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Code of Ethics and Ministry Practice

and the:

Code of Conduct for Lay Leaders

The Ethical Ministry Refresher is an opportunity to gather ministry agents to engage with the Code of Ethics and Ministry Practice to:

1. Exercise professional awareness,
2. Encourage reflection on best ministry practice
3. Promote collegiality, to build frameworks of support for future growth and change

… and a good excuse for a cuppa together. Ministers, Candidates, Pastors, Chaplains and Lay People engaged in ministry (including Lay Preachers) in the Synod of Victoria and Tasmania are required to attend two Code of Ethics workshops each year.

BEFORE THE SESSION

* Read through this document. It begins with the preparation work you will need to complete to attend this Code of Ethics session and is followed by the session outline.
* Ensure you have a current copy of the relevant Code of Ethics and Ministry Practice and bring it to the refresher session. You can find a copy of the Codes of Ethics here: <https://assembly.uca.org.au/images/assemblies/appendixdcoe.pdf>
* Review the ‘*Ground rules for Workshop discussions’* and ‘*Safe shared pairing’* (below) and be ready to participate.
* Complete the preparation outlined in the next section.

PREPARE

Please read all of this document before the start of the session. The document includes: Guidelines for Group discussion; Paired Sharing Guidelines; Extracts from relevant codes of ethics; a reflection resource and couple of general scenarios and a set of case studies.

Please bring a full copy of your code of ethics and ministry practice to the session.

Please reflect on and prepare reflections on at least one scenario, at least two of the case studies, and ensure that you read all of them to be able to participate in group discussions well.

INTEGRITY – RESPECT – CONFIDENTIALITY

Guidelines for Group Discussion

1. Arrive on time, remain for the entire session, and do not wander in and out of the session.
2. Unless you’re expecting an emergency call, please turn mobile phones off. If you must take a call, please leave the room before doing so to minimise the interruption.
3. Practice active listening. Hear what the other person is saying. Let them finish talking. Think before you respond. Try to ask a question for clarification rather than making an assumption.
4. Talk about yourself and your own experience. You may ask questions of others, but do not challenge the validity of another’s personal experience or point of view. Code of Ethics case studies are intended as tools for reflecting on how the Code applies to our own ministry practice. Sometimes discussions may need to hold a wide range of views, and the facilitators may need to ensure the spirit and intention of the Code of Ethics is being upheld in the discourse.
5. Keep your comments brief and to the point, so everyone has a chance to speak.
6. Do not generalise the experience and feelings of others based on your experience. Let people speak for themselves.
7. Do not attack, or try to hurt, or pass judgment on anyone, whether they are present or not.
8. Treat this group session as confidential conversation; do not repeat elsewhere what is said during this session.
9. Stay on topic.
10. Please be discerning about what is appropriate for you to share in the wider group, what may be better suited to the ‘paired sharing’ and what should be shared only with your Supervisor.

Safe Paired Sharing

This is an opportunity to engage with the topic on a more personal level, and to integrate your experience as it relates to the Code of Ethics. Please keep discussions confidential and remember that paired sharing is in no way to take the place of a conversation with your Supervisor. We are all vulnerable people. Collegial respect and care for one another is essential for ministry.

Sharing an example from your ministry could include:

* An actual (de-identified) situation that you feel comfortable to discuss in this setting;
* A ‘hypothetical’ situation that could possibly happen to you or someone else – what steps would you take to resolve it, or how might you prevent a breach of the Code of Ethics? What choices might you make in this situation?
* A situation when you were concerned about another person’s ethical engagement with you (de-identified). Reflect on what might the other person in the situation have done differently so they would not have acted unethically towards you, or how in your ministry practice you seek to avoid such violations and develop healthy practice.

The suggested format for the paired sharing time is as follows:

Paired Sharing: (45 minutes)

* Share for 15 minutes each: Think of an example from your ministry that relates to the topic. How did you frame it? What did you learn? How are you practicing ministry differently as a result?
* Together discuss: What insights have we gained about prevention of ethical breaches in ministry practice?
* End with (10-15 minutes): – What would you like to bring to the group about your own experience, or about this discussion?

**Code of Ethics and Ministry Practice**

* 1. PROFESSIONALISM
     + - 1. Ministers shall exercise their ministry to the other person in the pastoral relationship in a professional manner. This includes, but is not limited to:

offering the best quality care, leadership of worship and preaching of which they are capable;

offering appropriate Christian teaching;

appropriately dealing with emotional and spiritual needs;

being sensitive to people's different social contexts;

following recognised and acknowledged modes of working in specialist areas such as bereavement, trauma and suicide;

being sensitive to the needs and vulnerability of the children and young people with whom they work, ensuring that the professional nature of the relationship is made clear in an appropriate way;

being sensitive to the needs of, and ways of relating to, people from any different cultures with whom they have contact including being aware of one’s own inherent cultural bias.

