



comments from the chat box

during discussions on the proposed new Synod structures

From John and Marilyn Piper: 10:49 AM

I think Marion's answer is unsatisfactory and not borne out by experience. I think this is a real opportunity to be seen to be enabling local churches via missional partnership representation to be involved in the strategic direction of the work of the synod.

From Lawrence Moore: 10:51 AM

I'm surprised that the non-participation of all MPs isn't seen as a problem that needs solving. If the focus is (rightly) local and operates through MPs, I believe all MPs need to be represented and active in the decision-making processes of the Synod.

From Lawrence Moore: 10:56 AM

Mike Walsh's contribution raises for me the question about how to ensure that we have government by Council (comprising the local churches) as opposed to government by Executive Officers. I'm sure that's a question of optics, but it needs to be interrogated and be clearly "visible".

From John and Marilyn Piper: 11:01 AM

There is real opportunity here to enable all local churches to be represented in the decision making of synod committees via mission partnership representation. It is really disappointing to hear Mike Hart say that it is not envisaged that there will be major changes in the membership. I share Mike Walsh's view that the members of synod need to be more involved in the evolution of these plans before a resolution is voted on.

From Liz Kam: 11:03 AM

I agree with you John.

From Bernie: 11:05 AM

What's critical here is, is communication both up AND down enhanced.

From Alastair Clark: 11:05 AM

I think there should be formal provision for representation of missional partnerships in the new committee structure.

From Lawrence Moore: 11:06 AM

Thanks John. I'd certainly second Mike W's suggestion that the committee is made up of MP reps. That ensures the church participation in decision making and ensures their responsibility for scrutinising the work of the Exec/Synod as part of conciliar government.

From Lawrence Moore: 11:14 AM

Brian, does the Exec have a view on Mike W's suggestion that there ought not to be a resolution, but a progress report instead?

From Mike Hart: 11:18 AM

The Executive have a meeting after both sessions and before the Synod Meeting reconvenes. They will consider the feedback and discussions, and can if appropriate amend the resolutions in the light of feedback.

From Lawrence Moore: 11:19 AM

Thanks, Mike H

From Will Lindsay: 11:19 AM

I would support the comments from Marilyn Piper and Mike Walsh. As a very new and inexperienced member of Synod it is taking me some time to understand how the aims and objectives of local churches are played out into those of Synod. I would also agree that most members and Elders probably don't fully understand the challenges of both. Being pessimistic, as local member numbers shrink and churches disappear unless we narrow down the actions we need to take matching local requirements to secure the sustainability of local church communities we will end up not existing sadly.

From Alastair Clark: 11:23 AM

I believe in making arrangements as simple as possible; the proposed role of these new "posts" appears confusing and overshadowing the Mentors. We need more human resources at MP and congregational level.

From John and Marilyn Piper: 11:26 AM

Capacity is clearly an issue but so is involvement and representation. If people don't feel involved then the capacity issue will get worse.

From Adam Scott: 11:31 AM

My sense is that Steering groups are a key stakeholder within the Synod and a place where churches can/could experience a sense of involvement on a local level.

From Margery Pitcher: 11:33 AM

I've been at Joint Elders meetings & Steering Group meetings where people have said that Synod & Pastoral Committee have no idea about what being Elders in local churches is like - I point out that I am on APC & Synod Exec as well as being an Elder. When asked if they would like to fill a vacant place on APC they say they are too busy! Nor do they respond when they are asked whether they want to report/raise anything at APC meetings.

From Jacky Embrey: 11:33 AM

That's part of my concern - we need to include them positively - they should know when there are needs in one of the churches.

From Daleen ten Cate: 11:33 AM

I think the Missional Discipleship Mentors should be members of the Steering Groups. They work locally with the churches. If the narrative is that the Steering groups are not just another level of management but about mission. It make sense that the Missional Mentors should be at the table.