, feasible and, in case of the departure of the diocesan, did not leave the assistant in an ambiguous position. In the latter instance, presumably, the diocesan structure could negotiate an 'interim contract' with the assistant since initially it was understood that he would not be a candidate for diocesan in case of vacancy. Whether an 'interim contract' should be negotiated seems to be a different issue, dependent on the needs and nature of the diocese; the skills of the assistant, etc.

A subsidiary question is the matter of the voting and other rights and responsibilities of the assistant bishop. We are guessing that there are mixed practices. I was warmly welcomed and accepted as assistant in Washington (which other assistants affirm also) and, most usually, I was introduced as 'the assistant bishop of Washington'. I was graciously given seat, voice and vote in the diocesan convention.

However, whenever I introduced myself it was always as: 'Bp. Walker's assistant bishop' and, on principle, I did not vote in the convention. Partially, this was because I did not want to have the appearance of giving Bp. Walker an 'automatic' vote and, also, since I was part of his professional staff (which was basically half ordained and half lay), I chose personally to identify with the normally dis-enfranchised lay staff. So, for me, at least, this is an ambiguous area.

IV. The issue of clarity of contract, in a sense, is pro-forma. At the same time, since experience between a diocesan and assistant bishop is normally minimal, it is an area in which assumptions can replace realities. If the diocesan has produced a position description, it may be a true assessment of what help and in which areas he needs assistance. At the same time, inevitably, there will be unclear words, phrases and concepts (the so-called 'blue-sky' items) which should be clarified and 'grounded'. Some questions which might be explored during the hiring and contract-making period might be:

- a. Obvious hard-line items of salary and benefits (including continuing education, vacation and sabbatical opportunities for the up-grading of skills);
- b. Responsibilities to provincial and national church which every bishop has and what time leeway is there for these assignments;
- c. The manner in which extra-diocesan duties relate to diocesan responsibilities. As an example, in Washington, I was encouraged to both teach a senior short-course at a neighboring seminary and to run for election to the Alumni board of my own seminary. Since we had students for both ordained and lay ministry in both institutions, it went along well with my assignment to be staff to the Commission on Ministry and the diocesan Parish Intern Program. So, also, since one of my professional organizations was the Association of Clinical Pastoral Education (ACPE), I was released to attend both regional and national meetings of that group, which helped me to (a) keep up professional credentials, status and knowledge; (b) had relevance to plans I was developing for service and employment at time of retirement and (c) kept us in contact and personal and professional relations with the C. P. E. supervisors who, since our and seminary standards required a basic quarter of C. P. E., would have fundamental in-put into the passages, formation and education of persons moving towards ordination.

A significant portion of the contract process should be to develop ongoing methods and processes for monitoring and evaluating the (a) relationship between the diocesan and assistant; (b) the assistant and

others on the bishop's staff; (c) the assistant and the wider diocesan system; and (d) the assistant's areas of accountability, both in terms of performances and in terms of transformations, transitions and transfusions in the process and contracting.

Experience indicates that the important thing is that the contract be seen, and understood, as a living, process document, reflective of relationships and change. It is not something to get done, over-with and forgotten until re-negotiation time. In Washington, where there is a Bishop's Canon for Executive Office, the basic responsibility of monitoring, evaluating and negotiating resided with that person. This was logical, insofar as that person was also accountable for the other staff persons and for the fundamental development of the program and budget, based on the diocesan's 'vision'. These areas, of course, had relevance to the assistant's function and position.

In less structured, and simpler, jurisdictions, this could not be possible. In such cases, it might be helpful, both from the perspective of stewardship and clarification, to employ a consultant from outside to develop and implement this whole area. This would bring a certain objectivity to it since, in some sense, both the assistant bishop and executive person (who in smaller jurisdictions is probably the diocesan himself) were in a staff relationship.

Such agencies as the Alban Institute, Washington, D. C. ; the Association for Creative Change, Syracuse, N. Y. ; neighboring seminaries (both Episcopal and ecumenical); CODE (Conference of Diocesan Executives); the House Committee on Pastoral Development (Coral Gables, Fla.) are potential resources for this, and we found these groups and persons always willing to explore issues and relationships, both informally and by contract. Then, also, persons who have been assistant bishops or diocesans in such a relationship might be available to assist with this (cf. Appendix for list).

