**AGENDA DOCUMENT 1**

**Trial structures for governing bodies and national office functions: Report of the evaluation study**

**Report prepared by: Wendy Taylor, Managing Director and Principal Consultant, Taylored Consulting Pty Ltd**

**5 June 2018**

**Executive Summary**

As a result of Synod resolutions in 2015[[1]](#footnote-1), various Governing Bodies and National Church functions were re-structured to provide leadership, governance and other resources that are churchwide, mission-focused, service orientated, efficiently delivered and effective in enacting the decisions and direction of Synod.

The changes have been trialled over the past three years, though the implementation and outcomes to be gained are likely to need 1−3 years more to be fully realised, since a number of matters have required lead-in time, and are still works-in-progress at the time of this report. An evaluation of the trial was requested by Synod.

This report provides a summary of the Evaluation Study of these changes, undertaken independently by Wendy Taylor, Principal Consultant of Taylored Consulting Pty Ltd at the request of General Church Council (GCC).

The changes are intended to establish a national structure that provides improved leadership and governance, by:

1. Enabling GCC to focus on the strategic priorities of the LCA by reducing from over 20 the number of boards, commissions and committees reporting to General Church Council to only five (not including the GCC sub-committees) reporting to it;
2. Achieving greater effectiveness and integration of mission activities through one Local Mission Board focusing on the mission of the whole Church in Australia and New Zealand and providing GCC and Synod with the in-depth advice it requires for the policies, direction and resourcing of mission activities;
3. Strengthening the LCA Bishop’s capacity to exercise oversight responsibilities by participating in fewer, but influential mission-setting and decision-making bodies, especially the proposed one local mission board that has a key role in shaping the direction of the LCA’s mission activities;
4. Developing a better managed, more systematic and collegial approach to mission planning, sharing resources and shaping future directions through placing the majority of the mission departments into the Office of the Bishop;
5. Establishing the position of Mission Executive Officer to lead a national local mission leadership team that works together to achieve the outcomes described in point 4.
6. Strengthening national capacity to provide support services through a more effective, coordinated and integrated management structure under the Executive Officer of the Church.”

**(RECOMMENDATION 6 -** Extract from Synod 2015 Agenda 2.2.4)

**Findings in summary**

Though not universal, the majority of entities and persons who participated in the Evaluation of Trial Structures for Governing Bodies and National Functions, indicate the moves as positive, with a further grouping indicating no effect as yet. Perceptions of negative impact are in the minority, with some of these seen as transitory.

This positive sentiment is strongly stated by certain respondents – GCC, Office of the Bishop, District Bishops and Administrators, national office personnel, and half of the Boards/Commissions and Committees. Comments in both focus groups and survey indicate a need to continue implementation to reap the full benefits.

**Key positive findings include:**

* Key Leaders of the Church (GCC, The Bishop, District Bishops) report time efficiencies in their work as a result of:
	+ Fewer reporting bodies
	+ Clearer connections points
	+ Establishment of departments such as Church Worker Support, and the consistency of policy and practice that is developing through it.

This has enabled greater focus on missional work.

Department Managers also report fewer Board/Committee meetings of shorter duration, which results in time efficiencies to handle the additional scope of work now performed.

* Administration in Districts and congregations is gradually being standardised and streamlined and this is creating efficiencies for District Administrators; this is also enabling the Key Leaders (above) to start a shift in their focus from compliance and risk management, to strategic matters for the Church. Various Boards and Committees report the positive flow on effect of this with their increased engagement from either the Bishop or GCC.
* Various Churchwide services are progressively increasing their scope of work, with the Communications Department, Finance and Administration and ICT Departments already undertaking large volume work for the Church; these areas are markedly improved over past performance, though more is to be done. Progress to date is reducing the burden on congregations, improving the consistency of branding, promotion of the Church’s messages and services, and delivering efficiencies in service and cost per transaction. The removal of administration from Districts and congregations is gradually allowing their few resources to focus on missional work, but this is variable at present in terms of the positive impacts felt. For some, including entities such as ALWS and ALC, the transition of systems and processes underpinning these shifts, particularly in the areas of finance/ payroll and technological support is causing concerns over loss of past or needed levels of service. Lutheran Archives express concern over loss of past levels of service in the area of ICT support.
* The risk profile of the Church has been fundamentally improved.
* The skills available to the Church via its Boards, Committees and Commissions is very valuable and substantially more fit for purpose (this also assists effective risk management).
* The profile of Local Mission has been substantially developed within the Church, with increased linkages across the many entities and programs that deal with this at national levels.

The majority of related Committees indicate the establishment of a Local Mission Department has had a positive impact. The strategic positioning and integration of goals and activities in Local Mission is still to come, as is integrated work on Local Mission with the Districts and congregations.

* The amount of time spent with focus on Cross-Cultural Ministry and Ministry for the Ageing has increased, as has their profile within the Church, their production of resources and inputs to national policy and initiatives.
* The effectiveness of half the number of Boards, Committees and Commissions has been positively impacted by the changes made to Governing Bodies. Many report seeing the connections points more clearly, though the mechanisms to connect need more work.
* Efficiency – one quarter of the Boards, Committees and Commissions indicate positive impact, with another substantial group indicating no significant impact, at least as yet; significant efficiencies have been made by those Boards, Committees and Commissions that now receive some administrative support and the increased participation of the Executive Officers of the Church is adding value to the focus, decision – making and actions taken by these groups.

**Key areas found to warrant further development include:**

* Strategy development and communication of it, in the areas of:
	+ Local Mission (priority)
	+ Long term financial planning and management
	+ Communications
	+ Communications technologies, especially for education and worship purposes (priority).
* Cross-Board alignment of goals and activities under the Strategic Directions, a priority especially for:
	+ Local Mission
	+ Education.
* Local Mission Department/ Board and its linkages to Districts for formation – maintaining the organic model, its agility and its connectedness, within a suitable governance framework.
* Delivery of more impact and support at the congregational level.
* **Role clarification and confirmation of information channels for Boards, Committees and Commissions**, so that their work promptly reaches and informs the decision-makers, and is integrated with other entities with common goals.
* Taking the next step: Move beyond the joined-up thinking to actual partnered approaches to Ministry and effective/efficient Churchwide functions.
* Governance training for members of all Boards, Committees and Commissions.
* Policy roll-out, especially Delegations Policy and priority Human Resources ones.
* Resolution of key service ‘glitches’ already conveyed to the service providers by internal ‘customers’.
* Consolidated financial and management reporting for the Church and its entities to support governance/ oversight, accurate determinations of the financial position of an entity, its programs, related entities and the overall Church, financial sustainability and informed decision-making, at both strategic and operational levels.
* Performance in the timely management and accuracy of payroll adjustments, especially for pastors, including locums.
* Communication of work plans for Churchwide service providers to increase awareness and importantly, to support District planning with congregations.
* Next stage development of the governance structures in terms of their linkages to District entities and other arms of the Church such as schools and aged care.
* ‘Workforce development’ activities for both pastoral and lay workers with focus on:
	+ Pastoral support and care
	+ Pastoral development and skills training
	+ Performance management
	+ Succession planning.

**Consultant’s Recommendations**

1. Continue the implementation of the changes, and move beyond the ‘trial’ status of them to facilitate prompt action and further implementation. Continue the focus of pursuing improvements in effectiveness and efficiency in governing bodies and national service areas, with a view to achieving churchwide, service-oriented functions that support other members to use their time and effort to enact Synod resolutions and undertake mission on behalf of the Church.

1. Continue a focus on accountability in the Churchwide service departments in terms of effectiveness and efficiencies delivered, through ongoing evaluation and reporting to GCC. (Recommendations on possible evaluation processes are provided in Section E.)
2. Implement governance training for all members of Boards, Committees and Commissions.
3. Activity on role clarification and identification of clear conduits of information flow and exchange, to support joined-up thinking and timely communication to decision-makers. The EOC working with Boards and Committees, to recommend mechanisms to enable this to happen promptly, to ensure those entities currently unclear in their role move into optimum productivity as soon as possible. Include Board to Board mechanisms for those with common goals eg Local Mission at national and District levels, Board for Lutheran Education and Board for Australian Lutheran College.
4. Develop and communicate the strategic plans identified as key to the Church’s continued shift to effectiveness and efficiency, above. Immediately move to a needs analysis of the communications technology needs of key ‘customers’ for education and worship.
5. Develop formal work plans for the national functions/departments, and communicate them. Encourage partnership approaches as part of this. Consider a needs analysis of congregations (based on the experience of the 2015-2018 changes) to inform the priorities in these plans for ‘early wins’ in a continuing change management focus to support improvements in effectiveness and efficiency at grassroots/ congregational levels. Ensure the focus on congregational support through national functions retains a strong service orientation, and result in more effective and efficient processes for the congregations. Consider a ‘work request’ tracking system to ensure accountability for prompt, accurate and complete service in ‘hygiene’ areas such as payroll adjustments and processing.
6. Develop a transparent resource assessment process and criteria to identify carefully the possible options for resource allocation to any LCA entity, and also proposed increases in national office workforce numbers.
7. Identify and implement a mechanism for continued discussion and engagement on ‘Mission’, including at congregational levels to ensure integrated and partnered thinking, but also to focus with congregations, on what is the core purpose of the Church.

