

---

# ENHANCED PARTNERSHIP MODEL

---

PACIFIC REGION

---

January 28th, 2010

---

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

*EPM PARTICIPANTS*..... 3

*WELCOME AND OPENING REMARKS – Dwight Cuff* ..... 4

*MEETING AND OBJECTIVES – Bill Rasmus* ..... 4

*HISTORY OF CHAPLAINCY AND CONTRACTING – Bill Rasmus*..... 4

*QUESTIONS TO BE EXPLORED BY THE CONTRACTORS* ..... 5

*PLENARY DISCUSSION – QUESTION 1: Partnership* ..... 6

*PLENARY DISCUSSION – QUESTION 2: What is working well?*..... 7

*CONTRACT DISCUSSION* ..... 8

*PLENARY DISCUSSION – QUESTION 3: Needs and Challenges* ..... 8

*DISCUSSION GROUPS*..... 10

*CSC GROUP*.....10

*INTERFAITH COMMITTEE ON CHAPLAINCY* .....11

*CONTRACTORS*.....12

*CHAPLAINS*.....13

*CONCLUSION* ..... 14

*ADDENDUM 1*..... 15

## **EPM PARTICIPANTS**

### **FACILITATOR:**

**Rev. Bill Rasmus**, BC Corrections, Interfaith Committee on Chaplaincy (President)

### **CORRECTIONAL SERVICE OF CANADA**

Ms. Jayne Aster	Administrative Assistant to the Regional Chaplain, Pacific
Rev. Rick Burk	A/DG Chaplaincy, Restorative Justice
Rev. Cuff	Regional Chaplain, Pacific
Ms. Michelle Hawco	Director of Interventions, Pacific
Rev. Hugh Kirkegaard	Regional Chaplain, Atlantic

### **CHAPLAINS**

Fr. Dennis Alexander	Kent Institution
Rev. Pascal Bergeron	Vancouver Community Chaplaincy
Rev. Larry Duguay	William Head Institution
Rev. Angus Haggerty	Mountain Institution
Rev. Don Ibsen	Matsqui Institution
Rev. Wendy Murchy	Fraser Valley Institution for Women
Fr. Joe Ostopowich	PI/RTC
Pam Pederson	Kent Institution
Rev/ Tom Rathjen	Mission/Ferndale
Rev. Leon Remus	Matsqui Institution
Kevin Sawyer	Mountain Institution
Rev. Helen Tervo	PI/RTC
Fr. Mako Watanabe	Mission/Ferndale

### **CONTRACTORS**

Ron Davis	Pentecostal Assemblies of Canada
Rev. David Hearn	Christian & Missionary Alliance
Marilyn Heibert	BC Conference of Mennonite Brethren
David Holten	Canadian Baptists, Western Canada, Calgary
Rob Ogilvie	Canadian Baptists, Area Minister
Bishop Preibisch	Evangelical Lutheran
Rev. Stephen Rowe	Anglican Church of Canada

### **INTERFAITH COMMITTEE ON CHAPLAINCY REPRESENTATIVES**

Ms. Sandra Duguay	IFC Executive Secretary
Rev. Earl Wood	Church of the Nazarene

## **MINUTES – EPM (Pacific)**

January 28<sup>th</sup>, 2010

### **WELCOME AND OPENING REMARKS – Dwight Cuff**

Regional Chaplain, (Pacific) Dwight Cuff welcomed all those gathered. A few introductory remarks were made and participants were asked to introduce themselves briefly.

It was announced that there had just been word from NHQ that as of January 29<sup>th</sup>, 2010, Rick Burk would be moved into the Acting position of Director General, Chaplaincy and Restorative Justice for a period of four months. He will be replacing the recently retired DG, Terry Richardson, until a new DG is appointed following the competition process.

### **MEETING AND OBJECTIVES – Bill Rasmus**

Bill was introduced and began by sharing a little about himself. He then stated that the purpose of this and the other meetings to follow over the course of the next 1 ½ yrs was to find the best way possible to make this process work and to ensure that it was meaningful for all involved.