* + - * 1. Ministers shall not engage in sexual relationships with people in their professional pastoral care.
        2. Ministers have a responsibility to provide unbiased pastoral care to those with whom they disagree, and to consult their supervisor in relation to the situation.
        3. Where there is an actual or potential conflict of interest in matters affecting Ministers, their family or their financial interests, the Ministers shall absent themselves from discussion and decision, except in the case of deliberations by Presbyteries, Synods and Assembly and their agencies on ministerial stipends and entitlements.

**Pre-Reading**

**Extract from Sustaining Ministry: Foundations and Practices of Serving Faithfully, by Sondra Wheeler.**

© 2017 by Sondra Ely Wheeler. Published by Baker Academic, a division of the Baker Publishing Group. [www.bakeracademic.com](http://www.bakeracademic.com) Taken from ebook edition, created 2017

***From* Chapter 1: A Moral Framework for Power**

Ambivalence about power may be particularly strong among those deeply informed by Christian faith, and this ambivalence may pull them in two directions at once. On one hand, Christians are used to thinking of God as omnipotent, and they are accustomed to forms of address that stress divine power. “The Lord of Hosts” and “the Almighty” are familiar and reassuring names for God in prayer and song, inspiring confidence in the believer that the One on whom they call is able to help and sustain them, no matter what circumstances they face. Christians are also formed by biblical texts and liturgies that call on God the Holy Spirit to descend in power on God’s people, enabling them to resist evil and transforming them so that they might be signs of the in-breaking of God’s power to heal the world. All of this encourages them to view power positively, in terms of its agency for good in a broken world.

On the other hand, Christians are also heirs to the scathing critiques of earthly power, both political and economic, that run through the great Hebrew prophets. These range from the woes pronounced on “those who are at ease in Zion” who “eat lambs from the flock, and fattened calves from the stall” but “are not grieved over the ruin of Joseph” (Amos 6: 1, 4, 6) to predictions of all the impositions that would result from the king Israel was determined to have in order to be “like other nations” (1 Sam. 8: 4–18). Over and over, the Hebrew Scriptures denounce the arrogance and overreaching that attend the exercise of human power, warning that the abuses of the powerful will bring down judgment on the nations, including Israel and Judah. And for Christians the climax of the biblical witness is the revelation of Jesus the Redeemer, who empties himself of his own power for the sake of those he comes to save (Phil. 2: 6–8). He appears not as the conquering hero but as the Suffering Servant, the Lamb of God who “did not open his mouth,” even to defend himself before corrupt authorities (Isa. 53: 7; Matt. 27: 12–14). His advent marks the decisive intervention of the God who “has put down the mighty from their thrones, and exalted those of low degree” (Luke 1: 52 RSV), and firmly ties the cause of the Holy One of Israel to those who are despised and powerless.

The unease about power is likely to be especially acute among those who have been to seminary. Theological research over the last fifty years has stressed the degree to which the mission of God in the world is identified with rescuing the marginal and challenging the structures that maintain inequity and foster injustice.[[1]](#footnote-2) Jesus explicitly takes up this mantle at his first public utterance, when he applies Isaiah’s words to his own ministry: “The Spirit of the Lord is upon me, because he has anointed me to bring good news to the poor. He has sent me to proclaim release to the captives and recovery of sight to the blind, to let the oppressed go free, to proclaim the year of the Lord’s favor” (Luke 4: 18–19). No wonder those who aim to follow this itinerant preacher, a man of questionable parentage and no visible means of support, are uncertain about the role of power in Christian life and ministry.

But pastors who wish to align themselves with God’s mission, who wish to be of help to the world that God loves, cannot simply dismiss all human power as a manifestation of evil. The broadest and most helpful definition of “power” may come to us not from sociology or political science, but from physics: power is simply the ability to have an effect in the world. In itself, then, power is a kind of capacity, a channeling of energy that makes it possible to bring about a change. Only those who are content to be ineffectual in their ministry can eschew power altogether or regard it as inherently tainted. Thus the key questions, the ones necessary to any moral evaluation of power, are these: What kind of power is used? By whom? And to what ends is it directed? Only when we have answers to such questions can we determine whether the abstract good that power represents is good in any actual case, that is, whether it is good news for the inhabitants of the world in which it is exercised. To recover a critical appreciation of power as a necessary force for good, we turn below to an older conception of what makes the use of unequal power legitimate. It is an understanding already well developed in pre-Christian antiquity, and it underlies the three classical professions of ministry, medicine, and law.