In addition, several matters were identified and changes suggested by the various Boards and Committees, in terms of next stages of development.

**Evaluation Study – Methodology and Participation Levels**

**Evaluation Framework**

The General Church Council approved an evaluation framework in October 2017. The framework includes:

* Definition of the key ‘problems’ identified with the past Governing Bodies and national functions, in terms of their effectiveness for the LCA and their efficiency in progressing the decisions and directions of Synod;
* Key outputs of the changes in terms of activities undertaken and the participants involved in the transitions or affected by the changes;
* Outcomes achieved as at the General Convention of Synod 2018 or expected to be achieved in the next 3−5 years, as a result of the changes made;
* Key measures of the improvements achieved for the Church, as at the time of the evaluation (up to end March 2018).

**Evaluation Study**

The Evaluation Study has been completed in the period November 2017 – April 2018. The detail of its methodology in assessing outcomes under the evaluation framework was developed by the consultant, then approved by the Executive Officer of the Church in consultation with GCC.

Not all national office functions were evaluated, only those where there was major work done to address the criteria and seek more effective support services through increased coordination and integration, ie. Local Mission, Communications Department, Church Worker Support Department, Finance and Administration, and Information and Communications Technology (ICT).

The evaluation criteria used have been derived from the wording of the Resolutions, ie

Evaluation of whether each of the overall changes introduced has resulted in **leadership, governance and other resource structures or management processes** that are:

* Churchwide
* Mission-focused
* Service-oriented
* Efficient (presumed to mean more efficient than in the past structure)[[2]](#footnote-2)
* Effective in delivering/ supporting Synod decisions and directions.[[3]](#footnote-3)

The participants identified in the Evaluation Framework were agreed as the participants from whom views were to be gathered on perceptions of and satisfaction with the changes. They were consulted via:

* twenty focus groups of the primary Boards, Committees and Commissions of the LCA which were affected to a small or large degree by the changes;
* an online survey with 505 persons invited to participate (resulting in 262 responses), including all Synod representatives who voted on the 2015 resolutions;
* workshop discussions with national office managers, and the national office leaders’ fora;
* an interview with the Bishop.

In addition to the consultations to gather perceptions, outcomes that could be quantified were identified and are reported below in Section C. These include financial savings, increased volumes of output, increased scope of service, speedier throughput of Synod resolutions and increased efficiency in use of resources through centralised administration.

**Respondent profile**

In broad terms, the survey responses (*N= 262, from 505 invitations to participate)* were comprised off:

1. 117 Synod delegates (45% of responses received; 37% of the total Synod representatives invited to participate)
2. 34 persons working in national office including pastoral and lay workers (13%)
3. 12 persons working in District Offices including pastoral and lay workers (4%)
4. 99 persons who identified as a member of a participating Board, Committee or Commission (38%).

Note: While several participants hold more than one role within the Church’s structures, they received a single invitation to the survey and could only provide one response as an individual. Focus groups were entered as another single response, though minority views within a group have also been captured with a second entry for some questions.



**Key Results of the Changes to Governing Structures and National Functions**

**Reported Achievements**

**C1. Reported Achievements – Governing Bodies**

The following outcomes have been identified to date (31 March 2018) as achievements resulting from the changes made to Governing Bodies:

1. Reduction in the number of bodies directly accountable to GCC to five key Boards
2. Movement of multiple Boards into a Committee structure e.g. Board of Local Mission supported by various Committees
3. Refocus of the Bishop’s involvement in Boards, into fewer but the key influential mission-setting and decision-making bodies
4. Boards (and Committees) now operating with new Terms of Reference, with a focus on mission planning and strategy
5. Movement towards competency-based Boards and Committees with consideration of gender and geographical representation
6. GCC agenda and workload now more focused on strategy and mission because of less reporting bodies
7. Regular reporting on national office work has increased accountability to Governing Bodies
8. Holistic risk identification and mitigation strategy work done churchwide
9. Conflicts of Interest identified more comprehensively and documented
10. Clarity of contact points is allowing more churchwide focus in consultations, strategy, projects
11. Improved management and throughput of business in all Governing Bodies, including Synod resolutions, due to increased capacity in national office (now to be known as LCA Churchwide Services) and Committees; (analysis of throughput of Synod resolutions is demonstrated in Attachment 3)
12. Decisions of Governing Bodies achieving more throughput to action because of increased capacity at national office level
13. Separation of the work of the interim Board for Local Mission into two committees: More hours now spent on Cross-Cultural Ministry resulting in improvements in accountability of grants, the development of resources, and the submission to the Federal Government’s discussion on strengthening immigrations laws
14. Separation of the work of the interim Board for Local Mission into two committees: Allows more events to be planned and resources deployed to Cross-Cultural Ministry and New and Renewing Churches
15. Moving to a Committee for Ministry with the Ageing (from the Board for Lutheran Aged Care Australia) has resulted in a mission and ministry focus
16. Development of a local mission management and department structure, and recruitment of an Executive Officer-Local Mission
17. More joined up thinking – through the formation of a Local Mission Leadership Team and the holding of Local Mission staff meetings – leading to better cross-promotion, greater awareness of activities, active seeking of cooperation and partnerships
18. Improved governance of Local Mission with improved advice from the Local Mission committees (e.g. competency-based Board and committees; clarity re delegations of authority, development of policies and procedures which leads to improved practice)
19. Board for Local Mission is developing a unifying Local Mission strategic direction which will inform the work of the local mission departments.

**C2. Reported Achievements – Local Mission**

1. Employment of Executive Officer-Local Mission (EOLM) has led to increased activity in Ministry with the Ageing (e.g. improved communication through e-newsletter; One Loving God project on resourcing the ministry; speaking to Federal Government’s discussion on Elder Abuse; development of discussion papers; ability to assist re Aged Care governance review outcomes)
2. Employment of EOLM has led to increased activity in New and Renewing Churches (e.g. feedback survey from conferences; improved accountability for grants, improved communication)
3. Employment of EOLM has led to increased activity in Cross-Cultural Ministry (e.g. improved accountability documentation for grants; development of Cross-Cultural orientation booklet)
4. Shared resources and joint projects - examples include a joint project of Ministry with the Ageing and Lutheran Community Care SA/NT for ‘One Loving God’ resourcing project; and soon-to-begin projects between Australian Lutheran College and Cross-Cultural Ministry re cross-cultural unit/s and training, and a LCA immersion/study tour
5. Increased communication of Churchwide issues (e.g. the Aged and Community Care governance consultations have led Ministry with the Ageing to develop a theological identity paper and are now working on a paper on multi-faith issues; the development of a Cross-Cultural Ministry orientation booklet)
6. Increased communication of the work of New and Renewing Churches through the development of web and social media presence and the offering of training/conferences
7. Development of theological identity for aged care facilities (the theological identity discussion paper together, with the outcomes of the One Loving God project, will lead to a framework for and resources to support the induction and formation of staff in Lutheran aged care and community services).

**C3. Reported Achievements – Communications Department**

Websites:

1. Roll-out of 566 auto-generated one-page congregation websites, a free service for congregations (churchwide integration website project: to achieve greater effectiveness, efficiency, functionality, useability, brand and message consistency).

eNews:

1. Consistent growth in requests for eNews services from departments and Districts (16 lists in 2014; 34 in 2017)
2. Upwards trend in voluntary subscribers to all lists
3. Extremely low (<0.3%) unsubscribe rate
4. Dramatic spikes in website traffic as a direct result of weekly and fortnightly eNews
5. Increased response to employment and volunteer vacancies as a result of eNews advertising.

Social Media:

1. Steady and consistent growth in social media engagement
2. Facebook page is attracting a younger demographic than our traditional media channels do
3. Best-practice for organisation social media presence is used, which helps to shape churchwide policy and procedures.

Communication Services:

1. Consistent growth in service demand every year since establishment of the unit (2014; a department as of 2015)
2. All LCA departments and districts now using Communications Department services; increasing requests being received from congregations.

Branding:

1. Increased standardisation in overall branding (LCA logo, tagline and messaging) across the church, adding to sense of unity and professionalism.