What staff responsibilities and in which areas the assistant bishop is assigned is dependent on needs, skills, availability of other persons to do it. Again, in Washington, the Asst. Bishop's staff roles included Commission on Ministry, the Parish Intern Program, the Commission on Alcoholism and Other Substance Abuse (CHAOS), the Commission on Peace and the Committee on Pastoral Care. These appeared to be logical appointments because each are areas of primary responsibility of the bishop by consecration and canon, or by specific actions of General Convention (such as actions which mandated that each diocese

should have systems reflective of concern for the illness of alcoholism and peace-making). Because, through training and experience, these were areas where I seemed to match better than some other staff persons, it packaged well. Each diocesan and assistant (together with the normal assignment structures of the Council and Convention) would need to make their own assessment of what would be fitting and logical.

V. Obviously, by temperament and personalities, it can be important for the diocesan and assistant to be comfortable with each other and, at the same time, be complementary in skills, interests, experience and styles. A good rule, often, for staff is to have as much variety to cover the needs; as much compatibility and complementariness as keeps people honestly talking to each other.

The bishop of Washington was black; identified with urban church work; an ecumenical and worldwide church leader; was an experienced educator and was younger than the chosen assistant.

The latter was some four to five years older; was white; was a trainer and leader in town-country church work; had been the diocesan of a geographically broad institutionally small inter-mountain diocese and had little practical experience in world-wide church and society.

At the same time, they had known each other initially when the diocesan had been a university student in Detroit, where the assistant had been a rector of a small, inner-city parish and going to graduate school. Because of different vocational environments, they really didn't know each other intimately but they had worked together minimally in the House of Bishops, the Bishop's Urban Caucus and the 1978 Lambeth Conference groupings. However, the mix was such that they could explore possible mutual ministry in a comfortable manner.

The diocesan had major responsibilities in many areas in a complex diocese. It was a major metropolitan jurisdiction, with a significant rural and historic component; it was the site of the National Cathedral of which the Bishop was also Dean (and which, institutionally, in terms of budget and institutions and numbers of employees was as big as the diocese); it was the national Capitol, etc. He, by nature of skills and assignments, was a world and national church figure. There were a large number of diocesan institutions (educational and social agencies); and he was a significant ecumenical leader, both from a Christian perspective and trans-religious. So, also, he was on external boards of trustees around



the nation (seminaries, preparatory schools, foundations, etc.). Inevitably his calendar and role was very complex. At times, inevitably, there was difficulty in maintaining contact and give-and-take.

By and large, however, this was a minimal concern, since both the executive officer and the diocesan's administrative secretary were competent and legitimate 'message carriers' and communicators.

Surely, the compatibility of the two bishops involved is a primary concern. This is certainly one of the reasons for a time-limited contract. By mutual agreement, or by individual decision, each can break it off for the common mission or if things have moved to a point in life (individual or corporate) where a change is indicated.

VI. As with any transition, there is stress potential on spouse and family. And, mostly, it is no more so than any other move. Washington had a contract with the Alban Institute at the time whereby new clergy and spouses coming into the diocese went through "Clergy-in-Transition".

The assistant and his spouse did this and it was extremely helpful to look at some issues/relationships/decision-making processes/grief at leaving mountains and desert, and much more together. Also, it had the benefit of allowing us to get to know much better those clergy/spouse duos who were going through the same transition on parish or other level. The point is that the transitional period should be monitored.

And, of course, wisdom dictates that the wife be involved in some, if not all, of the contract negotiation. After all, they have to live somewhere and in something; they are moving as a relationship and, perhaps, with children; they will go on vacations and want to identify. There is some indication from some assistant bishops' wives that there can be some stress at moving from being 'first lady' to 'second'. Most seem to find this a relief, which is an issue that others should deal with, and very often one of the purposes of an assistant bishop moving into another scene is so that the spouse may develop her own career and use the opportunities that a different area has. In Washington, for example, the assistant's spouse tutored functionally disabled readers in the 14th and 16th Sts. corridors and ultimately went on to earn a Master's Degree in a specialized educational field at a local university, so that, in retirement, she could exercise a new serving career.