**Ethics of the Professions**

In the contemporary context, anyone who wishes to draw on professional ethics as a source of insight must overcome several hurdles. To begin with, today we use the word “professional” to designate anyone who is paid for any sort of activity, from landscape design to pet photography. It is possible to be a professional house-painter or skateboarder, or even a professional escort (bringing to mind the phrase “the world’s oldest profession,” a euphemism for prostitution). With the bar for what we mean by a profession set so low, it is no surprise that we often take “professional ethics” to mean no more than the application of lowest-common-denominator standards of decent behavior to the arena of paid work. Thus we might expect to find in manuals on professional ethics minimal requirements of honest exchange and prohibitions on force and fraud, perhaps with some aspirations to basic competence thrown in for good measure. And in general we would not be far off. But embedded in the word “professional” is the trace of the term’s origin in the verb “to profess”—that is, to declare publicly one’s central convictions and commitments. This is a clue to a much older and richer understanding of certain kinds of human work, one that regards them as fundamentally moral enterprises demanding far more than the minimum of decent behavior.

Underlying the classical professions is the ideal of service to fundamental human needs, needs that require the development of specialized knowledge and skills to address. The acquisition of such knowledge and skills is a prolonged and labor-intensive process. It demands focused study over a number of years and a substantial period of supervised practice. These preparations must be supplemented by ongoing education so that practitioners remain well informed about emerging knowledge in their fields. Since it is not possible for everyone to acquire the requisite knowledge and skills—and indeed not possible for anyone to become expert in all three arenas—all human beings must sometimes depend on the services of professionals to meet essential needs, including the need for spiritual health and salvation, for bodily health and life, and for the maintenance of justice among humans and between them and their societies. Dedication to meeting these needs is the moral foundation of the three original professions of ministry, medicine, and law.[[2]](#footnote-3)

The disparate knowledge and skills possessed by the professional regarding a basic human need create an imbalance of power between the practitioner and those served in a critical area. It is one thing for a student’s tennis instructor to know more about his or her game than the student does, but it is quite another for someone’s physician to know more about his or her body and how to treat it than that patient does. The latter is potentially a matter of health and survival. Similarly, the expertise of the minister may have a bearing on the eternal welfare of a congregant’s soul, as the knowledge and skills of the attorney may be needed to preserve a client’s property, liberty, or even life.

The moral justification for the cultivation and application of this disparate power in other people’s lives is the protection of the interests of the patient, congregant, or client. This entails that the interests of those served must govern, direct, and limit the use of the professional’s power.

But laypeople in any given arena will not be able to assess fully either the competence or the moral performance of the professional to whom they entrust these basic and critical needs. In churches, laypeople do not usually know enough pastoral theology to judge whether the pastoral counselor gives sound spiritual advice, nor are they in a position to know whether the minister is scrupulous and careful in the performance of professional duties. In seeking medical care, patients are generally not able to evaluate independently the medical knowledge and clinical judgment of their doctor, nor to tell whether she or he has done diligent research to identify the best possible treatment plan. Similarly in law, the average client is unable to interpret either the language of legal documents or the significance of legal proceedings. In all these cases, those who turn to professionals for help are in a significant sense at the mercy of those whom they consult. Those seeking help must depend not only on the professionals’ knowledge and skills but also on the professionals’ diligence, compassion, and dedication to the good they are trained to serve. That is to say, they must depend on the character of these strangers who wield enormous power over them at times when they may be extremely vulnerable. For this reason the practice of the professions has historically been understood as an inherently moral undertaking. It is not merely a means of livelihood but a dedicated way of life. With this understanding come the five requisite characteristics that distinguish a profession from other forms of compensated work.

***Competence***

The first requirement of the professions is competence, which involves the specialized knowledge and skills that enable the professional to meet basic human needs—knowledge and skills that must be acquired and maintained at the highest level. The need for professional competence makes ongoing study a moral obligation, an expectation codified in continuing education requirements for maintaining professional licensing.