**C4. Reported Achievements – Church Worker Support Department**

1. Increasing links established across all entities with Church Worker Support Department
2. The recognition of coverage and management of all Church Workers (Pastors, Lay Workers, other Employees and Volunteers) has resulted in increased dialogue, increasing consistency of current policy application and practice, greater understanding of compliance issues and awareness of other issues that are emerging across the LCA (for example incidence of mental health issues)
3. Improved and increased relationship development, in particular with College of Bishops, District Administrators, Local Mission, LEA and other Ministry Support Functions (i.e. PSD, Communications, Finance and Admin)
4. Reduced rework or duplication of work (expected savings to workloads of District Bishops, District Offices in timeframe of 3-5 years)
5. Increased scope of work for HR/ people management within CWS than previously undertaken by Lay Ministry Department - increasingly providing support to Congregational and District Leadership (e.g. Congregational and Board Chairpersons, Bishops and Administrators) for all Church Worker service types in the Church
6. Increased resource development, including resources for congregations – for example, induction handbook template, template position descriptions, performance development framework and guidelines
7. Reduced staff turnover due to improved local practice as a result of engagement between CWS and local congregations (likely to be realised over longer term but current trend shows slight reduction in 2017 compared to 2015 and 2016)
8. Accelerated policy development in CWS/HR area: Overarching Policy and Framework and initial sub polices endorsed by GCC (1/2018) which will pave the way for accelerated policy development and accompanying guidelines; communication and discussion stage imminent
9. Consistent interpretation of existing policy and practices and in line with LCA and legislative requirements
10. Increased support of congregations with Industrial Relations matters (including redundancies, award interpretation) resulting in improved outcomes for individuals involved and for congregations/LCA entities through improved risk mitigation and identification of support needs for all affected parties
11. Built deeper and more strategic engagement with ALC (beyond that with Grassroots) to support and promote ALC
12. Initiated contact with LCA Schools to improve awareness in schools of career, service and study opportunities within the LCA in collaboration with ALC, and local entities (e.g., LCC, LYQ, LS and LDS) – including development of resources and school visits
13. Providing resources and ongoing support to the Continuing Education for Pastors Program, in particular to the Coordinator and through ALC
14. Planned congregational visits to support local leadership have commenced and the aim is to visit every congregation over next 3 years.

**C5. Reported Achievements – Finance and Administration Department**

1. Increased reach of central finance and administration services, implemented via HRS system (though HRS not itself an outcome of 2015 Synod) e.g. Coverage of payroll (now 80% of LCA workers), leave management services. as a result of HRS = 1400 persons managed per pay, with 99%+ accuracy (Cf 65 persons in 2015)
2. Transfer Fund centralised ($1M costs pa) = more efficiency in negotiations possible; improved oversight; less administration at district offices
3. Other HRS modules implemented since 2015, with more to come in next years eg WHS, Training and Development
4. Ability to calculate and track leave liabilities and associated costs e.g. Annual Leave, Long Service Leave - greater oversight and closer management of liabilities possible
5. More efficient establishment of new workers/employees in LCA administration records and payroll systems within HRS, compared with previous processes = less time spent by various people
6. Increased support to Ministry for the Ageing, New and Renewing Churches, Grow Ministries, International Mission, Communications, in budget management, accounts receivable and account payable, administration
7. Administration support to smaller ministries co-located in national office coordinated for greater efficiency and flexibility
8. Ability to grow administration support with efficiencies due to increased activity.

**C6. Reported Achievements – Information and Communication Technology Department**

1. Increased reach of service/ support including hosting and management of domain names and web services, LCA email option, single sign on for portal services and access
2. Shift to Australian based web-servers has made it possible to offer/sell space to congregations for hosted services
3. Nos. of non-national office entities supported e.g. Lutheran Archives, SA, NSW and Victorian Districts, ALC (covering 88 staff)
4. Nos of congregations supported = 109 separate hosted accounts
5. Microsoft licence negotiation as a national Not for Profit (NFP) organisation = saving of $20K per month cf. individual District expense levels
6. Single Sign On (SSO) achieved through co-ordination of various systems (SharePoint, LAMP2, HRS)
7. Creation of LCA email inboxes for those working on Church work.

**Current Status of the Trial Changes**

It needs to be stated that some of the changes planned as a result of Synod 2015 resolutions were being implemented concurrently during the Evaluation Study. This means that participants were sometimes commenting on current activities, which they had not yet had time to experience in operation. For example, many of the Committees and Commissions were consulted in early 2018, and at the same meetings were also to revisit Terms of Reference (ToR) for their entity (with some having been refined and others edited in minor ways from the past versions). This was particularly an issue for those Committees which had previously been Boards. Though some Committees had been functioning during 2016–2017, the number of meetings held as a new entity, and membership during this period, varied. Certainly, some issues of role clarification and uncertainty around information and communication conduits for their entity, were not yet understood or bedded down, but this was just commencing through their discussion of Committee Objects and Duties within their Terms of Reference. Their ToR typically address their reporting lines, at least, if not their connection points and communication channels.

Also, implementation of various work plans for national office departments was active, naturally, during the months of the evaluation study. The ‘hard’ data shared here was taken in two snapshots (in January 2018 and an opportunity to update it provided at end March 2018); the reality is a dynamic one and therefore will have changed by the end of the Synodical period. Examples of such dynamic data include the numbers of persons covered by the LCA payroll and the number of congregational websites developed and ‘live’ at the time of data collection.

Finally, a number of the planned changes towards more integrated missional work, and effective and efficient administrative working, will take longer time to demonstrate their impact, and a five-year timeline is more likely needed for assessment. Examples of longer-term impacts expected include increased integration of the Local Mission activities under a holistic strategy (in development currently), and the strategic refocus of GCC operations as the various Boards and Committees move fully into the changed governance arrangements.

**Key Results – Perceptions of the changes, by Stakeholders (Focus Groups)**

**Qualitative Feedback from Focus Groups *(N=20)***

Analysis of the qualitative feedback from the participants in focus groups has been undertaken and the following is a thematic summary of the key positives and the key issues identified as still problematic.

In relation to the issues raised, these have been shared with the managers in National Office and also the Standing Committee on Constitutions, to inform their concurrent work and in the interests of prompt attention to any sensitive or problematic issue raised.