Summary Reflections:

There are, on reflection, some things we would have explored more:

1. Would it have been more efficient to have had the assistant functioning from an auxiliary office somewhere out of the city and, thus, perhaps seen as more accessible to the more rural and isolated areas of the diocese? The majority of persons and congregations were in the urban and suburban Washington area. Given the diocesan's calendar, which called him away much, there was a felt need to have the assistant available to the majority--and to the staff.

Given other geographies in other jurisdictions, split residences and offices have proven efficient and helpful. At the same time, there is always the danger of constructing unintentionally a mini-diocese. Some good hard monitoring and honest evaluation can handle this, but persons in these kinds of relationships know that the 'rivers of the psyche' run deep and fast. Support groups, provincial and other meetings with bishops in same relationships, etc., and consultation with the House Committee on Pastoral Care, or other agencies, make sense.

2. Given the assignments in areas of ministry and education and formation of postulants-candidates-deacons, very often, the assistant was closer to, and knew more about, such persons than the diocesan. However, they were a primary responsibility of his. Since the assistant answered the Ember Day letters; pastoral concerns with such persons; visited them at seminaries; related to their faculties and supervisory chaplains, etc., there was some danger of his becoming the 'pastor' and key person to the ministry aspirants rather than the focusing diocesan. Through pre-ordination retreats; semi-regular luncheons, hosted by the diocesan, for aspirants; sharing ordination services but, primarily, focusing them on the diocesan; etc. it was moderated. But, after all, by canon, it was the diocesan who made the final and tough calls and decisions and, thus, there was always the possibility of the 'good assistant/tough rector' syndrome. Again, close monitoring is called for. We were aware of the issue; were willing to discuss it; blow off steam and understood that the captain was on the bridge! However, we are sure, that some persons aspiring to ministry believed that they didn't know their bishop, and he didn't know them as fully as might be desired.

3. There is also the question of the distribution of time/energy/work between episcopal and staff roles and relations of the assistant. Often

they were seen, and felt, synonymous. At the end of the tenure, as the diocese was going through some restructuring, we were trying to move to a 75% episcopal and 25% staff ratio. We had begun with a 50%-50% division.

The unique gift the assistant bishop brings to the relationship is the episcopacy. In some instances, perhaps most, other ministers on the staff, whether ordained or lay, might have functioned better or as well in particular areas. This might have meant that the assistant could have 'flown the Purple' more widely and pastorally in the name of the diocesan.

4. So, too, the whole question of the 'authority' of the assistant remains. And it is not easy and clear. In one sense, it involves the personalities and temperaments of the two persons involved. On occasion, surely, the diocesan made decisions with which the assistant disagreed or, if he had the 'imperium' of authority, would have made a different decision. Actually, these were few since, basically, the two parties shared a common ecclesiology and vision. Both were persons who expected to live in trust and respect relationship. The assistant, also, was a clinical pastoral supervisor and social worker by education and training and came to the position from a holistic view of the matter. (Example: When asked in the Search Committee about this area, the response was: "I learned as much about the episcopacy and church from Casey Stengel's N. Y. Yankees as anywhere else. Every member of that team could play two or three positions and, as long as they kept winning pennants and the Series, no one cared who batted in what position. . . . I really think that the Church and its episcopacy should be like that. Robert Greenleaf has written extensively about Servant Leadership and, for me, that is a primal and basic theological and psychological reality.")

Always, there are some questions about whether a bishop, without elected jurisdiction, is operative. Of course, every assistant bishop has been duly elected and ordained. If he does not have jurisdiction, can he, through 'contract', borrow or assume the authority and structure of another diocesan? Under a sensitive system and with intentional, reflective partners, we believe so. Surely, all bishops should have legitimate status, whatever their titles or legitimate vocational passages. By canon, each has full membership in the House of Bishops. If it is true that, fundamentally, bishops are called to be servant leaders, then under appropriate settings and contracts, assistants make a good bit of strategic and pastoral sense. At this time, of course, there are relatively few of them and, frustratingly, often when diocesans seek such assistance, no candidates are available.