Bill went on to say that previous meetings around the contracting model were tightly controlled, but these were intended to give everyone full voice and the opportunity to share from the heart. Although no one is sure what the EPM looks like now, the hope and intent of these meetings and discussions is to come up with a national strategy to address the issues that have been brought up by all participants in this process. It is also important to have something in place that can be concretely measured as we are fast approaching the 2011 signing of a new Memorandum of Understanding. Our goal, ultimately, is to enhance the ministry of chaplaincy.

#### **Five objectives were put forward:**

1. Define unique mandates of all parties
2. Identify common/conflicting interests
3. Come up with a set of common principles
4. Address processes (evaluate, etc.)
5. Enhance the ministry.

### **HISTORY OF CHAPLAINCY AND CONTRACTING – Bill Rasmus**

Chaplaincy and the Correctional Service of Canada have been at the inception of caring for the special needs of both inmates and staff. Initially, chaplains were employees of the service but the change-over to contracting was made in 1978. There has been a great deal of unhappiness on the part of chaplains since Canada Revenue's concerns had been addressed and resolved to their satisfaction in the form of

contracting. Although the change predates the Gomery Inquiry, issues were certainly exasperated by it. The Treasury Board began looking more closely at the contract model.

It was understood that chaplains were not be disadvantaged by the contract model. However, over time, and most recently, employees and contractors have become more and more defined, resulting in chaplains now beginning to feel the disadvantages of their status.

Significant issues have arisen that highlight the great divide between employees of CSC and contractors. For instance, in one institution a chaplain is called in day or night to organize a CISM (critical incident debriefing) when serious or violent incidents take place, be it staff or inmate, but is refused the self-care needed in their experience of the trauma because of their status as “contractors. Similar situations exist when chaplains are called to court to testify—they do not have access to a lawyer through CSC as an employee would. These and other issues have created disadvantages to the chaplain.

There has been a great deal of unhappiness over the present status and situation of the chaplains, therefore, national consultations were held last year. However, no consensus was arrived at and no clear mandate was derived.

The Director General at the time, Terry Richardson, approached EXCOMM with the matter and discussion was had. EXCOMM made it clear that they would not entertain the employee route, would not add resources to solve the liability insurance issue, but would support an “enhanced partnership model”. This brings us to where we are today and why we are engaging all partners in an attempt to come up with an enhanced model of chaplaincy that will address the concerns of the chaplain.

## **QUESTIONS TO BE EXPLORED BY THE CONTRACTORS**

Answers to the three following questions were explored in an open discussion.

1. Why are you engaged in prison ministry?
  - Name three important elements of your prison ministry?
  - How do you engage other partners in your prison ministry?
2. How are you engaged in prison ministry and with whom?
  - What has been your unique contribution to this partnership?
  - From your point of view, how is the partnership working?
  - What are your responsibilities in this partnership?
  - What concrete proposals/ideas can you contribute to this partnership with respect to the challenges of the future?
3. What could contribute to the enhancement of your prison ministry?
  - What are the challenges you have experienced in your prison ministry?
  - How do you engage other partners in contributing to the experience of prison ministry?

A fourth question was directed to all participants in the quadrangle, i.e. CSC, Contractors, Chaplains, and the IFC.

4. How do you envision your contribution to the future of prison ministry?
  - Can you offer a concrete idea that would strengthen the partnership?

Discussion of these questions was fluid and interlaced. Opportunity was given to all participants to answer the questions and express opinions. (See Addendum 1 for “key word answers” to the above questions.)

“**Partnership**” was asked to be defined. It was suggested that partners came from a variety of sources, viz., volunteers from the community, links with other agencies including inmate and community programs, contractors, the faith communities, chaplains, CSC, the Interfaith Committee on Chaplaincy, and the Chaplaincy Management Team. However, this word needs to be defined according to the CSC definition—what it actually means in terms of our relationship as chaplains rather than employee or contractor.

## **PLENARY DISCUSSION – QUESTION 1: Partnership**

From a **Regional Chaplain** perspective, elements important to the ministry and in their relationship to chaplains are that of encouragement and the encouraging of outreach, navigating the system of behalf of the faith communities and the chaplains, and engaging partners in their ministry by networking.