Table 1: Qualitative feedback, in themes, from focus groups February – April 2018 *(N=20)*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Key positives heard during focus groups | Key negatives/ areas for further development heard during focus groups; matters still seen as problematic |
| Governing Bodies and Governance Matters |
| Now know who to focus on and why; feel there are clear lines and resources to take effective action; can feel the new energy | While seeing more joined up thinking, movement in same directions, yet to see more tangible partnering and much outcome (early days) |
| GCC and the Bishop of the Church are more focused on strategic matters: Can better exercise their roles; time savings and reduced pressure of supervisory role; | Policy devt is in transition, so yet to see full renewal; still lots of policy and compliance matters exercising our time – yet to get to strategy as focus for majority of time |
| Feeling and enjoying more focus and interest from GCC, who have more time |  |
| More alignment evident; reinforcement of common objectives | * Ctee/ Commission roles need more clarity; where to link in; how to add value; how to inform timely decision making by Boards with Ctees’ ‘on ground’ intelligence; delegations need sorting;
* Board to Board linkages are needed for those with common or shared aims;
* Need to clarify roles and parameters for consultants and ex-officio members in terms of them fulfilling roles across Boards;
* What expectations are there of Board to Board, to staff, to Ctee communication?;
* Cross Board alignment of Strategic Directions is a big remaining issue.
 |
| Skills Matrix for Board and Ctee membership helpful; can use at District level too;Skills - based membership a positive in terms of specialist skills now available in the right places eg for risk mgmt., finance etc; frees up Ctees, less worrying. | Don’t think congregations see the value or understand the needs for governance in the Church vs. the Church’s core purpose as a Church |
|  | * The role of the District is the next governance question; need to remember that they are closer to the congregations; will need extensive conversation and likely to cause tensions.
* District staff already concerned about their future and roles cf. national functions.
 |
|  | The connection points for school governing bodies in the structures is still unclear; symptomatic of the questions remaining about the next levels of governance structure |
|  | The ‘rules’ around governance structure of Ctees is not appropriate to all types of governing work; a generative space for Local Mission has been lost. |
| More accountability and leadership contribution evident from roles of Executive Officers (EOs); more contribution felt and valued by both committees and senior staff |  |
| Positive impact in appointment of Assistant to the Bishop (Public Theology). | Would like opportunity to delegate work to the departments, to expedite and integrate; concerns re lack of resource/support (could be shared) |
| Local Mission |
| Increase dialogue about what “Mission” means, how to get engagement and how to work at a national level | Still need to consolidate (and continue) robust discussion of what is “Mission” |
| Ministry for the Aging feeling more connected and recognised | Unsure of fit of Aged Care within LM; disparate needs and complex |
| EOLM recruitment has made a fundamental difference to how the committee can do business; bridging the gaps between Local Mission (LM) entities; broadened scope/ thinking and communications | EOLM scope of work is too much; concerns re workloadStill need more partnered work across LM groups: models and willingness, proactivity |
| Recognition of Local Mission as a key focus for the Church is very positive; it is shaping the directions in ministry | New and Renewing Churches needs to consider District strategy and engage District Bishops as they plan their activities at local levels |
| Local Mission Department achieving a lot and getting positive feedback at District levels | Local Mission needs to consider the varying demographics of Districts and regional differences, in strategy development; tendency for metro centric thinking and activity |
|  | Inadequate representation of District and grassroots reps in new Ctee structure (noting that the membership of boards and committees is skills-based and not representational);Need to clarify relationship to local mission groups |
| Funding more aligned to strategy; accessibility to resources much improved | * Need a national strategy for Local Mission to ensure linkages and alignment
* Resourcing of Local Mission is a concern as its scope of programs is large
 |
|  | Lots of communication still needed to get messages to congregational levels |
| Good cross-fertilisation for LM Ctees through EOLM; more integration of LM activity; more probity; more connection between departments with LM focus; more information flow | Need to clarify alignment of Finke River Mission to LM department and strategy |
|  | Schools Ministry still needs attention; lay chaplains need engagement and support |
| Much improved progress on Cross Cultural mission work (research, reports, throughput); the restructuring has provided focus and time to attend to mission; has raised the profile and awareness of this as a contemporary issue in Church |  |
| The changes are going in the right direction and need to be sustained; the increased focus on mission is tangible | Concern of any further changes eg to Board of LM; just gaining momentum and sense of breadth/scope of role |
| Communications Functions and Department |
| Can disseminate messages for whole Church quickly; redevelopment of websites a valuable contribution | Roll-out of services could benefit from more communication itself. Need to communicate if expected timelines will not be met. |
| Contracted communications services for District very valued and efficient e.g. journalist |  |
| Increase consistency in brand, style; quality of outputs, freshness etc as result of collaboration and cooperation with Comms Department | Efforts needed to get changes requested to website accurate; seems to be frequent changes to personnel who look after website maintenance |
| Improved, proactive consultation from national office re forthcoming events/ milestones; good professional advice and skills provided to enable; collaborative styles evident; more unified service; responsive; quick pick up of their scope. | Need more forward -looking communications strategy: targeted and fresh thinking about what media for which target cohorts and the ‘hard to reach’: scoping of emerging demands and how these will be addressed – media mix needs to keep pace |
| Church Worker Support Functions and Department |
| Valuable skill set in HR Management = reduced risk to Church, through positive management of some difficult matters; already saving Bishops’ and District Office time | Pastors feeling unsupported; nett effect of governance changes has been no increase in care for Pastors |
| Positive grassroots effects from creation of CWS Department: prompt, diligent, helpful service from ‘one stop shop’; joint approach to problem solving | Congregations still in learning mode and cause issues |
| Less volunteers managing staff matters = reduced risk to the Church | Need more engagement with support for lay chaplains/schools |
| Improved quality of policy devt and writing noted for GCC level; prepared to listen and debate content | Need work on succession planning for pastors; median age is 55; many retirements imminent |
| Increasing focus on professional devt for pastors and workers provides some reassurance about future skills | Need increased focus on performance assessment and reviews of role scope, going forward |
| Finance and Administration Functions and Department (F & A) |
| Better reporting now (F&A); more aligned and integrated reporting; The F & A Dept doing best they can with resources they have;Significant progress in past 5 years | But still need better budget reporting; cannot get accurate or consolidated reporting; worrying to a number of Ctees etc; hard to provide oversight.Need analysis skills/ role and oversight mechanisms once new platform in place.Ctees need to be treated as a ‘customer’ is assessment of reporting requirements. |
| Ctees now recognise more accountability to LCA for LCA funds | Need to take a strategic view of our financial mgmt. needs; need an Investment Fund |
| Useful F & A Ctee: much improved financial mgmt. (early win from Governance Review) |  |
|  | Budget over Synodal term would be a sensible devt for program funding |
|  | Budget devt process back to front; should be developed in light of strategic and operational plans from Ctee level, not mandated from above |
|  | Concern re change effectiveness is dependent on LLL funding as an enabler; need to develop funding models further in consideration of role of Districts |
|  | Pay processes and timeliness for pastors including locums need to be speedier; need to be mindful of impacts on Centrelink income; on-boarding to HRS needs improved PR  |
| Good there is a centralised pay service | Lots of negative perception of F&A Department is skewed by HRS currently, if not going well |
| Responses from F&A section have been quick otherwise (see comment under Key Negative -->) | Significant negative impact on time of ALWS accountant in shifting to less flexible HRS payroll system; Help Desk under-resourced |
| Information & Communications Technology Functions and Department |
| HRS good and efficient; positive direction | Need ICT Plan and more strategic focus; this will inform new skills set requirements |
| Good helpful ICT staff, if it’s their issue to resolve; good at getting back; take responsibility; provide products, service, and solutions | Need more resources and strategic focus in ICT area; need to look at the synergies between technologies as these develop |
| Valuable Churchwide service | Seem under-resourced for the scale of service now; some internal customers had better service from their outsourced provider previously |
|  | Will need more significant/ sophisticated architecture for Worship, ALC, Schools delivery/ websites, eg for live streaming, e-storage of resources, provision of music, podcasts; assessment uploads and security protocols, educational program delivery; remote access and tech support 24/7; very reliable and stable access needed |
| Sharepoint working effectively for Board papers etc; reduces admin and creates efficiency for Ctee members remote from mtgs; costs could be extended to capture and share Board to Board communications e.g. Minutes | Sharepoint not working efficiently for many yet |
| One’ login’ works well |  |
|  | LCA needs to recognise and better resource the key introduction/ implementation stage of new technologies with better change management planning |

**Qualitative Feedback from Survey *(N=262)***

As indicated in the Methodology section (B) above, the criteria used for evaluation were derived from the wording of the 2015 Resolutions, ie changes have been evaluated by the selected participants, on the basis of whether they have resulted in impacts that are:

* Churchwide
* Mission-focused
* Service-oriented
* Efficient (presumed to mean more efficient than in the past structure)[[4]](#footnote-4)
* Effective in delivering/ supporting Synod decisions and directions?[[5]](#footnote-5)

The rating scale used provided was:

5 = Significant positive effect

4 = Positive effect

3 = No effect

2 = Negative effect

1 = Significant negative effect

NA = Not able to rate; insufficient knowledge or exposure to be able to provide an informed
 view.

**Analysis of results by Stakeholder Group – Focus Groups and Survey**

The following tables of results indicate that the change impacts are being positively felt by GCC, Districts, and persons working in national functions so far, but limited impact has yet been felt at congregational level. This outcome was anticipated by GCC and the Office of the Bishop at this time, given the lead-time it is taking to negotiate and establish new bodies, systems and churchwide processes. As mentioned earlier in this report, GCC has expected some of the change benefits will be realised in more the five-year+ timeframe.

However, some positive impact has been achieved by the stronger churchwide and service focus of some national departments who are interacting with congregations, in the example of the Communications Department with marginally higher (than “3”) scores for impact in terms of effectiveness and efficiency from the Synod representatives (Table 3).

Table 2 provides some next level analysis for the respondent group of Boards, Committees and Commissions. As a result of changes to Governing Bodies, this respondent group is marginally more positive in terms of impact on effectiveness, though close to an even split between those reporting a positive effect, and those reporting ‘no effect’; a small minority, report a negative effect. For those that rated it, Local Mission changes are also rated as positive by the majority of this group. In the subsequent table (Table 3), which summarises all Board, Committee and Commission respondents into one grouping, these variations are lost because the data has been normalised by the calculation of medians or averages.

