
ENHANCED PARTNERSHIP MODEL

ATLANTIC REGION

February 9th, 2009

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PARTICIPANTS.....3

WELCOME AND OPENING REMARKS.....4

REMARKS – THÉRÈSE LEBLANC, DEPUTY COMMISSIONER (ATLANTIC).....4

CORE ISSUES AND EXPECTATIONS FOR PARTICIPANTS5

GROUP DIALOGUE – PRINCIPLES OF PARTNERSHIP5

GROUP DIALOGUE PRESENTATIONS.....6

DISCERNMENT OF ATLANTIC REPS.....10

CLOSING REMARKS AND ADJOURNEMENT10

ENHANCED PARTNERSHIP MODEL – (ATLANTIC)

PARTICIPANTS

FACILITATOR: David Hale

CORRECTIONAL SERVICE OF CANADA

Ms. Thérèse LeBlanc	Deputy Commissioner, Atlantic Region
Mr. Mike McLeod	Director of Interventions, Atlantic Region
Mr. Yannick Lang	Chief Procurement, Atlantic Region
Rev. Rick Burk	Acting Director General, Chaplaincy, NHQ
Dr. Rev. Dwight Cuff	Regional Chaplain, Pacific
Fr. Michel Beauchamp	Regional Chaplain, Quebec
Rev. Hugh Kirkegaard	Regional Chaplain, Atlantic
Ms. Michelle Landry	Sr. Project Officer, Chaplaincy, NHQ

CHAPLAINS

Rev. Lloyd Bruce	Springhill Institution (United Church of Canada)
Rev. Pauline Coffin	Nova Institution (Convention of Atlantic Baptist Churches)
Rev. Phil Ferris	Westmorland Institution (Convention of Atlantic Baptist Churches)
Rev. Greg Frazer	Dorchester Penitentiary & Shepody HC (Anglican Diocese of Fredericton)
Rev. Gordon Green	Atlantic Institution (Apostolic Church of Pentecost)
Mr. Craig Murphy	Dorchester Penitentiary & Shepody HC (Diocèse de Moncton)
Ms. Peg Noseworthy	Springhill Institution (Archdiocese of Halifax)

CONTRACTORS

Deacon Bob Britton	Archdiocese of Halifax
Rev. Terry Doiron	Faith Christian Fellowship Canada, Moncton, NB
The Ven. Geoffrey Hall	Anglican Diocese of Fredericton
Mr. Peter Hoar	Executive Director, Christian Council for Reconciliation
Rev. Daryl MacKenzie	Convention of Atlantic Baptist Churches, St. John, NB
Rev. Wes Mills	Apostolic Church of Pentecost, Calgary, AB
Arch. Andre Richard	Diocèse de Moncton, Dieppe NB
Canon Fred Scott	Anglican Diocese of Fredericton

INTERFAITH COMMITTEE ON CHAPLAINCY

Ms. Monique Marchand	Canadian Conference of Catholic Bishops, ON
Mrs. Sandy Duguay	Executive Secretary, Interfaith Committee on Chaplaincy

MINUTES – EPM (Atlantic)

February 9th, 2010

WELCOME AND OPENING REMARKS

The meeting began with music from Josh Groban and a reading from the book of 1Kings, chapter 19. David Hale encouraged the group to begin the day with hope, gratitude, and a listening ear as they set out to work on the EPM.

Hugh Kirkegaard welcomed everyone and began with a brief history leading up to today. Contracting began in 1981 when the system was struggling to understand whether chaplaincy should still be a part of what CSC did -the compromise was the contracting model. The previous pattern, however, did not adequately bring all the stakeholders to the table. We now have opportunity to dialogue on how to proceed in order to better situate ourselves in the future.

REMARKS – THÉRÈSE LEBLANC, DEPUTY COMMISSIONER (ATLANTIC)

The DC began by sharing her connection with ministry through family members. She went on to say that chaplains in CSC have played an integral part of the Service's work from the beginning and have provided a creative process that is otherwise lacking in the work that CSC does. Chaplains have provided spiritual help and support for both inmates and the staff who are tasked with one of the most difficult jobs—that of changing human behaviour. The community and society expect us to change offenders into law-abiding citizens. What staff see is not easy to understand—the violence. How chaplains impact the offenders and staff, having that “listening ear” is invaluable.

Ms. LeBlanc lauded Pierre Allard and Charles Taylor whose passion brought about a model for chaplaincy and developed significant models for Community Chaplaincy and volunteer involvement. This has resulted in more than simply a “church service” within the institutions. Restorative Justice also goes beyond what CSC could have imagined when first entering into contracting. No one had anticipated how this ministry would grow and how it would champion victims of crime, Circles of Support and Accountability, the families of offenders, and provide structure around the most violent to enable them to return to the community.