***Moral Commitment***

The second central requirement of the professions is moral commitment. The professional must embody a commitment to the good to be served, whether salvation, health, or justice. This is a matter of conviction and personal dedication as well as knowledge and skill. It is not enough to have the required abilities; the professional also must be the right kind of person and care about the right things. This commitment is expected to shape one’s whole being. A profession is not just a kind of work; it is a kind of life. Thus professional licenses can be forfeited for moral unfitness or misconduct even if it is unrelated to the individual’s work.

***Self-Monitoring***

Since only those possessed of the requisite knowledge can evaluate the competence of professionals and the performance of their work, the third requirement of the professions is self-monitoring. Professions must have standards of preparation and practice internal to their membership and must provide mechanisms for evaluating and holding one another accountable to those standards of knowledge, skill, and behavior. This requirement for self-monitoring is maintained in bodies of professional licensing and adjudication, such as boards of ministry, state medical boards, and state bar associations.

***Altruism***

The fourth central requirement of the professions is altruism. The commitment to the well-being of congregants, patients, or clients includes placing their interests above the self-interest of the professional. The form of life of a professional is expected to cost the practitioner something, to entail some degree of sacrifice on behalf of the good of those served. Doctors, for example, are not only expected to be available in emergencies at all hours of the day and night; they are also expected to care for patients even when these patients pose a risk of infection to the doctor. The willingness to make such sacrifices when they are called for is a core element of the moral commitment a professional undertakes. Correspondingly, it is the foundation of the high esteem in which devoted professionals are held by society.

***Fiduciary Responsibility***

We have said that professionals attend to essential human needs, that they possess vital knowledge not shared by others, and that their work involves the exercise of power in relation to people who may be especially vulnerable. We have noted the requirements of altruism and devotion to the well-being of others. Together, these features of their work entail that the power professionals wield must be rigorously directed to the interests of those they serve and not to the professionals’ own interests or needs. The obligations that arise from this duty include the scrupulous honoring of confidentiality and the active and intentional protection of the congregant, patient, or client from harm, whether by act or omission. For these reasons, the kind of power exercised by professionals is called “fiduciary power.” It is a term rooted in fides, the Latin word for “faith,” because it represents a power entrusted for the sake of the one served and not that of the one exercising power. Fiduciary power is not power over another person but power for him or her, exercised at the beneficiary’s behest, and on his or her behalf. Thus the final requirement of the professions is fiduciary responsibility, the commitment to use entrusted power appropriately.

***Ministry as a (Peculiar) Profession***

Thinking of ministry in light of the traditional requirements of professional ethics offers us several insights. Each of the distinctive marks of the professions has implications for how ministry is prepared for and practiced, and for what excellence in that practice requires. First, the nature of professions as grounded in special knowledge in service to human need creates an obligation for ministers to become and remain well informed and well equipped for their work. This means that theological education cannot be finished in seminary. Ministers must set aside time for reading and study, continuing education events, and consultation with others when particular expertise is needed for some aspect of their pastoral work. This is not a luxury but a duty to those they serve.

The idea that professional practice requires a personal commitment to the good to be served and a certain character on the part of the practitioner underscores that preparation for ministry can never be merely a matter of information and technique, a body of knowledge and skill that anyone might acquire and employ. Preparation for ministry rests equally on moral formation and spiritual development. Pastors must not only know the right things; they must love the right things and become the sort of people who can truly be shepherds to souls. Theological schools and their students must take the spiritual-formation aspects of pastoral preparation seriously. And since character is not only expressed in behavior but also continually molded by it, the work of formation must be recognized as ongoing, a path to which one is committed rather than a destination one reaches.

The necessity of professions maintaining internal standards of accountability means that those who judge the suitability of candidates for ministry and those who evaluate their readiness for service must be prepared to say no as well as yes. Likewise, the church boards and officers charged with monitoring professional performance—particularly those members who are themselves ministers—need to regard their work as bearing responsibility for the welfare of the whole church. To take this responsibility seriously demands the willingness to remove those who for whatever reason are incompetent in, or unfit for, ministry. It is not grace to look the other way—not for the community that is badly served nor even for the person who is thereby abetted in doing harm to the people of God. Jesus’s unflinching words about the fate of those who “put a stumbling block before one of these little ones who believe” in him come to mind (Matt. 18: 6; cf. Mark 9: 42; Luke 17: 2).