Table 2: Next level investigation – Boards, Committees and Commissions’ Summary of Impacts (Focus Group data)

Note: Not all Boards, Committees and Commissions provided a rating in each Area of Change, focusing on those with which they deal more regularly. Some also feel able to rate Impact on Effectiveness but ‘Not able to Rate’ for Efficiency, as the changes are seen as still being implemented.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Area of change | Positive impact reported | No impact reported | Negative impact reported |
| Governing Bodies |
| Effectiveness | 10 (Boards and Committees) | 7 | 1 |
| Efficiency | 6 | 6 | 1 |
| Local Mission |
| Effectiveness | 7 | 1 | 1 |
| Efficiency | 5 |  |  |
| Communications Department |
| Effectiveness | 3 | 1 |  |
| Efficiency | 3 |  | 1 |
| Church Worker Support Department |
| Effectiveness | 2 | 1 |  |
| Efficiency | 2 | 1 |  |
| Finance & Administration Department |
| Effectiveness | 1 | 1 | 2 |
| Efficiency | 2 | 1 | 2 |
| Information & Comms Technology Department |
| Effectiveness | 1 |  | 1 |
| Efficiency | 1 |  | 1 |

**Changes to Governing Bodies and national office functions**

The following table (Table 3) provides a breakdown of all results for those questions that required a rating, using the five-point scale mentioned above. The statistical Median of All Respondents is shown, with comparisons provided for various Respondents Groups. Use of the Median in this edition of this report, conveys more statistical accuracy by recognising the range of ratings provided by respondents; the scores are not normalised therefore, as they can be when Averages are used.

Table 3: Rated Survey Questions, by Respondent Categories; Calculation of Median responses. Grey highlights a Positive Response. Those Medians rating higher than “3” indicate a substantial number of respondents rated a “4” or better.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Survey Questions / Response Groupings(questions requiring a rating: 5 = Significant Positive Impact; 4 = Positive Impact; 3 = No Impact; 2 = Negative Impact; 1 = Significantly Negative Impact) | Median – AllResp*(N=262)* | Synod | GCC | Committees & Boards | District Bishops + District Administrators | National Office |
| **Governing Bodies** | **3.7** | **3.00** | **4.00** | **3.50** | **4.00** | **3.75** |
| Q2. What impact on **effectiveness** of your group/District/Congregation has this work on Governing Bodies had?  | 3.8 | 3.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.00 |
| Q3. What impact on **efficiency** of your group/ District/ Congregation has this work on Governing Bodies had? | 3.5 | 3.0 | 4.0 | 3.0 | 4.0 | 3.50 |
| **Local Mission** | **3.7** | **3.00** | **4.00** | **3.50** | **3.75** | **4.00** |
| Q6. What impact on **effectiveness** of your group/District/Congregation has this work on Local Mission had?  | 3.8 | 3.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.00 |
| Q7. What impact on **efficiency** of your group/ District/ Congregation has this work on Local Mission had? | 3.5 | 3.0 | 4.0 | 3.0 | 3.5 | 4.00 |
| **Communications Department** | **4.0** | **4.00** | **4.17** | **4.00** | **4.00** | **4.00** |
| Q10. What impact on **effectiveness** of your group/District/Congregation has this work by Communications Department had?  | 4.1 | 4.0 | 4.5 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.00 |
| Q11. What impact on **efficiency** of your group/ District/ Congregation has this work by the Communications Department had?  | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.00 |
| Q13. Please rate the service you have had from the Communications Department in the years since 201 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.00 |
| **Church Worker Support Department** | **3.7** | **3.00** | **4.00** | **3.33** | **4.00** | **4.17** |
| Q15. What impact on **effectiveness** of your group/District/Congregation has this work by Church Worker Support Department had?  | 3.6 | 3.0 | 4.0 | 3.0 | 4.0 | 4.00 |
| Q16. What impact on **efficiency** of your group/ District/ Congregation has this work by the Church Worker Support Department had?  | 3.6 | 3.0 | 4.0 | 3.0 | 4.0 | 4.00 |
| Q18. Please rate the service you have had from the Church Worker Support Department in the years since 2015 | 3.9 | 3.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.50 |

Table 3 continued: Rated Survey Questions, by Respondent Categories; Median of Responses. Grey highlights a Positive Response. Those Medians rating higher than “3” indicate a substantial number of respondents rated a “4” or better.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Survey Questions / Response Groupings(questions requiring a rating: 5 = Significant Positive Impact; 4 = Positive Impact; 3 = No Impact; 2 = Negative Impact; 1 = Significantly Negative Impact) | Median – AllResp*(N=262)* | Synod | GCC | Committees & Boards | District Bishops + District Administrators | National Office |
| **Finance and Administration Department** | **3.5** | **3.00** | **4.00** | **3.17** | **3.67** | **3.67** |
| Q20. What impact on **effectiveness** of your group/District/Congregation has this work by Finance and Administration Department had? | 3.7 | 3.0 | 4.0 | 3.5 | 4.0 | 4.00 |
| Q21. What impact on **efficiency** of your group/ District/ Congregation has this work by the Finance and Administration Department had? | 3.6 | 3.0 | 4.0 | 3.0 | 4.0 | 4.00 |
| Q22. Please rate the service you have had from the Finance and Administration Department in the years since 2015 | 3.2 | 3.0 | 4.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.00 |
| **ICT Department** | **3.9** | **3.67** | **4.00** | **4.00** | **4.00** | **4.00** |
| Q25. What impact on **effectiveness** of your group/District/Congregation has this work by the ICT Department had?  | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.00 |
| Q26. What impact on **efficiency** of your group/ District/ Congregation has this work by the ICT Department had?  | 3.8 | 3.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.00 |
| Q28. Please rate the service you have had from the ICT Department in the years since 2015 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.00 |

Table 3 also provides indications of the service performance of the national office functions. The following data is extracted from it. Achieving impact at the congregational level is still an area for development, as indicated by the Synod representative ratings (and comments).

Extract Table 3: Please rate the service you have had from the national service providers, since 2015 (Median values)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Median – AllResp(N=262) | Synod | GCC | Committees & Boards | College of Bishops + District Administrators | National Office |
| Communications (Q13) | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.00 |
| Church Worker Support (Q18) | 3.9 | 3.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.50 |
| Finance and Admin(Q22) | 3.2 | 3.0 | 4.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.00 |
| ICT (Q28) | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.00 |

**Commentary by Respondents to survey – Impacts of the changes made**

The following themes have been identified in the various comments sections available to Respondents throughout the survey. While there is strong consistency between these themes and those expressed in the focus groups and reported earlier in this report, the following includes a stronger congregational voice, via the Synod representatives. This results in more identification of local service perceptions, issues and concerns.

1. **Governing Bodies** (*N= 158 comments (55 of which indicate ‘No comment’, or ‘No impact’ as a response)*

*(Note: There is no correlation between items in the Positive column and those adjacent in the Negative column).*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Positive Themes | Negative Themes |
| Clearer and better understood governance; increased accountability and oversight; clearer sense of role and purpose | Relative focus on the gospel seems diminished |
| Improved coordination and overview of mission; clarification of areas now regarded as mission eg Lutheran Media, aged care, cross-cultural ministry, Central Australia = more collegiate work, sense of common purpose and focus in discussions | Local level engagement has been negatively impacted eg Cross-Cultural Ministry, New and Renewing Churches; many local congregations not seeing benefits/ services/ information flows |
| Clearer risk identification | Many services and supports provided do not cater for the smaller congregations and their limited capacities eg CommsChoice, payroll systems |
| More resources and support available; more resources/ training promoted that we can use | Compliance paperwork and processes not easy to use/ understand eg Professional Standards, or not sufficiently flexible for the realities eg HRS |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| More information communicated and accessible; improved quality of information provided | Many Churchwide services don’t get back or respond; demands are experienced as excessive; congregations feel these support services have been distracted by the changes happening |
| Clearer connection points in the structure = more efficient | Pastoral support has not improved tangibly |
| Less time and effort tracking finances | The structure for one committee is considered to be less efficient than in the past since it lacks key voices and easy mechanisms for engagement/ dialogue with Districts and their mission planning |
| Skill sets available to Boards and Committees | Remote members feel even more distanced |
| More transparent and simplified reporting | Increased workloads for managers of Churchwide services is affecting their support and leadership of staff |
| Improved capacity for strategic decision-making | Much information is slow to reach the congregation level |
| Broader roles and scope of work for many areas of Churchwide services | Congregations feeling disempowered, going backwards; that the ‘tail is wagging the dog’ in areas such as HR (though the admin improvements are welcome) |
| Improved management of meetings and their outcomes = more action, promptly | Increased tensions in some quarters; uncertainty for staff and functions in Districts |
| Less administration for Committees | Clarify what decisions can be made locally; empower congregations to make (good) decisions |
| Less administration and staff management time spent by Bishops and District Administrators | Encourage all Districts to participate fully as one Church so approaches can be consistent, projects and discussions most impactful |
| Shorter focused meetings; time spent on other things such as mission |  |
| Following the national structure model is enabling Districts to focus on a mission-oriented structure |  |

1. **Local Mission** (*N=129 comments (46 of which indicate ‘No comment’, or ‘No impact’ as a response.))*