Deputy Commissioner LeBlanc recognizes the frustration across the country over the present model and how past attempts to improve the situation have not succeeded to alleviate the concerns. This is the challenge: to think of how an old model can become new again. CSC remains committed to the work of chaplaincy and to the model despite the ups and downs and are encouraged by the process that is being undertaken in order to have a conversation around new ideas and innovations. Flexibility is certainly seen as a possibility. An enhanced partnership reinforcing the relationship between all stakeholders is very encouraging. The hope is that this process will strengthen Chaplaincy to assist the CSC with the many challenges that are being faced with an increasingly diverse population, more violent offenders, the specialized needs of aboriginal persons and women in our care as well as the complex needs of mental health concerns. Ms. LeBlanc was present for the early morning session.

To be successful in changing the lives of offenders, we need strong chaplains, committed partners, and engaged communities, so that we can make a difference in the lives of offenders and create safer communities.

Ms. LeBlanc concluded with a word of thanks and expressed her gratitude for the commitment that Chaplaincy has demonstrated towards the correctional service and for those present representing all the partners in this process.

CORE ISSUES AND EXPECTATIONS FOR PARTICIPANTS

All received an index card and were asked to write on one side "My hope for the day is..." (complete the sentence) and on other side, "One core issue for which I want an answer is..." (complete the sentence). Answers were shared with the group.

GROUP DIALOGUE – PRINCIPLES OF PARTNERSHIP

Participants were separated into three groups and each was asked to spend time discussing one of the three principles highlighted in the document that was sent out prior to the meeting. Several questions were provided to stimulate and open up the conversation. Participants were given 1.5 hours for discussion.

'MOVING FORWARD TOGETHER, PRINCIPLES OF PARTNERSHIP' included three core principles and several sub-issues.

1. That chaplains within CSC are offering ministry in answer to a personal call, mandated, supported and under the authority of their faith communities.
 - a. Pastoral Identity
 - b. Professional Issues
 - c. Workplace Issues
2. That the faith communities, the Interfaith Committee (IFC), CSC and the chaplains themselves all share rights and responsibilities in the provision of chaplaincy services.
 - a. Service Provision - Rights and Responsibilities
 - b. Professional Issues
 - c. Workplace Issues
3. That, among the partners, there is mutual accountability to be clarified according to their unique roles.
 - a. Professional Identity
 - b. Professional Issues
 - c. Workplace Issues

GROUP DIALOGUE PRESENTATIONS

Presenters from each group highlighted both the positive aspects and the challenges of the present contractual situation.

PRINCIPLE 3 – Positive Aspects

- Named the partners, mutual accountability to be clarified among their unique roles with a focus on communication and ongoing relationship between contractors and chaplains.
- Certain clarities from CSC perspective when it comes to training, training must be done on the outside not CSC.
- Important to have a pastoral plan available for contractors
- Letter of best practice for IFC from faith communities (denomination, in good standing, professional development - companion document to the contract,
- Issues that can't be in the contract: expectations of the contractors, what do you expect of the contractor, this document written by specific faith communities
- It would help for contractors to know what is expected from them, i.e. more clarity on issues such as professional development
- Inconsistencies, expectations, how one addresses those kind of things,
- Ministry comes first, contracting second - sense of call as well as the contractor taking ownership of that call.
- Mutuality in relationship
- Salary benefits all coming out of that mutual sense of call and relationship.
- Most significant - first time group sat down to dialogue, sense we need to continue this type of dialogue
- Contractors: their responsibility to the chaplain, e.g. spiritual care, training , and support, disconnect presently
- Day to day work of chaplains and CSC - contractors need education
- Conversation between contractor and chaplain for spiritual care/training

PRINCIPLE 3 – Challenges

- Lack of contact with IFC - would like one representative each from catholic and protestant denominations. Need to find a representative for Atlantic (Hugh and IFC looking into this.)
- Chaplains need more connection with the IFC and contractors. (Monique Marchand, IFC, explained the composition of the IFC.)
- Because of the role of comptroller in the contracting process, spiritual oversight often gets lost in the shuffle.
- Significant necessity for having a connection with all four groups.

PRINCIPLE 2 – Positive aspects

- Denominational benefits package, continuity of contracting
- Mandated ministry, a call from God to both chaplain and the Faith Community
- Autonomy within partnership, flexible hours, flexibility to minister
- Room to negotiate on behalf of chaplains' self interest
- No increases to the fees this year. Give opportunity for Faith Communities to up the fees.
- Ability to stay within their own conscience and Faith Community's beliefs
- Freedom to not be an employee, not under control of CSC, e.g. neutrality in labour disputes

PRINCIPLE 2 – Challenges

- Role confusion – lack of clarity in terms of roles, e.g. who do chaplains report to or communicate with? their faith communities? the Regional chaplain? E.g. desire to retire, leave chaplaincy, etc.
- Frustration with the Reporting Tool, it is the opposite of what ministry/chaplains normally do: “tell the story”. Analysis of the report is quantitative which is very limiting when considering “pastoral presence”.
- Lack of clarity re: the relationship between chaplain and AWI (Assistant Warden, Interventions)
- Variations between denominations and regions, can become chaotic
- Amount of work, busyness
- Confidentiality
- Liability
- Tendering Process – Although the contract is with the Faith Community, the system now requires a re-tendering process when a chaplain leaves his position. Look at the possibility and advantage, perhaps, of continuing the contract with someone duly screened and who meets the criteria.
- When rights and responsibilities clash, at present under the contract model, no one would be forced to fulfill any task or duty CSC would impose.
- The new emphasis on “spirituality” or “spiritual care person” rather than religion. Can Roman Catholic and Protestant denominations be sustainable in this new era when emphasis is becoming more and more multi-faith? A “spiritual care person” does not need to be ordained, anyone could claim that title. Chaplaincy has consistently resisted this notion, and has rather engaged the multi-faith community to work along-side of RC and Protestant chaplains. The strength in chaplaincy comes in being a formation that is recognized by a legitimate organization. Strength of chaplaincy is in the Faith Community independent of institution or institutional church. This is how chaplaincy can speak with authority and credibility.
- Reality of job security as it now stands
- A need to approach the changes being discussed carefully.

