



ANGLICAN DIOCESE OF CANBERRA & GOULBURN

PROTOCOL FOR ADDRESSING CHURCH WORKER PERFORMANCE CONCERNS

APRIL 2016

PROTOCOL FOR ADDRESSING CHURCH WORKER PERFORMANCE CONCERNS

A: SCOPE:

The protocol describes the processes to be followed when there are concerns expressed about the performance of a church worker in our Diocese.

A church worker is defined as a person who is or who at any relevant time was:

- a member of the Clergy; or
- a person employed by, or contracted to, a Church Body; or
- a person holding a position or performing a function with the actual or apparent authority of a Church Authority or Church Body; including:
 - a person holding an office in this Diocese;
 - a member of Synod;
 - a churchwarden of a ministry unit;
 - a member of any other board, council or committee constituted by ordinance or resolution of the Synod or of a parish council or chaplaincy unit council;
 - a person employed by this Church or a diocesan agency;
 - a member of a body corporate incorporated in this Diocese;
 - a person in a position of trust in a diocesan agency or ministry unit including worship leaders, lay pastors, youth workers and others engaged in worship, caring for parishioners and carrying on the work of this Church; and
- a person in any other position of leadership within the Diocese.

Performance concerns include, but are not limited to:

- Dissatisfaction in relation to fulfilling clearly defined job description or role expectations
- Concerns about management style
- Incompatibility between church workers and their supervisors
- Information in relation to the general functioning of a church worker, including but not limited to physical and mental health concerns

This protocol is not applicable where there is an alleged serious breach of Code of Good Practice by a church worker. The Professional Standards Ordinance will be used in such cases.

B: OUR COMMITMENT:

Our commitment is to provide a protocol to address concerns within the church, in a Godly, loving, compassionate and procedurally fair manner.

Where there are concerns in relation to a church worker a performance review is recommended.

Effective and ongoing supervision is a key to minimising likelihood of dissatisfaction with performance or a role requiring a formal review. Key components of effective and ongoing supervision include, but are not limited to:

- Opportunities to reflect on role expectations, role practices and how the expectations are being met
- Clear framework for accountability within the supervisory relationship
- Establishment of appropriate ministry boundaries

In implementing this protocol we apply the **overarching principles** of:

Seeking to glorify God in our responses to each other

Striving to serve each other even in the midst of our disunity

Seeking to grow Christ-like in our reactions to each other

Extending grace to each other

Focussing on restoration of relationships

Seeking help where needed, to address grievances

C: APPROACHES TO ADDRESS CHURCH WORKER PERFORMANCE CONCERNS

Locally Assisted Approach

If the dissatisfaction relates to a person holding a Lay Minister's Licence, a Stipendiary Lay Minister's Licence, or a person employed in a ministry or non-ministry role in a ministry unit or a Volunteer church worker, the Rector may initially activate the workplace performance review.

If the Rector does not feel equipped to activate such a review, they may seek assistance from an Archdeacon or the Director or Safe Communities.

Process:

1. The person responsible for the supervision (**The Supervisor**) of the person who is subject of the concerns (**The Person**) shall provide the Rector (or Archdeacon or Director of Safe Communities) with a document clearly identifying the expectations of the role.
2. The Rector shall articulate and seek clarification from the **Person** regarding the requirements of the role.
3. Where the **Person** has not met the expectations of the role, the Rector shall provide documentation to the **Person** outlining where and when the examples

have occurred and provide the **Person** with an opportunity to respond to the concerns.

4. The **Person** shall be provided with a timeframe to remedy the areas identified.
5. Where the concerns have not been remedied within the stated timeframe, consequences will be implemented.

Diocesan Intervention

A. In the case of a clergy person under the supervision of the Rector or other supervisor

If the clergy person is under the supervision of a Rector or another supervisor (**The Supervisor**), the **Supervisor** may be involved in the performance review.

In this situation, it is important that a clergy person under the supervision of a Rector or other supervisor has a Position Description outlining what will be expected of the clergy person as well as what the clergy person could expect of their supervisor. This would apply to both honorary and stipendiary clergy. It equally applies where a clergy person predates the appointment of an incumbent, as well as a clergy person appointed after an incumbent has been installed.

This approach is predicated upon the existence of such a document.

Steps in the Review Process:

1. The Position Description for the person who is the subject of the concern (**The Person**) shall be provided to the Archdeacon or Director of Safe Communities.
The Position Description needs to clearly identify the expectations of the role to be fulfilled by the clergy person.
2. The Archdeacon or Director of Safe Communities in collaboration with the supervisor shall articulate and seek clarification from the **Person** regarding the requirements of the role as expounded in the Position Description.
3. Where there are areas of role expectations which have been identified as unmet, the Archdeacon or Director of Safe Communities in collaboration with the **Supervisor** shall provide documentation to the **Person** outlining where and when the unmet expectations have occurred and provide them with an opportunity to respond to the unmet expectations.
4. The **Person** shall be provided with a timeframe to remedy the identified unmet expectations.
5. Where the unmet expectations have not been remedied within the timeframe, the **Supervisor** shall advise the Diocesan Bishop to discuss the consequences.
6. The consequences shall be implemented.
7. Where the consequence does not include termination of licence, ongoing supervision of the **Person** by the **Supervisor** shall be monitored by the Archdeacon or Director of Safe Communities.

B. In the case of a Rector or Priest-in-Charge

If the clergy person is a Rector or Priest-in-Charge the Diocesan Bishop may be involved in the performance review.

Steps in the Review Process:

1. Upon receipt of a concern related to performance of a Rector or Priest-in-Charge, the Diocesan Bishop or their delegate (Assistant Bishop, Archdeacon or Director of Safe Communities) will assess the identified concerns (*tasks or manner*) to determine if they are valid.

If they are not deemed to be valid, then the person expressing dissatisfaction will be advised as such and suggestions will be made to assist the person to move forward from their concern.

2. Where there have been failures to meet the expectations of the role, the Diocesan Bishop or their delegate shall provide documentation to the Rector or Priest-in-Charge outlining where and when the concerns have been reported to have occurred and provide them with an opportunity to respond.
3. The Diocesan Bishop or delegate shall discuss the valid identified concerns with the Rector or Priest-in-Charge and provide them with a timeframe to remedy the identified concerns, including direction around forums in which to address the concerns, the tools to deploy to address the concerns and the skills needing to be developed to address the concerns.
4. Where the identified concerns have not been remedied within the timeframe, the Diocesan Bishop will discuss the consequences with the Person.
5. The consequences shall be implemented.
6. Where the consequence does not include a serious breach of the Code of Good Practice, the Person's performance shall be monitored by the Archdeacon and reports will be provided to the Diocesan Bishop.

REVIEW OF PROTOCOL

This protocol was endorsed by Bishop-in-Council on 3 June 2016 and is to be reviewed and adjusted as required periodically by the PSRG.