*(Note: There is no correlation between items in the Positive column and those adjacent in the Negative column).*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Positive Themes | Negative Themes |
| EOLM appointment a positive contribution; has brought increased energy and focus to local mission; integration of the various arms/activities; a national voice now evident for some areas; holistic approach now evident | We continue to lose members |
| Local Mission now more organised and planned; better resourced; more accountable; less distracted by governance; more sense of purpose; gets more done between meetings | Some materials such as hymnals not having impact; others not suitable for cross-cultural work – despite the efforts put into their development |
| Quality and value in a number of the resources and training now provided e.g. the SENT, Due/Eaton and Kiefert materials; more training has been accessible  | Aging members in congregations do not use technology and are missing the information disseminated this way; lots of information does not reach pastors or congregations (for various reasons) |
| Various congregations feel well supported by the New and Renewing Churches team and GROW ministries and their input has been valuable | The theology of mission needs attention |
| Increased focus on Aged Care as part of mission is positive; more buy in evident; more collaboration, education and engagement of leaders in this area | Support at the grassroots continues to be needed; less focus on the strategy; we need practical supports to work on evangelism, mission and church planting with small resources |
| Communication is more frequent and clearer; links and points to connect are clearer; consultation now more meaningful, barriers are reducing | Need more focus in ALC training for pastors to be Sending pastors rather than Church-keepers; need them to learn to be more inclusive of their congregations’ members’ opinions; need local ministry teams; help local members with discipleship |
| Keep going on this integrated pathway for Local Mission | One Committee is a silo from other local mission departments; increases workload and admin for the workers which distract time and resource from church planting and mentoring |
| The continued connection between Local and International Mission is valued | We were more connected and felt more involved under the Interim Board for Local Mission |
|  | Aged Care sector is highly regulated and will cause more issues going forward; LCA should withdraw from this sector other than have chaplains |
|  | Improve the connections between Aged Care leaders and the Church; increase theological training of these leaders and look to succession planning for their roles |
|  | Need to make communication with the District Mission Directors easier for joint thinking and acting on challenges in local mission; need a line of contact |
|  | Linkages and partnered work needs more attention, eg Lutheran Media and CSBQ, GROW and Cross-Cultural Ministry |
|  | We would benefit from the exchange of stories from congregations where positive progress has been made |
|  | Need to continue to recognise the geographic (all Aust, northern Aust, Central Aust, NZ) and demographic spread of the Church and the differences this brings when developing/implementing new policy, programs, resources etc |

1. **Communications Department** *(N= 132 of which only 16 are ‘No comment’, or ‘No impact’ as a response. That is, this is an area of LCA Churchwide services that has a relatively high level of acknowledgement of its work.)*

*(Note: There is no correlation between items in the Positive column and those adjacent in the Negative column).*

Given the diversity of the Church members and their communication preferences, it is not perhaps surprising that some things seen as positives by some are seen as negatives by others. Some comments indicate some confusion as to the source of specific resources, e.g. with worship and Lutheran Media, but this isn’t an issue for the users.

The majority of comments for this area and Churchwide service are positive, with considerable consensus, while the ‘negatives’ listed (especially those down the list) are more individual comments. They are included to pass on messages that may be useful for the staff to hear.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Positive Themes | Negative Themes/ Improvements Sought |
| eNews valued for its information currency and range, ease of use and forwarding; ease of use of links = more efficiency | eNews questioned for its continued value by a minority; also seen as repetitious |
| Valued supports for committees and their dissemination/ repository of material; improved publicity | People feeling overloaded in the volume of communications via email, eNews etc – can’t keep up; key news needs to be on opening page |
| Significant improvements in access and currency of information about the Church | Communications in the Church also need to focus on outreach, training and equipping people, rather than just information sharing |
| Professional look to congregational websites; good progress on branding; valued as a local resource that Pastor can use for teaching, outreach; helping to get news about church planting and local mission out | Many congregational members express lack of a local website, don’t feel supported in areas where access is limited. Some unaware of what they can access directly as a congregation. |
| Lines of communication between congregations and national Church are now much easier | Service times would be useful on local congregation websites to assist those visiting (used to have this) |
| The access to resources is appreciated | Getting messages out seems to have more focus than mission; need to remember that Communications is only the mechanism |
| One stop shop for communications has made sending messages throughout the Church more efficient and thereby enabled them to be more regular | Many members don’t have computers or want to access this way, so less information is flowing to them than previously; need a communications strategy and means to continue for older members  |
| Increased online presence = less phone calls and delays = more efficiency | Social media clunky, requires too many clicks; uses high traffic times; not reflecting users preferred methods e.g. video/image; provide more photos (and names) |
| Advertising support from Communications service area has greatly assist the Nominations Committee to attract better, broader range of candidates for Church committees = added value for the whole Church | Some congregations (in the minority) developing their own apps or websites, more tailored to the local needs and interests, so see them as better quality than LCA product |
| Electronic blogs valued | Suggest web pages with content from thought leaders, where members can get answers to key questions; need spiritual substance; suggest inputs from Commissions |
| Facebook valued by adults for the younger people in their lives and congregations | LAMP2 implementation is urgent so congregations can readily update congregational websites |
|  | Need online mechanisms for those for whom English is not a first language |
|  | Unsubscribing is clunky; multiple copies received and can’t stop this |
|  | Suggest some online tutorials that could help the non-tech savvy members learn how to find key areas of interest |
|  | Suggest more children’s resources online |
|  | Communication with stakeholders about roll-out times or their delay needs to improve |
|  | Establish central resource/data base storage for all to access for resources for worship such as hymn lyrics, music |
|  | ‘How to give a donation’ is too hard |
|  | Need integrated systems for event management – with pre and post follow ups as well as registration and payment |

1. **Finance and Administration Department** *(N=112 of which 24 are ‘No comment’, or ‘No impact’ as a response. A further small number of responses indicate their congregations are yet to be transferred into the payroll system.)*

*(Note: There is no correlation between items in the Positive column and those adjacent in the Negative column).*

While there continue to be glitches and delays reported in sorting the information required for the new payroll system, most views are positive and people report starting to reap the benefits. Others are not experiencing benefits compared with their previous systems under local treasurers; the new system therefore takes more time than previously and is seen as less direct for communications.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Positive Themes | Negative Themes/ Improvements sought |
| Reliance on the skills of volunteers to undertake these tasks has been relieved from many congregations and Committees = appreciation and the time capacity to focus on other things, or to have non-financially trained persons in the congregational treasurer role | Financial reporting accuracy and ease of interpretation remains a major issue for many Boards, Committees and program managers = time wasted and risks not well managed for the Church |
| Staff report much satisfaction with online application process for leave and being able to check balances; the ready access to information | Management/ accuracy of leave entitlements, holiday pay, superannuation contributions and reporting of these is not sufficient or efficient as yet |
| Streamlined approaches supported with coaching has been helpful and created efficiencies and greater accuracy for the majority of respondents  | Lack of/ access and interpretation of historical data records in congregations is affecting accuracy and timeliness of updating/reporting leave balances |
| Budgets and spreadsheets are being better explained; appreciated | Financial imposts of these new admin systems is a concern to congregations that are struggling financially |
| System provides an improved base for employment management; improved information is a valuable tool | During the transition to HRS based payroll, the change management was not always handled well: people in congregations (and departments) report feeling pressured, rushed and unable to ask questions, resulting in issues later.Other central decisions not well communicated or forecast to congregations e.g. changes to use of helpers for counting monies; changes to pastor’s pay = cause of local antagonism |
| HRS is an excellent tool; appreciate the efficient, centralised system; has improved consistency and revealed inconsistencies of practice across the Church | Lead up time to transfer to HRS seen as too long at three months+ |
| Finance Department trying very hard to provide accurate data; appreciated for doing the best they can with and through the changes and with the systems capabilities available to them; positive experience of making enquiries | Access to part-time staffers for queries can be difficult for those in different time zones; need to work proactively and co-operatively with congregations for the items that are outside the normal circumstance and to demonstrate service for the congregational dollars that fund this area. Personal contact with congregational Chair or Treasurer would be appreciated.Finance/payroll staff need to be more responsive when there are problems. Resolution times of 6 months+ are not acceptable. |
| Improved transparency of the Church’s administration as a whole and at local level | Changes imposed with no consultation or flexibility, not appreciated; congregations feeling disempowered; Some experiencing the removal of GL codes without consultation = not assisting with reporting back to bodies/ funders in the manner they require; projects require multiple GL codes |
|  | Local people (congregation and District levels) involved in HR and payroll matters sometimes fail to notify changes in employment arrangements and then this compounds for the individuals as delays are experienced  |
|  | At this point, a number of congregations report that the new system is not saving them time, instead taking more time than previously |
|  | LCA funds transfer process in and out of NZ has improved but there are still issues with communications and lack of transparency |
|  | Staff resources in Finance support seem overworked resulting in delays in response; this flows onto to time impacts for grant submissions, donors, transfers of funds, and provision of reports for program managers |
|  | Need to ensure full bed down of the HRS and its capabilities to reap the full benefits, e.g. provision of full reports, links with system functional etc. |
|  | Need to start creation of separate investment funds for the future operation of mission within the Church as members’ contributions decline |
|  | Other financial resources/ tools for congregations would be valued eg budget planning kit |
|  | Review of process for remuneration of retired and locum pastors needed – needed by an external party; currently some inflexibility and loyalty not rewarded |
|  | The regular ‘sweeps’ of funds from local accounts need to be explained to assist understanding of use and deployment, at local level eg ‘payroll’, ‘superannuation’ or what? |
|  | More work needed in this Churchwide service area on centralised management of broader financial tasks and facilities management, for those not in North Adelaide precinct |