**Contractors** expressed their sense of calling and speaking to the vision of their faith communities and the recognized need for chaplains to reach inmates. Chaplaincy was also seen as an under-girding of our Biblical mandate and is only possible through those in our community who have that call. It was acknowledged that one of the weaknesses of some faith communities is connecting the chaplains to the local church and the local church to the chaplain and institutions. There needs to be seamlessness between the church, the chaplains, and the community. Chaplains are there to see the correctional process through a different lens and that personal encounters create an entry point to dialogue and change. Chaplaincy should be considered “missions” to the community.

Continuing the conversation, a **chaplain** added that institutional chaplains and the chapel could be viewed as a “church plant” to our faith communities. Further comments from the **chaplains** included their personal sense of call, God’s grace in their lives, their prophetic role, fulfillment in meeting the needs of others including staff and inmates, hope, freedom and joy in their ministry, and the sense of never being alone. It was also mentioned that with regard to the Mission Statement and the Core Values of CSC, chaplains in their role both interact and represent these values. Chaplaincy is about going to the hard places. In the particular case of a female chaplain ministering to a male population, the worth of being able to give the inmates the opportunity to experience a healthy relationship with a woman, the lack of violence in that relationship, and for the men to experience nothing being asked of them was invaluable.

The chaplains were admonished to be aware of their own need of self-care after going through some confessional times with inmates. There is much “woundedness” in prison ministry and there is always loss even through the victories.

Chaplaincy is actually mandated in Section 2 of the Charter which, in fact, requires CSC to welcome chaplains. Both the CSC and the CCRA are the reason for the existence of the IFC. However, all they are obligated to do is to let chaplains in, not necessarily pay them. We are working with a Public Service definition of partners. The effective working of government is to develop interceptor policies of service, ergo, the most effective way is to partner as no one can be "all things to all people".

In conclusion it was stated that prophetic authority was rooted in the chaplain's own faith community. The faith community has an obligation to its chaplains and vice versa.

## **PLENARY DISCUSSION – QUESTION 2: What is working well?**

Among the views and comments were the following points:

- stability
- communication fairly good as well as collaboration with other stakeholders in the CSC
- importance of the chaplain's visibility
- building trust by addressing the inherent dignity of each individual
- the energy of inmates and volunteers that is generated
- fairness
- ability to vision with staff and be proactive in enhancing goals
- good interrelationships with other chaplains, good fellowship, and a sense of respect from CSC staff.

At this point, there was some anxiety among a few of the chaplains over what was being discussed as opposed to hurrying on and getting down to the crux of the contract model. The CSC spokesperson, Michelle Hawco assured everyone that these processes were needed in order to arrive at a "good end". This is, in fact, how the decisions are usually arrived at in the Service.

One chaplain expressed frustration at the whole process and felt talked down to, wondered how partnership and continuity work.

In illustrating what brought everyone here and why this particular process, Rick told an anecdotal story of his first encounter with an inmate in the Saskatchewan Penitentiary. What he realized was that there were not only he and the inmate in the room, but an unseen crowd of others—representing the faith community, the inmate's family, citizens and the community-at-large, staff, et al. It was in this instance that he became conscious of how everyone was engaged in this short meeting, and herein lays the continuity. Our ministry must be the continuity. Our vision is whether it is the employee or contract model that is used, the ultimate goal is to have all the stakeholders at the table. In the past 150 years, this has not been done well.

## **CONTRACT DISCUSSION**

The question was posed by a contractor as to whether this Enhanced Partnership Model would provide greater opportunity for contractors to be involved in formulation of the contract. The contractor went on to say that this would be preferable to the status quo of being sent the contract document and then simply signing it.

Bill returned a question asking how contractors see this further involvement, what would it look like, what kind of negotiations would they like to be involved in.