Perhaps, in the next period, more will become so, as we develop more data, feel comfortable with the model and various bishops recognize that passages can be a sign of health and wholeness. Surely, as a mode and model, the assistant bishop approach indicates a very functional and serving model which, in some instances, can be of help to both diocesans and their jurisdiction. With limited time-contracts, there is flexibility for the diocesan's decision-making. For the person who becomes an assistant, it is a way to finish and move on to another work; to continue to serve; to prepare for the passage beyond, like creative retirement; or, if you will, to tone up or re-cycle 'old muscles' while remaining intentional and responsible to their ordination vows and commitments.

Instruments and resources used:

1. Survey of the members attending the 1984 interim meeting of the House of Bishops, Jackson, Miss., Sept. 1984.
2. Questionnaire to active 'assistant bishops'.
3. Questionnaire for members of the 'search committee for assistant bishop' of the diocese of Washington, five years after they nominated me to the diocesan.
4. Consultations with diocesan clergy and laity who were representative of the diocese of Washington.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- David B. Joslin: Apostle In Our Midst, Forward Movement pamphlet.
- Trinity Institute: Towards a Theology of Priesthood report of a consultation. . . Trinity Church, N. Y.
- Thomas J. Talley: The Liturgy of the Bishop, article in OPEN, Associated Parishes, Arlington, Va.
- Committee on Pastoral Development: Bishops and Diocesan Councils View the Episcopate: A study in Church Leadership (Report to House of Bishops, Oct. 1, 1979)
- Verna Dozier: The Authority of the Laity: Alban Inst. , Washington, D. C.
- Canadian Catholic Conference: Directory of the Pastoral Ministry of Bishops; C. C. C. , Ottawa, Canada, 1966.
- Wm. Appleton Lawrence: The Work of a Bishop, A. Witness Pamphlet, undated
- A-dre Simonet: The Priest and His Bishop; Herder, St. Louis, 1969
- National Conference of Catholic Bishops: The Ministry of Bishops.

APPENDIX I.

Survey of Bishops, Interim Meeting, House of Bishops, Jackson, Ms., 1984

I. Type of Bishop: Diocesan: 46; Coadjutors: 2;  
Suffragans: 6 Assistants: 5  
Assisting: 4

(61 total responders)

II. Twenty-three respondents had served as bishops in other categories than those they were now in:

1. Assisting Bishop: and had been suffragan, coadjutor, diocesan and assisting
2. Four (4) had been suffragans and coadjutors
3. Sixteen (16) had been coadjutors
4. One (1) had been assistant (?..doubtful statistic)
5. One (1) had been suffragan

(This was not a clear question and therefore not too helpful. Mea culpa, friends)

III. When asked about assistant bishops, fifty-four (54) answered positively and unqualifiedly as in favor; seven (7) were undecided. There were no flat out 'nos.'

IV. Thirty-two (32) affirmed that the concept of Assistant Bishop was responsive to the Episcopal tradition; Fourteen (14) said no and ten (10) were undecided. The others gave no response, generally saying "what tradition?"

V. Asked to ascertain the 'pluses' and 'minuses' of assistant bishop model, in order of priorities, we find:

	<u>Pluses</u>
Diocesan can choose	33
Time limit on contract	25
Fills needs for special skills	20

Allows for transfer of Bishops	14
Get experienced help	14
Flexibility	12
Team arrangements, lessening load of Bp.	10
Compatibility	6
Immediate help--no cost or red-tape of election, consecration, etc.	6
Economical	3
Principles of missionary strategy	3
Avoids proliferation of bishops	2
Can terminate if not satisfactory	2
Raise Episcopal 'presence' in diocese	1
Protects new diocesan from unfortunate inheritance	1
Avoids duality of leadership	1
Renewal of ministry (presumably for assistant, but perhaps on diocesan's part also)--'buddy/confidant'	1
Wider choice of compatible skills	1
Sharing of Work	1
Growth, through change	1

Minuses

Laity and clergy have no choice	30
Role ends when diocesan retires/dies moves on	11
None available or none with appropriate skills	5
Tentativeness	3
Use of 'office' to solve personal problems--'misfits'	3