If altruism is the virtue central to all professional practice, for Christian ministers this virtue has a particular character and a personal name. The love of God made known in Jesus Christ is the touchstone of Christian existence. Accordingly, Jesus is the definitive model of self-giving love, something made explicit in the New Testament: “We know love by this,” says the writer of 1 John, “that he laid down his life for us—and we ought to lay down our lives for one another” (1 John 3: 16). While such an admonition is addressed to the whole church, it has a particular bearing on life in ministry: those who are called as pastors are to imitate the Good Shepherd, who “lays down his life for the sheep” (John 10: 12). Few pastors in the contemporary church may be called on for such literal self-sacrifice (although that depends greatly on where and whom they serve). But even in settings of relative safety, the steady work of being present for and attentive to the needs of others, of resisting the corrosive powers of disillusionment, discouragement, and simple fatigue, can be demanding and costly. For those who aim to sustain such a self-giving pattern for a lifetime, more than good rules of practice are needed. Ministers must be deeply formed in a love that imitates the love of God.

The concept of fiduciary responsibility has a particular resonance in the ethics of ministry. As with all professionals, pastors’ ability to help others depends on the trust of those they serve. Such trust includes the confidence that those who have greater knowledge will not use it to do harm, or for their own convenience, or carelessly—but will use it to help the vulnerable who must rely on them. But in the case of clergy, congregants’ trust in the pastor is often closely aligned with their trust in God, so that their trust has a religious quality. Though it may not be wise to identify ministers too closely with the God whom they serve, the fact remains that many people see their pastor as God’s representative. This is especially the case with people in trouble, who sometimes entrust themselves to a minister’s care without reservation. In view of Christian convictions about the pervasive and insidious quality of sin, all who wield such power should be wary of the inclinations to self-serving and self-deception that all humans share. To be invested with authority as a servant of God calls for the most careful self-scrutiny and for scrupulous attention to how, and to what ends, power is used.

Thus far I have focused on the ways in which ministry is like the other classical professions, so that its practice can be illuminated by the ethical requirements common to them all. This is true even though the work of religious professionals contains special elements that give the application of those requirements a particular inflection, as the above discussion indicates. But there are also important dissimilarities between pastoral practice and the work of other professionals, including differences in the particular character of the power that operates and its associations. These bring with them a distinctive set of challenges and risks.

The first of these dissimilarities has already been alluded to. Only in ministry is there the dimension of sacral authority, a power viewed by the community as grounded in transcendent claims and ultimate commitments. For the religiously serious, the stakes can be extremely high. Therefore, ministers are never simply individuals. They are understood to represent a religious tradition and to speak out of an authority much older and broader than their personal insights or opinions. In many cases, they are taken more or less to speak for the whole church or even for God. Many people grant their judgments and advice a (sometimes unreasonably) high degree of deference, which helps to explain how those who intentionally abuse religious authority are sometimes able to get away with it for so long without being called to account.[[3]](#footnote-4)

Allied with the formal, institutionally conferred power of the pastoral office and the authority based on their knowledge of the tradition they represent, ministers are invested with symbolic power. They are visible signs of faith and piety, presumed to be especially close to God, and taken as models of faithful discipleship. Often ministers have ascribed to them virtues and traits they do not actually possess—or at least do not possess in the measure attributed. They are taken to be wise and holy people because that is what their work suggests. It is common for young children to confuse the pastor whom they see with God whom they do not, imagining (for instance) that God must be tall and have red hair because that is what Father Flynn looks like. Such simple associations might cause adults to smile, but even adults who surely know better sometimes harbor a similar confusion. The judgment of the minister is taken without reservation to indicate divine judgment, and the minister’s approval or disapproval is equated with the approval or disapproval of God. Such associations are most likely to occur among those who are most vulnerable, people under duress or in pain who feel the greatest need for a tangible support system. This overidentification between the pastor and God is an element frequently found in the most egregious cases of pastoral abuse.

Finally, ministers often bear what might be called projected power, the psychological identification of the pastor with whatever figure of authority and trust a particular parishioner is inclined to turn to for guidance: a parent, a teacher or mentor, or even another pastor from an earlier and more dependent period in the congregant’s life. Such projections are particularly easy to apply to ministers for those who encounter them chiefly in their most public roles, as leaders in worship. In public worship settings, the individuality of the pastor may be obscured to some extent by the robes of the office and the structured elements of the liturgy. Depending on the character of the projected relationship for which the minister is a “screen,” projection can greatly increase the power the minister wields over the parishioner and can bring an inappropriate set of expectations to bear on the pastor’s role.

All these forms of pastoral power are informal, not officially assigned by any institution. They are also not automatic and uniform, but depend on a number of variables in both pastor and parishioner. Rather than being strictly rational and intentional in their operation, such forms of power may be at work subliminally, not fully recognized or even conscious. This makes them harder to analyse and thus harder to govern. Together they constitute an added layer of responsibility and risk in the exercise of the minister’s office. Ministers need to be aware of, and careful about, the effect of such dynamics in their relationships with those they serve.”