PRINCIPLE 1 – Positive aspects

- That all 4 groups exist and have the willingness to be present, to get dirty, to get involved
- Connections already established with volunteers and faith groups, this can be offered within CSC chaplaincy, we rely on the parishioners
- Because of the hierarchal structure within several faith groups, some relationship is guaranteed between the contractor and chaplain

PRINCIPLE 1 – Challenges

- In the Atlantic Region there is an insufficient critical mass at a Diocesan or an administrative level to take care of all the needs, volunteers, contracting, etc., if contractors are to support chaplaincy
- A need for more gathering of chaplains or Regional Chaplains Meetings
- Challenge of creating awareness within our own Faith Community, to recruit volunteers and make the Faith Community aware of prison ministry. Needs to be support from church leadership to create a heart and interest for this ministry and to care for chaplains and inmates.
- Difficulty for lay Catholic chaplains to move to other dioceses and to receive a mandate to do ministry
- Present difficulty in recruiting qualified candidates for chaplaincy positions
- Concern as to whether or not the CSC will continue to provide funds for chaplaincy.
- Lack of job security
- Some chaplains have a sense of feeling alone in their work; how do we make the partnership real?
- Disparity in the way contractors manage fees, benefits, sick leave, etc.
- Complexity of “accountability”
- Need for partnership on all levels to be genuine and dynamic, not just in word
- Need for more regular consultation, presently too infrequent, remains a need to dialogue in order to discover “best practices”

Discussion followed. The question was asked what a flow chart of the partnership would look like. Rick Burk answered that a flow chart was inadequate to describe the unique relationships presented in the quadrangle. A picture was more appropriate. At the heart of any image is the ministry surrounded and supported by the government of Canada, the Correctional Service of Canada, the Interfaith Committee on Chaplaincy, the contractors/faith communities, and the chaplains. The working relationship between these groups is in some more defined than others.

Historically, those partners having the most visibility were the CSC and the chaplains. Chaplaincy has not been good at inviting faith communities in on the process. We have not achieved a balanced relationship that will make for an effective ministry as yet but the vision for the future certainly includes

this balance. Partnership does not necessarily imply equal partnership but if any one part is missing, the ministry suffers.



Monique Marchand (IFC) clarified that the role of the IFC is that of an advisory committee to the CSC through the office of the Director General, Chaplaincy. Their function is not to advise anyone else or to stand in as advocate for individual chaplains but to bring forward concerns that any particular faith community might have at the Executive Level.

There was an expression of concern that followed asking the question “who is there, then, for the chaplain?” Although, when conflict arose, the chaplain would in effect address him/herself to his own Faith Community, sometimes the conflict is with the Faith Community and leaves the chaplain to navigate the problem alone.

Hugh Kirkegaard remarked that in the past we have relied heavily on the government to give chaplaincy its identity. This has caused feelings of loneliness. It is time that we claim our identity as professionals and as a professional group. This in turn will give us integrity, legitimacy and a place to stand. CSC is looking for chaplains to bring to the table what it is they need in order to deal with the differing dynamics in a difficult environment.

David Hale added that in seeking to enhance this partnership there needs to be a mutuality and an equality that makes sense, to know where you fit in, and for the commitment in this process to be focussed around the care of offenders. It is the ministry and the purpose of ministry that brings all partners together and gives all involved a sense of having a stake in it.

More discussion highlighted the need to define partnership, stakes, roles, and responsibilities. A weight of responsibility needs to be established, i.e. who is responsible for cell phones, government vehicles, travel, Professional Development, and access to spend inmate money for chapel expenditures?

These regional consultations are moving toward a “working” team made up of chosen participants from each group. It was agreed that the next steps must be taken and that concrete policy be the result.

DISCERNMENT OF ATLANTIC REPS

After the afternoon break, contractors and chaplains were asked to meet together in their respective groups and choose someone to represent them on a working think tank/advisory group. Eight of twelve of the selected candidates will be chosen as part of a national commission.

The groups came back with the following names:

Contractor Rep: Deacon Bob Britton
Chaplain Rep: Rev. Lloyd Bruce

CLOSING REMARKS AND ADJOURNEMENT

Rev. Kirkegaard closed the meeting with thanks to all who had travelled to be part of this historical moment where participants could look forward to moving on together. It was Hugh’s hope that there would be more of these types of meetings on a more regular basis.

Evaluations forms were handed out.