Induces too high expectation of Episcopal presence	2
Assumption of secondary role hard	2
Loss of authority (see above)	2
Could leave when still needed	2
'Minority' persons non-available	2
Use of bishop when person in other Orders or lay ministry might do	1
Incompatibility	1
Exploration	1
Reduced jurisdiction	1
Overloading House of Bishops	1
Bishop's man--not diocese	1
Becomes canonical 'non-person'	1
Few Guidelines	1

VI: Experience in considering assistant bishops: Yes. 9 No. 38 Not applicable: 8

- a. Considered and rejected:
- |                                     |   |
|-------------------------------------|---|
| Wanted minorities and not available | 2 |
| Wanted suffragan                    | 1 |
| Bishop 'backed out'                 | 1 |
| No financing                        | 1 |
| Clergy did not want                 | 1 |

VII: Issues involving spouses:

Most didn't believe it was a big issue... at least, no other issues than, say, would confront suffragans and their wives. As listed, some concerns were:

- a. New freedom for spouse
- b. Reluctance to move on spouse's part
- c. Difficulties in stepping down as 'first lady'
- d. Wives need a feeling of support and care (again, no different than others)
- e. Without election, a spouse may feel removed from diocese (written in a way that this could be seen as both 'plus' and 'minus' and, perhaps related to a. above.)



APPENDIX II.

---

List of Dioceses and Diocesans hiring Assistant Bishops from Previous Diocese

---

Long Island	Robt. Wicher	Shannon Mallory	Central Africa
Pennsylvania	Lyman Ogilby	J. Brooke Mosley(*)	Union Seminary
Michigan	Coleman McGeehee	Wm. Gordon	Alaska
Washington	John T. Walker	Wm. B. Spofford	Eastern Oregon
Ohio	John Burt	Wm. Davidson	Western Kansas
Oklahoma	Gerald McAllister	William Cox	Suff. , Maryland
Minnesota	Robert Anderson(***)	Wm. Dimmick(**) Robert Varley	Northern Michigan Nebraska
Alabama	Furman Stough	Wm. Dimmick	Asst. , Minnesota
Arizona	Joseph Heistand	Wesley Frensdorff	Nevada and Nava- joland
Texas	Maurice Benitez	Anselmo Carral	Hispanic Center, Austin
Newark	John Spong (****)	Assorted persons, from Latin Ameri- ca, Africa, etc. Also, from town- country west.	

---

\* Mosley had been bishop of Delaware; Bp. of Europe and on staff of Presiding Bishop, before being elected dean of Union Seminary, N. Y.

\*\* Dimmick had two-year contract with Bp. Stough in Alabama but, unfortunately, died one month into the contract. Having been assistant and in a team situation in collegial episcopate in Minnesota, he would have developed two different models of assistantship.

\*\*\* Bp. Anderson had two assistant bishops. One, single, lived in ecumenical and Roman Catholic center in Collegeville, where his gifts in spiritual direction and ecumenics, were maximized. The other was vicar of a town-country mission in southern area of diocese, with pastoral and other oversight of non-metropolitan churches in that region.

Since departure of one of the assistants, Bp. Anderson has contracted with the Bp. of North Dakota (Harold Hopkins) to assist in the Fargo-Morehead area. Bp. Hopkins resides in Fargo and, logistically, this concept of episcopacies being shared across common, but porous, boundaries has merit. Eastern Oregon and Idaho have explored and implemented this for a long time, as have many other western and inter-mountain jurisdictions where, geographically, the diocesan resides a long way from certain congregations. The author of this paper once said that, if the church was really interested in 'renewal', the first act should be to redraw all of the diocesan boundaries. In his experience, he has seen no reason to change his mind.

\*\*\*\* Bp. Spong in Newark, which geographically is a rather compact diocese, but one of great ethnic and urban diversity, has had assistants on a short term contract: month to three or more months. These persons, generally, come from what is designated the THIRD WORLD, or the rural sections of North America. This also appears innovative, in terms of educating about world mission. Presumably these persons are seen as educational and consciousness-raising assistants and would have few, if any, staff roles. At the same time, it would seem to be a model, given the diocese's location in metropolitan area, of giving bishops/spouses from more isolated areas of the world a chance for short-term education; renewal in areas of arts, sciences, etc.