**Questions for discussion**

1. Wheeler identifies 5 characteristics that distinguish a “profession”: Competence, moral commitment, self-monitoring, altruism, and fiduciary responsibility. Do you think these adequately capture the professionalism of ministry? What might be missing?
2. In the extract, power and the use of power is described as a necessary good, but also potentially risky, tainted or dangerous. How do you view the relationship between power, ethical behaviour and the boundaries of ministry practice as set out in the (various) Codes of Ethics in place in the Church?

**Scenarios**

**Scenario 1: Changes and additions to team ministries**

How much should a Minister or Ministry Agent be involved with writing a position profile for another member of the team in which they minister?

How does this differ if the proposed new team member is another Ministry Agent or Minister (rather than, for example, an administration position, musician or another professional)?

How might this situation be different for:

Chaplaincy and other non-Congregational ministries?

Retired ministers?

Lay preachers?

Ministers or Ministry Agents in Supply and Interim roles?

When profiles are being finalised by a Church Council or Presbytery Standing Committee (or other body finalising a profile), should current Ministry Team members, having been consulted, absent themselves from the discussions to allow the body finalizing the profile to properly own the positions?

Discuss

**Scenario 2: Minister’s Leave usage**

Where (if anywhere) should ministers report their use leave entitlements?

The body responsible for the payment of stipend and allowances to a Minister (frequently a Church Council) has a responsibility to manage the minister’s leave, at least for managing annual budgets and arranging cover for services etc during a minister’s absence.

In what context or contexts should a Minister’s use of leave entitlements be discussed?

If a Church Council is concerned about whether a Minister has been keeping up with their annual leave and study leave entitlements and wants to discuss their concerns in a private sitting, with the Minister requested to leave the room for that discussion because of the conflict of interest issues. How should the minister respond?

Discuss

**Case Studies**

**Case Study 1**

Jess is a minister in Chapel Hill Congregation.  Jess has thought carefully about their personal and theological thinking on a range of issues related to sexuality.  They would, in the right circumstances, be happy to conduct weddings of same-sex couples, and would like Chapel Hill to consider expressing a clear stance of being open and affirming of LGBTIQA+ people within the congregation’s life.

The views in the Congregation and its CC are mixed.  It is probably true that majority agrees with Jess, but there are a couple of very strong voices who are clearly opposed to being open and affirming, whenever this is discussion. The CC has discussed this and decided that, given the strong and divided views within the Congregation, it is not yet time to fully discuss this and not the time to express a clear stance.

Jess is also aware of the Assembly’s discussion and resolutions on SOGICE (sexual orientation and gender identity change efforts) and aware of harm that “conversion” practices have caused to the mental health and wellbeing of people in the LGBTIQA+ community.

One day after church Craig makes a time for a Jess to make a pastoral visit.  It emerges that Craig’s son has recently come out as gay to Craig and the family.  Craig is horrified and wants the Minister to find resources to “fix” his son.  Craig mentions the possibilities of prayer services, to “pray the Gay away” and has heard of gay conversion programs.  Craig is seeking to enlist Jess’s help to find and access these resources.

Craig’s son is not present for this conversation, and the rest of the family is silent and doesn’t enter the conversation at this point.

1. What are the ethical challenges for Jess in this situation?  (it may be useful to refer to section 3.5 of the Code of Ethics as quoted above, and also 3.2(a), 3.3(f) and 6)
2. Who else might be involved in this situation, or might be consulted by Jess?
3. What are some acceptable ways forward for Jess in this situation?

**Case Study 2**

On Monday, Rev Jae-sung Cho was in the church office preparing for the afternoon's confirmation classes when Evelyn Miller, an older congregation member, arrived unexpectedly. It was clear that she was troubled about something. Evelyn, a grandmotherly figure with no formal leadership role in the congregation, is well-loved by the teens, who often sought her out at Morning Tea because she was always interested in their lives.

Evelyn shared that a 15-year-old girl named Lily had approached her at church the previous day, asking to chat privately. At first, Evelyn thought Lily was talking about a boy her own age. However, it soon became clear that the boy in question was a 24-year-old private piano tutor who had explicitly sexualized their relationship. Though Evelyn didn't have the exact words, it was evident from the story that the piano tutor had been grooming Lily and her parents for quite some time.

