

Guidelines for Reviews of posts.

Introduction

A Review is an opportunity for mutual enrichment; it may uncover potential, pinpoint areas of growth and development, highlight achievement and help to establish priorities. It is not an inspection but is to be undertaken in a context of prayer and fellowship.

Procedure

The SPC appoints a review team of 2-3 people with a convener seeking balance of lay/ordained, male/female and other factors.

The expectation regarding the time for reporting to SPC will be negotiated and agreed at an early stage.

The SPC secretary informs the key people involved, who have been appointed, the time scale and gives information on the nature of the review.

The review convener will then contact the minister(s), church secretaries, management group involved and others as appropriate. Information is exchanged, and the post documentation is made available to the group. E.g. last pastorate profile, SCM application, magazines, mission or constitution statements.

A brief note about the review team is made available for circulation in notices/web sites etc as appropriate for the post and a contact point given so that people involved can openly communicate their views to the reviewers in whichever way best suits them.

An initial exploratory meeting may be held of key people and review team to explore the best process to be undertaken.

The Review Team is completely free to pursue its own line of enquiry and to attend meetings, services or activities as seems appropriate. There are no set questions of enquiry, since these might have a limiting influence on possible judgments; Reviewers may follow whatever course seems necessary. When the Reviewers feel that they have enough information and that their opinions have taken shape, they produce a report which goes initially to the secretary of the SPC.

Basic information regarding the post, its development and successes and further areas of work that are being or could be developed all need to be included in the report. (Figures and budgets may be useful appendices here)

It may be appropriate for the review group to make recommendations. The review group will ensure it is clear which body or council the recommendation is addressed to.

If the review group become aware of serious problems (embezzlement of funds, sexual abuse) then a confidential interim report must be submitted to the Moderator as soon there is awareness.

The convener of the review group will normally discuss the report informally, out of courtesy and to correct any factual errors, with an appropriate person within the ministry being reviewed, prior to the report being presented to the SPC. The designated group then receives and considers the report of the Review Team which has been acting on SPC's behalf.

Representatives of SPC and ? the review group will meet with the ministers and pastorate/management group involved normally within 3 months of the report being received by them to share its findings. The report is circulated to the churches and people involved at this meeting.

The SPC ensures that recommendations are followed up by revisiting the review report and the situation as necessary in the months and years following the review.

The synod will cover reasonable expenses for those undertaking a review on its behalf.

Conclusion

There are two main positive outcomes from a review well undertaken. Firstly a fuller understanding of our interdependence as part of the body of Christ, enabling growth and greater transformative presence as God's people will develop. And secondly the identification of priorities for future works.

Rowena Francis
March 4th 2007