Note: It was felt that this list might be helpful to diocesan and jurisdictions who are exploring the concept of contracted assistant bishops. We have not asked any of them but we assume that any of the persons involved would be glad to share their knowledge and experience if asked.

COPIES OF THIS EXPLORATION ARE FOUND AT THE NATIONAL CHURCH'S ARCHIVES, SEMINARY OF THE Southwest, Austin, Texas; The Alban Institute, Washington, D. C. ; the Office for Ministry Development National Church Headquarters, 815 2nd Ave. , N. Y. C. and in office of Rt. Rev. Wm. B. Spofford, Mtn. States Tumor Institute, 151 E. Bannock St. , Boise, Idaho 83712.

APPENDIX III.

CANON 24. (1986 Numbering)

Of Assistant Bishops

Sec. 1. Whenever any Diocese shall, in the opinion of its Bishop, require additional episcopal services, the said Bishop may, with the consent of the Standing Committee of the Diocese, in lieu of requesting the election of a Coadjutor or Suffragan Bishop, ask the Diocesan Convention to approve the creation of the position of Assistant Bishop, and to authorize the Bishop to appoint a Bishop for such position, with the consent of the Standing Committee of the Diocese, and under such conditions as the Bishop may determine.

Sec. 2. Such Assistant Bishop may be appointed from among the following:

(a). Bishops now exercising jurisdiction, or serving as Suffragan Bishop, who under the Constitution and Canons, and subject to their provisions, would be eligible for election in that Diocese, Provided, that before accepting any such appointment a Bishop exercising jurisdiction as the Ordinary or as the Bishop Coadjutor shall resign that jurisdiction, or the right of succession, as the case may be;

(b). Bishops who, having resigned their previous responsibilities, are qualified to perform episcopal acts in this Church; and

(c). Bishops of a Church in communion with this Church, in good standing therein, if they:

1. have previously resigned their former responsibilities;
2. have received approval by a competent authority within the Church of their consecration of their appointment to the position of Assistant Bishop;
3. have exhibited satisfactory evidence of moral and godly character and theological requirements; and
4. shall have promised in writing submitted to the Bishop making the appointment to submit in all things to the Doctrine, Discipline and Worship of this Church, and also shall have submitted to and satisfactorily passed a thorough examination covering both physical and mental condition by recognized and licensed professionals appointed by the Ecclesiastical Authority of the Diocese with the approval of the Presiding Bishop. The forms of medical and physical reports prepared by The Church Pension Fund shall be used to these purposes;

Provided, that before the appointment of an Assistant Bishop in a Diocese under the provisions of subparagraphs (b) or (c), who is not otherwise a member of the House of Bishops, the consent of the House of Bishops or, if such appointment is to be made more than three months prior to a meeting of the House of Bishops, the consent of a majority of the Bishops having jurisdiction is essential and must be obtained.

Sec. 3. An Assistant Bishop so appointed shall serve at the discretion of, and be under the control and direction of, the Bishop having jurisdiction.

Sec. 4. No person may serve as an Assistant Bishop beyond the termination of the jurisdiction of the appointing Bishop or after attaining the age of 72 years.

APPENDIX IV.

General Convention: Louisville--1970

REPORT AND RECOMMENDATIONS WITH REGARD TO SUFFRAGAN AND ASSISTANT BISHOPS

The Commission has studied the role of Suffragan Bishops, and has also considered the status of so-called "Assistant Bishops", that is to say, retired Bishops who continue to function at the request of a Diocesan. We submit the following observations and recommendations:

1. We are of the opinion that many, if not most, Suffragan Bishops in the Church today find themselves in an anomalous position, fraught with uncertainty and frustration. We believe that the ideal structural form for a Diocese does not include provision for a Suffragan Bishop, and that good reason seldom exists for a Diocese to have a Suffragan Bishop.
2. We are aware that requests and pressures for the consecration of Suffragan Bishops generally arise in those Dioceses whose physical extent is too large or whose population is too numerous to permit orderly administration by a single Bishop, or by a Diocesan Bishop and a Bishop Coadjutor; but we firmly believe (a) that the best long-range solution to the problem faced by a Diocese which is too large or too populous involves a division into two or more smaller or less populous Dioceses, and (b) that in many cases a satisfactory interim solution lies in the employment of an Assistant Bishop.
3. We believe that the solution is rare in which the division of an existing Diocese is impractical; but we recognize that situations may exist, either now or in the future in which a Diocese cannot, for good reason, be divided, and in which the short-range use of an Assistant Bishop is impossible. In such a case, we recognize that the consecration of a Suffragan Bishop is the only practical solution to an otherwise insoluble problem.
4. We therefore recommend that the Constitution and Canons be amended so as clearly to recognize the status of (and the term) Assistant Bishop, as applying to a Bishop (Diocesan or Suffragan) who has resigned or retired, but who (not yet having reached age 72) accepts an assignment from a Diocesan to perform episcopal acts within all or part of a Diocese for a fixed period of time. We recommend that Diocesan Bishops who are overburdened by the extent either of their Diocese or its work enter into contractual arrangements with such

resigned or retired Bishops, whereby, for a fixed period, not extending beyond the age of mandatory retirement, the resigned or retired Bishop can act as Assistant Bishop, performing such duties as may be agreed upon.

5. In those situations in which the employment of an Assistant Bishop is impossible and the division of a Diocese is truly impractical, we recommend that the election of a Suffragan Bishop be permitted, but we urge that the following safeguards against ill-advised elections be imposed by canon:

(a) We recommend that the Canons contain a statement of policy restricting the election of a Suffragan to those instances in which (1) the division of a Diocese is impractical, (2) the employment of an Assistant Bishop is inadvisable or impossible, and (3) there is already a Coadjutor.

(b) We recommend that the Canons be amended to specify that whenever the Bishop of a Diocese asks for the assistance of a Suffragan, he shall state in writing and in detail to the Convention of the Diocese his specific grounds for such request when such grounds shall comply with the canonical restrictions referred to in the preceding sub-paragraph.

(c) We recommend that the Canons be amended to provide that before any election of a Suffragan Bishop, the Bishop of the Diocese shall state in writing to the Convention thereof the specific duties, the specific functions, or the specific area of the Diocese which he proposes to cede to the Suffragan upon his ordination and consecration.

(d) We propose that the Canons be amended to provide that such cession of duties, function, or area may be enlarged but not reduced, by mutual consent of the Bishop of the Diocese and the Suffragan, and that such assignment shall not be terminated by the death or removal of the Ordinary.

6. We further recommend that the canonical changes herein proposed be so drawn as to prevent their having any effect in respect of any present Suffragan Bishop; but we nevertheless recommend that the Bishop of every Diocese which has a Suffragan be urged, wherever practical, to make a voluntary cession of specific duties, functions, or area to such Suffragan.

APPENDIX V.

SPECIAL MEETING OF THE HOUSE OF BISHOPS 1971

Suffragan and Assistant Bishops

Bishop Richards, reporting for the Committee on the Office of Bishop, read the following report to the House:

Three Standing Committees have memorialized the House of Bishops, asking that the House review the matter of criteria for the election of a Suffragan Bishop.

One of the major objections stated is the enlargement of the House of Bishops. All three suggest that it would be helpful to re-study the whole matter of how episcopal assistance is provided in a Diocese which requires such help. It is inferred that other Standing Committees, which are reluctant to approve of such elections, would appreciate guidance on this complex matter.

Obviously, neither the Committee on the Office of Bishop, nor the House itself, can give instructions on this matter. Each Diocese, in the light of permissive canons, and on consideration of known autonomy, is free to decide for itself what it prefers to do.

However, your Committee would like to offer certain observations and would suggest that they be noted particularly by Dioceses which are anticipating the possibility of the election of a Suffragan.

1. The defining of the role of a staff person whose function is to supply assistance to a diocesan Bishop is a management problem; and before calling for the election of a Suffragan a Diocese might well consider having a management study, so as to ascertain the need for episcopal assistance, and so as to describe the kind of position that needs filling. If a bonafide position does in fact need filling, then such a position may call for specific skills and talents that can be supplied best by an appointment rather than by an election process. Clear analysis beforehand will help make this decision.
2. If it is clear that the Diocesan can be adequately assisted only by a person in episcopal orders, then there exists the possibility that the Diocese can still consider securing such assistance through appointment rather than election. Resigned Bishops represent a manpower pool from which such assistance can be drawn.