Towards the end of the conversation Lily asked Evelyn to keep their conversation secret. In her own panic, Evelyn had said, "Of course I will," a statement she deeply regretted as she knew she had to break her word.

Lily was one of the students in the confirmation class that afternoon, coming directly from school. One of her parents always picked her up following the class. Rev Cho knows he must report the abuse allegations to the authorities and manage the situation in the congregation.

1. With this matter raised by Evelyn, Rev Cho no longer has time to adequately prepare for the Confirmation Class, how might Rev Cho resolve this? What might Rev Cho do that afternoon?
2. How might Rev Cho and Evelyn care for Lily, given the promise of secrecy and the requirement to report?
3. Later Lily puts together that the report came from Rev Cho via Evelyn. At the next confirmation class Lily, with three other teens present demands to know why Rev Cho told people, doesn’t he care about privacy? How should Rev Cho respond?
4. What difference would it make if the piano tutor was also a musician at the church?   What further pastoral response might be needed here?

**Case Study 3**

Patricia is a minister, active in her own ministry and within the Presbytery particularly as a member of the Presbytery’s PRC. Patricia has adult children, one of whom (Annie) is active as a leader and member of the Church Council in a Congregation within the same Presbytery as Patricia, but one that is unrelated to Patricia’s own ministry setting.

Unfortunately for Annie, there is a situation of ongoing conflict in her congregation.  Patricia is concerned for Annie, and makes time for the two of them to talk about the situation, about Annie’s concerns and frustrations, to talk about what she might do and how she might respond.  Patricia is trying to be supportive of Annie but is being careful not to interfere in Annie’s Congregation.

After several months of conflictual Church Council and Congregational meetings, the minister / ministry agent at the Congregation meets with the Chair of the Presbytery’s PRC, raising particular concerns about one individual in particular within the Church Council, whom the minister sees as the cause of most of the difficulties.  The PRC chairperson raises the matter with the PRC itself.

1. Is there a conflict of interest for Patricia? If so, how might this be managed?
2. Does Patricia have to declare Annie’s involvement in the congregation and their relationship? It is not known around the Presbytery that they are related, and Patricia and Annie have different surnames.
3. In the discussion where Patricia was present, it becomes clear that the minister is reflecting the same concerns that Annie holds, and that Annie and the minister agree about the difficulties being caused by one particular individual on the CC.
4. Is this something that Patricia should share with the PRC?  Does this make any difference in the Conflict of Interest situation?

**Case Study 4**

Minister Douglas is in a part-time placement, as this is all that can be afforded in the ministry setting.  Douglas finds that the pro-rata stipend that he is paid is not adequate to meet his needs. As part of his continuing education and broadening of his practice of ministry, however, Douglas recently gained qualifications and accreditation as a counsellor, and is trying to set up in private practice as a counsellor to fill the income gap.

1. What are the possible conflicts of interest in this situation?  (map these out as a group)
2. How might these conflicts be managed? (the group could develop a management plan)
3. Who should be consulted as these arrangements are made?
4. What are the implications when Douglas finishes his current placement and moves to another placement?  Does the cutting of pastoral ties change the possibility for congregation members seeking counselling from Douglas?  How?
5. Does it make a difference if Douglas’ new placement is full-time, or another part-time placement?

**Case Study 5**

Simon is a Minister / Ministry Agent.  They are the minister in a Congregation.  Happily married, Simon and his partner consider themselves partners in ministry as well as partners in their marriage.

Simon’s partner is keen to lead the new outreach ministry that Simon has been developing with the Church Council and has written to the Church Council expressing their interest in taking a leadership role in this initiative.

1. How should Simon respond? What responsibility does the Church Council have? Should Simon be present for Church Council discussions?

When the Church Council informs the Presbytery of the start of the Outreach Initiative, the Presbytery’s Standing Committee asks the Church Council how they are managing the potential for Conflict of Interest in this situation.

1. What Cultural and/or other biases might be involved in this situation?

**Case Study 6**

Rev Sio Atu attended a same gender wedding ceremony of a friend Dave Loti in a Congregation that both the Minister in Placement, Rev Jo Moon, and the Congregation/Church Council have approved to hold same gender wedding in their Church. Rev Sio Atu does not accept same gender marriage, and he was uncomfortable with the liturgy and the whole wedding service. Nevertheless, he attended to support his friend even though Dave Loti was marrying a person of the same gender.