It was stated that the first step would be in finding out how the process works, i.e. how are the figures arrived at and how are the parameters and percentages arrived at. The question was asked whether or not there was any consultation with the contractors and/or the chaplains at this time. If not, would there be opportunity for the chaplains, the contractors, or both to have input into the process in the new EPM? Is there some way to be involved?

Hugh informed the group that there exists presently wide consultation with the contracts, not the process. It is reasonable to discuss this. When it comes to numbers, however, it is fairly cut and dry, i.e. the contract treats people the same way for similar work.

There needs to be a conversation about the numbers. People need to be treated as partners not as servants. Rick's dream is that in the future we can all be partners having the right balance. What will that look like? What it can't look like is that chaplains who deliver certain kinds of agreed upon level of service across the country are treated in one way because their contractor is fully engaged in the process while others are not. At some point we need to wind up through this procedure with a genuine negotiating process.

Bill added that this process gives opportunity to reformulate the contract and to fill in the gaps that will be identified.

Moving away from the sense that chaplains would not be disadvantaged by the contractual arrangement, it has de facto in the last 15 or 20 years been found not to be the case. Where previously chaplains had access to a variety of resources, training, etc., there is now a diminishing of this access. From the point of view of contractors and chaplains, there are specific training and resources that need to be provided by CSC in order to be able to provide services.

## **PLENARY DISCUSSION – QUESTION 3: Needs and Challenges**

As part of the exercise to identify needs and challenges, Bill began by calling upon Dwight Cuff to share what CSC has been able to provide for the chaplains in the Pacific Region.

Dwight began by saying that in actuality, the EPM process has already begun, and it must be acknowledged that in 2004 the awareness of the increasing problems with the contracting model

prompted discussion on the part of the IFC in order to address the issues. Dwight attended the findings and a process began to deal with these concerns. Although the issues have been with us for a long time, these meetings are designed to now give opportunity to all the stakeholders to identify what is not working.

Rev. Cuff went on to say that in the Pacific, chaplaincy enjoys many privileges that are not shared across the country such as the provision of cell phones to chaplains, the use of institutional vans, computers and offices. Most are invited to be on the CISM (Critical Incident Stress Management) team and many are invited to be on institutional committees, e.g. Mental Health, Operations, Palliative Care, Restorative Justice, Cultural Diversity, Review Board, Best Practice, Strategic Health, etc. The Region is not experiencing any problems around the liability issue nor with Administrative Fees for contractors. The selection process is the same as that which is practiced nationally (Faith Communities present in the interview room), communication is good, and the Pastoral Plan as well as the Reporting Tool is shared with the contractors. One denomination has provided Ministry Enrichment courses for its chaplain.

The question was posed as to how to ensure that all chaplains are treated equally in matters such as **health and dental benefits**. Hugh Kirkegaard pointed out the difficulty that this presents due to the different traditions and practices from which each chaplain comes. Bill Rasmus acknowledged the need for equivalencies across the board when dealing with benefits. NHQ and the IFC can either create a unified approach in an effort to provide basic coverage for pension, medical, etc. IFC is now looking into this. Michelle Hawco echoed the need to address this inequity and recommended that equity and equality re: pensions, medical, etc. should be built into the EPM and that the opportunity presented to us to do so should be seized.

The desire for an **advocacy group**—someone or some entity to dialogue and consult with—was expressed by one of the chaplains present. Bill clarified the role of the Interfaith Committee on Chaplaincy. The IFC is an advisory committee which advocates for chaplaincy as an entity rather than for individual chaplains. It speaks prophetically on behalf of the Faith Communities to the highest level of Canada and advocates nationally. (It was suggested by some that either the IFC or the Regional Chaplains could advocate on behalf of the chaplains.)

The issue of having to **compete for your own job** and the uncertainty of retaining one's position was raised. How can competent and qualified people be recruited under the present system? Is there/could there be some sort of evaluation or review for chaplains who are approaching the end of their contract term to let them know how they are doing and what they can expect. The suggestion was that perhaps the Pastoral Plan could be used as a tool for review. It was recommended that this issue be put before the National Strategy Team to see this changed. Possibly the term can be increased to 8 years plus one probationary year. Bill mentioned that CSC is restrained by outside policy and sources. The old contract is off the table and now is the time to enhance this model. There will be multiple factors to look at to try and change this very difficult situation.