1. **Information and Communications Technology Department**

*(N= 110 of which 32 are ‘No comment’, or ‘No impact’ as a response.)*

*(Note: There is no correlation between items in the Positive column and those adjacent in the Negative column).*

Some of the comments made under this heading indicate confusion between the roles/ services of the Communications Department and the ICT Department, e.g. provision of websites.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Positive Themes | Negative Themes/ Improvements Sought |
| Sharepoint working reasonably well for meeting papers | Load time for websites is slow |
| Skype supporting Committees to meet virtually and not have to all travel = more efficient for them, less impact, and less cost | Need maintenance support and ways of supporting those less proficient and more remote |
| Having a centralised resource on which to call for tech support or advice is much appreciated | Skype for Business not as efficient as Skype; lots of downtime to get all members on for a meeting |
| Web-hosting appreciated; working well | Sharepoint does not meet more specialised needs of some departments; is not a substitute for a corporate records management system |
| Single sign on and LCA email are much appreciated | Having to pay for extra supports. Eg when a new staffer begins, is not appreciated |
| Very helpful service support and training provided by the team; very prompt and friendly service support  | Supports for those less technologically proficient with things like Sharepoint are needed; high levels of frustration reported by a minority; induction of Committee/Board members recommended at start up/ new members |
| LAMP access is positive | Support demands are increasing; lack of completion of tasks is a negative in what is otherwise a helpful service |
| Interaction of members in Church groups is much easier and a great saving of efforts all round; much appreciated; Committees are more efficient | Reliability of systems is a problem; equipment needs upgrade to be most efficient |
| Advice and support for securing Church data has been appreciated and reduced risks | Tech mechanisms for Intragroup interactions between meetings would be appreciated |
| Reduction efforts for Spam are appreciated  | Could ICT have remote access to computers to assist those less proficient to troubleshoot? |
| LCA Shared Drives are helpful | ICT Department may not be able to handle the increasing and specialised areas of demand; some tailored solutions are needed to sit alongside the broad organisational system needs |
|  | Roll out and implementation of new systems is slow and frustrating |
|  | Access to Group Data Account in future world of NBN would be appreciated |
|  | General training on use of computers, data security, uses of social media, software etc would be appreciated |
|  | Resource capacity to assist with project oriented IT work would be valuable to departments and also other parts of the Church |
|  | Establish service level agreements to be transparent about service provision and costs. |

**Analysis of results using quantitative data**

In assessing performance against some of the evaluation criteria (such as Provision of Churchwide, Service-Orientated functions and Efficiencies Gained) it has also been possible to test some matters cited as Achievements, with quantifiable data.

(Reading of this section should be supplemented with the qualitative feedback summary reported in Section C, Table 1, which highlights the positive outcomes of these efficiencies, e.g. how time saved is now being spent.)

Examples indicating efficiencies gained and churchwide focus, include the following (as at March 2018).

1. Reduction in the number of bodies directly accountable to GCC from 20 to five key Boards.
2. Improved deployment of the Church’s ‘management’ resource has been achieved as demonstrated by the timely implementation of (more complex) 2015 Synod Resolutions and a reduction in the number of Synod Resolutions required.
3. Separation of the work of the interim Board for Local Mission into two committees: More hours now spent on Cross-Cultural Ministry resulting in improvements in accountability for grants, the development of resources, and the submission to the Federal Government’s discussion on strengthening immigrations laws.
4. Separation of the work of the interim Board for Local Mission into two committees: Allows more events to be planned and resources deployed to Cross-Cultural Ministry and New and Renewing Churches.
5. Roll-out of 566 auto-generated one-page congregation websites, a free service for congregations (Churchwide integration website project: to achieve greater effectiveness, efficiency, functionality, useability, brand and message consistency).
6. Consistent growth in requests for eNews services from departments and Districts (16 lists in 2014; 34 in 2017); extremely low (<0.3%) unsubscribe rate.
7. Reduced staff turnover will be possible to monitor in future, due to improved local practice as a result of engagement between Church Worker Support Department and local congregations. (This is likely to be fully realised over longer term; current accessible data does not allow accurate classification of all workers and pastors.) Turnover in 2016 was higher than usual because of the resolution of some long-standing people matters within the Church ‘workforce’, after the appointment of the Manager, Church Worker Support.

Baseline data for 2017 and a consistent formula for calculation will be possible from now on, as the implementation of the HRS system provides for more accurate capture and categorisation of all Church workers. This will support trend analysis of turnover from 2017 onwards. Data for 2015 and 2016 was not clearly measured on the same baselines, eg volunteers and expected completions of contract may have been included but are now too difficult to extract from the historical data.

1. Increased reach of central finance and administration services, implemented via HRS system (though HRS not itself an outcome of 2015 Synod) eg Coverage of payroll (now 80% of LCA workers), leave management services. As a result of HRS = 1400 persons managed per pay, with 99%+ accuracy (Cf 65 persons in 2015). (That there has been some ‘pain’ to achieve this is recognised. Reported service ‘glitches’ have been progressively resolved and local familiarity with the information and processes required is growing.)
2. Transfer Fund centralised ($1M costs pa) = more efficiency in negotiations possible; improved oversight; less administration at district offices.
3. Numbers of non-national office entities supported eg Lutheran Archives, SA, NSW and Victorian Districts, ALC (covering 88 staff).
4. Numbers of congregations supported = 109 separate hosted accounts.
5. Microsoft licence negotiation as a national Not for Profit (NFP) organisation = saving of $20K per month cf. individual District expense levels.

In terms of Governing Bodies, it has also been possible to examine the effects of the shift to competency-based Boards and Committees, on representation statistics.

Though not a perfect analysis because some of the data (particularly around church membership numbers) is uncertain to a degree, and it was really only the restructured boards/committees that have been fully subject to the competencies-based approach. The other weakness is that Nominations Committee can only choose from who nominates for vacancies. With these provisos the representation analysis shows:

The breakdown of governing body representation by District (LCA membership in the District as a percentage of the whole LCA membership) is:

SA/NT:   55% (50%)

Qld:        14% (30%)

NSW:         5% (4%)

Vic/Tas:  17% (14%)

WA:          4% (1%)

NZ:            4% (1%)

Queensland is well under-represented but this not entirely due to over-representation from SA/NT, but fairly well shared among the other Districts.

Of those bodies that are new and been appointed under the new system a similar pattern emerges:

SA/NT:  48% (50%)

Qld:       11% (30%)

NSW:       7% (4%)

Vic/Tas:  22% (14%)

WA:         11% (1%)

NZ:             0% (1%).

Given the small sample, even a relatively small number of Western Australia representatives skews their percentage relative to their size. Queensland remains well under-represented; the balance of (their) numbers is shared among the other Districts.

**Key Findings**

Though not universal, the majority of entities and persons who participated in the Evaluation of Trial Structures for Governing Bodies, indicate the moves as positive, with a further grouping indicating no effect as yet. For many others, such as Synod representatives from 2015, the majority indicate ‘no impact’, at least yet.

The positive perspective of the changes is strongly stated by certain respondents – GCC, Office of the Bishop, District Bishops and Administrators, national office personnel, and half of the Boards/Commissions and Committees. Comments in both focus groups and survey indicate a need to continue implementation to reap the full benefits.

**Key positive findings include:**

* Key Leaders of the Church (GCC, LCA Bishop, District Bishops) report time efficiencies in their work as a result of:
	+ Fewer reporting bodies
	+ Clearer connections points
	+ Establishment of departments such as Church Worker Support, and the consistency of policy and practice that is developing through it.

This has enabled greater focus on missional work.

Department Managers also report fewer Board/Committee meetings of shorter duration, which results in time efficiencies to handle the additional scope of work now performed.