At the wedding reception which Rev Sio Atu attended, the celebrant Rev Jo Moon was there. Rev Sio Atu started a conversation with Rev Jo Moon which ended up in an argument that got loud. The argument was about Rev Sio Atu criticizing Rev Jo Moon about theology and the liturgy. Dave Loti asked Rev Sio Atu to leave, and he did.

1. What are the issues here and are there any breach of the Code of Ethics?
2. What advice would you give to both ministers, Rev Sio Atu and Rev Jo Moon?
3. Are there any intercultural learning here?

**Case Study 7**

Voluntary Assisted Dying

Jill is a well-established Pastoral Practitioner at the Uniting Gum Trees residential aged care centre. Betty, a Gum Trees resident well known to Jill, has recently been speaking with her doctor following a difficult health diagnosis with a poor prognosis, with a high level of suffering in the coming few months before her anticipated death. The doctor and Betty also spoke about the possibility of the Voluntary Assisted Dying (VAD) pathway and some documentation was provided to Betty should she wish to follow up this process.  When Betty next sees Jill she is distressed and mentions her health and the VAD conversation with the doctor and asked if Jill would be willing to have a separate conversation with Betty in the coming days to discuss the information and the VAD scenario.

Jill has been aware of the legislation changes making VAD legal and Uniting Church and Agencies’ support of the resident’s right to make their own decision about VAD. However, Jill has her own moral / ethical conflict about this pathway and wonders if she can be part of this conversation with Betty. The Chaplain Jill reports to is away on leave, there are multiple competing priorities for Jill and quite frankly Jill is uncertain if she is ready and able to have the VAD conversation with Betty.  Besides Betty, Jill is aware that staff at Uniting Gum Tree haven’t yet had a VAD situation, and many come from cultural and faith traditions that haven’t formed a position about the VAD legislation or aren’t supportive of VAD, so she anticipates - if Betty is eligible and completes VAD - that this will have a big impact on multiple staff.

Questions:

1. How does the Code of Ethics guide Jill in her pastoral role with Betty?
2. How might Jill respond to Betty? What are Jill’s options?
3. To whom might Jill discuss the ethical dilemmas involved?

**Case Study 8**

At a gathering of CALD ministers within the Uniting Church of Australia, an important discussion arose about the blurred boundaries between part-time and full-time ministry. Two ministers—one working on a 0.8-time arrangement and another on a 0.5-time arrangement—raised questions about role expectations and reasonable weekly work hours.

The discussion began when the minister on the 0.8 arrangement shared his struggle: "Even though I'm officially part-time, I often feel like I'm doing the work of a full-time minister. How is a part-time ministry supposed to be defined?" This resonated strongly with the group.

The minister on the 0.5 arrangement followed with a practical question: "If I'm half-time, does that mean I should work about 20 hours per week? And if so, how do we account for the unpredictable nature of ministry?"

Ministry, by its nature, defies regular hours. Pastoral care emergencies, sermon preparation, church council meetings, and community outreach frequently extend beyond designated times. This reality makes it difficult to establish clear boundaries between part-time and full-time placements.

Through their discussion, the ministers gained confidence in advocating for themselves and setting healthier boundaries. They recognised that part-time ministry isn't about doing less—it's about prioritising what's most important within the available time, while maintaining realistic expectations that support both ministerial well-being and effective service.

Questions:

1. What do you think are reasonable weekly work hours
   1. For full-time placements?
   2. For part-time placements?
2. How do you work to maintain healthy work levels and work/life balance in your situation?

**Paired Sharing**

The facilitator of the training will make a decision about the paired sharing process. This may take place at this point, or individually after the formal end of the session, particularly if the training is taking place in an online setting, or with a small group where paired sharing may be difficult to manage. The guidelines for paired sharing are towards the beginning of this document.

**Close of Session**

Thank you for your participation in these discussions. If any issues have been raised for you, ensure you talk with your supervisor about them.

1. Two seminal works on this topic are Gustavo Gutierrez, *A theology of liberation: History, Politics, and Salvation*, rev.ed.(Maryknoll, NY: Orbis, 1988); and James H Cone, *God of the Oppressed*, rev.ed. (Maryknoll, NY: Orbis, 1997) [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
2. The following discussion is indebted to the account offered in Ruchard M Gula, *Ethics in Pastoral Ministry* (New York: Paulist Press, 1996), 51 – 64. [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
3. See, e.g. Diana R Garland and Christen Argueta, “How Clergy Sexual Misconduct Happens: A Qualitative study of First-Hand Accounts,” *Social Work and Christianity* 37 (2010): 1-27 [↑](#footnote-ref-4)