## WHAT ARE THE CHALLENGES?

The following lists the challenges voiced by those present.

- Lack of advocacy for chaplains, the Faith Communities and the Regional Chaplains insufficient, would like to see a separate body or association—a common voice.
- Need for more communication with the IFC, desire for a designated person speak on the chaplains behalf to the IFC. (Bill reiterated that IFC communicates on a different level than for unique chaplains; there is not enough specification written in the IFC policy.)
- Need for contractors to be more involved in the contracting and hiring process.
- Lack of knowledge around expectations; need clarification and better communication.
- From the perspective of the contractor: cash flow at start of the new year when contracts need to be paid. Payments are not on time. There is a lack of understanding regarding the process. Need to reduce hardship.
- Lack of mention of chaplaincy in the CD's (Commissioner's Directives) although aboriginal affairs is frequently mentioned.
- Lack of clarity around roles, responsibilities, and reporting relationships

## DISCUSSION GROUPS

Participants were randomly placed in four groups representing the four partners in the quadrangle, i.e. CSC, IFC, Contractors, and Chaplains.

Three questions were supplied to generate discussion from each of the four groups' perspective.

1. What are the expectations of this group?
2. What is not being addressed, what are the gaps?
3. What is the strategy that can be brought from this group?

The results of these conversations were shared among the groups in the plenary discussion that followed.

---

## CSC GROUP

### 1. Expectations

- Contractor to provide supervision
- Charter is respected – mandated to offer religious/spiritual accommodation
- Clarification on interfaith issues within the institution (diets, religious items)
- To follow and understand that security and safety of the institution are paramount
- MOU is followed, mission statement, etc.

- Chaplains to have ‘finger on the pulse’ of the institution
- Vested interest in restorative justice issues
- Chaplaincy: Keep inmates busy. Would have measurable impact. Volunteer involvement (liaise)

## 2. Gaps

- Communication
- Do we value chaplaincy?
- Is chaplaincy integral to our mission?
- Lack of measurable results, outcomes
- Challenges of new reorganization and the transformation agenda. Keep everyone on the same page. Avoiding ‘silo’ effect.
- Gaps in inter-departmental consistency
- Accountability

## 3. Enhancement strategies

- “Fire them all!” After that, rehire and try again.
- Re-examination of contract
- Chaplaincy hasn’t been mentioned in standing orders. E.g. call psychology in crisis and ignore chaplaincy. Include chaplaincy in inter-disciplinary response.
- Include chaplaincy in: conflict management and strategic planning
- Encourage whole institution to view chaplaincy as an integral part of the CSC team and mandate
- Improve working relationship with volunteers by increasing respect and cooperation
- Multiply the number of days off and holidays for chaplains and access to pension fund!

---

# INTERFAITH COMMITTEE ON CHAPLAINCY

## 1. Expectations

- To represent the interests of the faith communities to the CSC
- To set standards and policy for the delivery of chaplaincy services
- To review and update the MOU
- To be an advocate for chaplaincy in the CSC
- To be kept informed by the CMT about matters relevant to chaplaincy within the CSC
- To have the resources to fulfill its mandate (e.g. travel, administrative support)
- To be/have a meaningful voice as a partner with all stakeholders

## 2. Gaps

- No designated person or process for effective communication
- Potential conflicts of interest
- Lack of resources to fulfill mandate

- Appropriate representation of local and national interests
- Clarification of role to chaplains and faith communities

### **3. Enhancement strategies**

- Go through a strategic planning process in terms of their role within the EPM
- 

## **CONTRACTORS**

### **1. Expectations**

- Continue to be fully funded
- Contractor in selection process
- Chaplain grounded and participate in their faith community
- Contractor involved in evaluations
- Contractor receives pertinent information (and vice versa)
- Create space for chaplains to be heard in faith community
- Well trained chaplains in the institutions
- Chaplain as a “Chaplain to whole institution”