3. The role of Assistant Bishop should be more carefully defined, and the possibility of making appropriate canonical changes so as to legitimize this role should be explored. When a Diocesan sees in a person in episcopal orders exactly the kind of person he needs for a well-defined and well-described staff position in his own Diocese, some provision might be made to allow him to negotiate the employment of such a person.

The securing of episcopal assistance through appointment rather than by election might help to use the skills, experience, and resources, of resigned Bishops, or Bishops who, after completing the canonical period of service in a Diocese (5 years), would be interested in a change of position and would welcome appointment to another Diocese as an Assistant Bishop in the light of these observations.

We recommend the following:

- (1) That any Diocese anticipating the possibility of calling for the election of a Suffragan take the preliminary step of seeking the counsel and advice of the Commission on Structure, and/or consider ordering a complete management study and analysis of the Diocese to assist in making this decision.
- (2) That the Committees on Constitution and Canons of this House study the matter and bring in their recommendations on the form and manner of defining and legitimatizing the role of Assistant Bishop.
- (3) That all Dioceses anticipating the possibility of electing a Suffragan Bishop within the next three (3) years notify this Committee, so that we can begin to discover, on the basis of experience and firm data, exactly what the dimensions of the problem might be. Data projected over the next three (3) years will help us determine the importance of this question.

Bishop Richards then moved the following:

Resolved, That the report of the Committee on the Office of Bishop be referred to the Committees on Constitution and Cannons, with the request that those Committees study the possibility of legitimatizing in canonical form the role of Assistant Bishop, and report their findings to the next meeting of this House.

Resolution adopted



APPENDIX VI.

DIOCESE OF MARYLAND

Position Description for Assistant Bishop

"The ministry of a bishop is to represent Christ and his Church, particularly as apostle, chief priest, and pastor of a diocese; to guard the faith, unity, and discipline of the whole Church; to proclaim the Word of God; to act in Christ's name for the reconciliation of the world and the building up of the Church; and to ordain others to continue Christ's ministry.

Book of Common Prayer, p. 855

1. The Assistant Bishop will serve as member of the staff of the Bishop of Maryland. He will participate in the corporate planning and collegial decision-making of the diocesan staff. His office will be in the diocesan headquarters in Baltimore. He will not have geographical jurisdiction.
2. The Assistant Bishop is envisioned as a close colleague and confidant of the Bishop and fully a part of a mutually supportive episcopal team in the diocese. The two bishops will meet at a regular time weekly for the exchange of ideas and information and the sharing and solving of problems.
3. The Assistant Bishop will share equally with the Diocesan Bishop in parish visitations, which generally focus on teaching, preaching and the administration of the rites of Christian initiation and maturation.
4. The Assistant Bishop will be assigned staff responsibility for one of the five major segments of diocesan program. The specific area will depend upon the talents and experience of the bishop selected and the particular configuration of the rest of the staff at the time that the Assistant Bishop is called. (See Attachment B for a description of the program areas envisioned.)

5. The Assistant Bishop will preside at half of the twin meetings with clergy and lay leaders in each of the regions of the diocese during the fall.
6. The Assistant Bishop will undertake his natural share of the pastoral care of the clergy and their families.
7. The Assistant Bishop will accept additional assignments from the Diocesan Bishop, especially in the area of administration. From time to time the Assistant Bishop will be given responsibility for presiding at ordinations and celebrations of new ministries.
8. The Assistant Bishop will be the Bishop's deputy in other matters requiring an episcopal presence as specifically assigned by the Bishop.
9. The Assistant Bishop will be accountable to the Right Reverend A. Theodore Eastman, as Bishop Coadjutor and Bishop-in-Charge of the Diocese of Maryland from July 1, 1985 to December 31, 1985, and subsequently as Diocesan Bishop from January 1, 1986 onward. A mutual evaluation of the episcopal ministry in the diocese will be undertaken by the two bishops annually.