### **2. Gaps**

- Chaplain’s health (emotional and spiritual)
- Chaplains undervalued
- Chaplain’s family health
- Balanced workload
- Life- long learning – funding available

### **3. Enhancement strategies**

- Ensure chaplains receive pastoral care
  - Ensure family receive pastoral care
  - Consultation between contractor and CSC on regular basis
  - Funding consultation
  - Create space for chaplains to be heard in and speak to faith community
  - Specialized ministry committee/group. Accountable to synod and convention
  - Encouragement and support for volunteers
-

---

## CHAPLAINS

### 1. Expectations

- To be heard
- Call to be neutral while prophetic
- How much of my personal theology can I/must I/should I present?
- Care of staff and offenders
- To be “up” on the language of corrections
- Render to CSC the things that are CSC’s, and to God...but not ‘us’ vs. ‘them’
- To be advocates
- To provide counsel
- To understand that we are chaplains rather than doing chaplaincy

### 2. Gaps

- Need to be invited ‘to the table’ more
- Need to work on being invited (i.e. review priorities)
- Miscommunication/poor communication
- Perceived invisibility and marginalization of chaplains

### 3. Enhancement strategies

- Initiate communication of vision and needs (at all levels)
  - Periodic one-on-ones with some/regular one-on-ones with others
  - Provide enough information to answer “why”
  - Responding to communications
  - Be more aware of circles of influence
  - Share stories
  - Build relationships
  - Awareness of stakeholders “Who’s *not* here?”
  - PRAY! Go to the top!
  - Meet with your peers
  - Maintain personal margins
  - Partner with volunteers (individuals and groups)
  - Lay claim to professional standing
  - Assert selves in environment
  - COMMUNICATION
-

## CONCLUSION

Bill Rasmus thanked everyone for their participation expressing his hope that all those present would leave feeling a sense of accomplishment for the work that was done through this meeting process.

A letter will be sent to all contractors involved in the process in order to select a representative from among them for the National Review team.

## ADDENDUM 1

### QUESTIONS #1: Why are you engaged in prison ministry?

- Call
- Corporate Vision
- Connecting parts of community
- Restorative Justice
- Biblical mandate
- Supporting individual call
- Reclaiming initial ministry impetus,
- Sense of mission
- Access to word and sacrament
- Personal experience
- Core values
- Congregation ethos
- Compassion for 'lepers'
- Calling: "why not?"
- Charter
- Offenders are citizens
- Compensation
- Freedom
- Kingdom vision
- Justice

### Important Elements of Prison Ministry

- Front line service
- Liturgical
- Outreach
- Change thinking and behaviour
- Hope
- Grace
- Never alone
- Reintegration
- Broaden vision re: partners
- Credibility
- Incarnational
- Pastoral presence
- Wisdom of tradition
- Relationship building
- Transformation
- Holistic work
- Hard places
- Advocacy/Prophecy
- Modelling

### How You Engage Other Partners in Prison Ministry

- Chaplaincy Management Team
- Interfaith Committee on Chaplaincy
- Networking
- Ministerial
- MCC
- Alpha
- M2W2
- College
- Local church
- Volunteer
- Bible courses
- Catholic Justice Services
- Secular agencies
- Correctional Service of Canada
- ICBC

## **QUESTION #2 – How are you engaged in prison ministry and with whom?**

### **What's working?**

- Stability (contract 5 years)
- Collaboration (i.e. Correction Team)
- Addressing inherent dignity
- Ministry of presence/trust
- Empowering inmates
- Respect of roles/mandates
- Consistency of chaplains
- Visioning
- Integration of service
- Interfaith work
- Good working relationship between chaplains
- Collegial support

## **QUESTION #3 - What could contribute to the enhancement of your prison ministry?**

### **What are the challenges you have experienced?**

- Competition process
- Lack of advocacy on specific issues (college of chaplains?)
- Designated communication person
- Hiring – Structure for community to be more involved
- Lack of knowledge of expectations
- Cash flow every April/May
- Commissioner's Directives – Promotion of Chaplains
- Clarifying roles, responsibilities, and reporting relationships