* Administration in Districts and congregations is gradually being standardised and streamlined and this is creating efficiencies for District Administrators; this is also enabling the Key Leaders (above) to start a shift in their focus from compliance and risk management, to strategic matters for the Church. Various Boards and Committees report the positive flow on effect of this with their increased engagement from either the Bishop or GCC.
* Various churchwide services are progressively increasing their scope of work, with the Communications Department, Finance and Administration and ICT Departments already undertaking large volume work for the church; these areas are markedly improved over past performance, though there is more to be done. Progress to date is reducing the burden on congregations, improving the consistency of branding, promotion of the Church’s messages and services, and delivering efficiencies in service and cost per transaction. The removal of administration from Districts and congregations is gradually allowing their few resources to focus on missional work, but this is variable at present in terms of the positive impacts felt. For some, including entities such as ALWS, Lutheran Archives and ALC, the transition of systems and processes underpinning these shifts, particularly in the areas of finance/ payroll and technological support is causing concerns over loss of past or needed levels of service.
* The risk profile of the Church has been fundamentally improved.
* The skills available to the Church via its Boards, Committees and Commissions is very valuable and substantially more fit for purpose (this also assist effective risk management).
* The profile of Local Mission has been substantially developed within the Church, with increased linkages across the many entities and programs that deal with this at national levels. The majority of related Committees indicate the establishment of a Local Mission Department has had a positive impact. The strategic positioning and integration of goals and activities in Local Mission is still to come, as is integrated work on Local Mission with the Districts and congregations.
* The amount of time spent with focus on Cross-Cultural Ministry and Ministry for the Ageing has increased, as has their profile within the Church, their production of resources and inputs to national policy and initiatives.
* The effectiveness of half the number of Boards, Committees and Commissions has been positively impacted by the changes made to Governing Bodies. Many report seeing the connections points more clearly, though the mechanisms to connect need more work.
* Efficiency – one quarter of the Boards, Committees and Commissions indicate positive impact, with another substantial group indicating no significant impact, at least as yet; significant efficiencies have been made by those Boards, Committees and Commissions that now receive some administrative support and the increased participation of the Executive Officers of the Church is adding value to the focus, decision – making and actions taken by these groups.

**Key areas found to warrant further development include:**

* Strategy development and communication of it, in the areas of:
	+ Local Mission (priority)
	+ Long term financial planning and management
	+ Communications
	+ Communications technologies, especially for education and worship purposes (priority).
* Cross-Board alignment of goals and activities under the Strategic Directions, a priority especially for:
	+ Local Mission
	+ Education.
* Local Mission Department/ Board and its linkages to Districts for formation – maintaining the organic model, its agility and its connectedness, within a suitable governance framework.
* Delivery of more impact and support at the congregational level.
* Role clarification and confirmation of information channels for Boards, Committees and Commissions, so that their work promptly reaches and informs the decision-makers, and is integrated with other entities with common goals.
* Taking the next step: Move beyond the joined-up thinking to actual partnered approaches to Ministry and effective/efficient Churchwide functions.
* Governance training for members of all Boards, Committees and Commissions.
* Policy roll-out, especially Delegations Policy and priority Human Resources ones.
* Resolution of key service ‘glitches’ already conveyed to the service providers by internal ‘customers’.
* Consolidated financial and management reporting for the Church and its entities to support governance/ oversight, accurate determinations of the financial position of an entity, its programs, related entities and the overall Church, financial sustainability and informed decision-making, at both strategic and operational levels.
* Performance in the timely management and accuracy of payroll adjustments, especially for pastors including locums.
* Communication of work plans for Churchwide service providers to increase awareness and importantly, to support District planning with congregations.
* Next stage development of the governance structures in terms of their linkages to District entities and other arms of the Church such as schools and aged care.
* ‘Workforce development’ activities for both pastoral and lay workers with focus on:
	+ Pastoral support and care
	+ Pastoral development and skills training
	+ Performance management
	+ Succession planning.

**Recommendations**

1. Continue the implementation of the changes, and move beyond the ‘trial’ status of them to facilitate prompt action and further implementation. Continue the focus of pursuing improvements in effectiveness and efficiency in governing bodies and national service areas, with a view to achieving Churchwide, service-oriented functions that support other members to use their time and effort to enact Synod resolutions and undertake mission on behalf of the Church.
2. Continue a focus on accountability in the Churchwide service departments in terms of effectiveness and efficiencies delivered, through ongoing evaluation and reporting to GCC. (Proposal for ongoing evaluation process are included below.)
3. Implement governance training for all members of Boards, Committees and Commissions.
4. Activity on role clarification and identification of clear conduits of information flow and exchange, to support joined up thinking and timely communication to decision-makers. The EOC working with Boards and Committees, to recommend mechanisms to enable this to happen promptly, to ensure those entities currently unclear in their role move into optimum productivity as soon as possible. Include Board to Board mechanisms for those with common goals eg Local Mission at National and District levels, Board for Lutheran Education and Board for Australian Lutheran College.
5. Develop and communicate the strategic plans identified as key to the Church’s continued shift to effectiveness and efficiency, above. Immediately move to a needs analysis of the communications technology needs of key ‘customers’ for education and worship.
6. Develop formal work plans for the national functions/departments and communicate them. Encourage partnership approaches as part of this. Consider a needs analysis of congregations (based on the experience of the 2015–2018 changes) to inform the priorities in these plans for ‘early wins’ in a continuing change management focus to support improvements in effectiveness and efficiency at grassroots/congregational levels. Ensure the focus on congregational support through national functions retains a strong service orientation, and results in more effective and efficient processes for the congregations. Consider a ‘work request’ tracking system to ensure accountability for prompt, accurate and complete service in ‘hygiene’ areas such as payroll adjustments and processing.
7. Develop a transparent resource assessment process and criteria to identify carefully the possible options for resource allocation to any LCA entity, and also proposed increases in national office workforce numbers.
8. Identify and implement a mechanism for continued discussion and engagement on “Mission”, including at congregational levels to ensure integrated and partnered thinking, but also to focus with congregations, on what is the core purpose of the Church.

In addition, the matters identified in columns 2 and 5, Attachment 4 also highlight details of many of the changes suggested by the various Boards and Committees, in terms of next stages of development.

**Consultant suggestions for ongoing evaluation processes**

Ongoing evaluation of Governing Bodies and Churchwide service providers is recommended as a demonstrable form of accountability back to GCC and Church members. Wide communication of the outcomes of the evaluations would be advisable to assist grassroots members to identify what their funds are delivering. (LLL indicates that this would be helpful from their perspective also.)

Some evaluation options can be undertaken on a service-by-service basis with the ‘customer’ eg a congregation which has received a new website from Communications, or support for resolution of a staff management matter from Church Worker Support. In these circumstances, a one-page service feedback form could be administered immediately (via Survey Monkey to assist likelihood and ease of response), seeking feedback on satisfaction, impacts on effectiveness and efficiency, and resolution of ‘customer’ need. Use the same rating scale as used in this study may assist trend analysis going forward. It is recommended that such data be collated annually for reporting in The Lutheran and other media, as well as management reports. Again, use of Survey Monkey for annual collation should be efficient for all parties.

For each Churchwide service provider it is recommended that simple formative and summative surveys/assessments be used during project work, e.g.

* Stakeholder analysis prior, then stakeholder feedback afterwards
* Test a congregation’s response to the planned work before the project plan is finalised so their needs are considered in the design; perhaps use ‘pilot’ forms of change management to ensure flexibility for different levels of congregational need and varying environments
* Use the feedback to inform the next stage of design
* Use the learnings for the development of the next iteration.

There may be an opportunity for standardised versions of project management/ stakeholder consultation tools that all service areas could use if the base is generic enough.

For more formal annual reporting, the existing reporting of performance against plan is recommended to continue. Increased rigour in the alignment between annual work plans and the Strategic Directions of the Church should ensure that longer-term directions can be realised. Some rolled-up form of this annual reporting is recommended to progress into reporting to Synod, if not already undertaken.

For GCC, it is suggested that a dashboard of ‘hard data’ can be gradually be developed as the Church’s reporting system capacities build with HRS. This will enable trend analysis year-on-year. Typical matters that could be monitored this way, in time, would be:

1. Church Worker turnover
2. Training completions/ days
3. Workplace satisfaction
4. Congregational/ ‘customer’ satisfaction
5. WHS incident data
6. Various workplace liabilities e.g. annual leave accruals, long service liabilities
7. Pastor development days/ units of study
8. Conduct of performance reviews; timeliness of completion.

The Church may wish to integrate other data/ information relating to Church membership and participation, so that a single snapshot tool is readily available to inform planning for strategic directions and decision-making.

1. The specific resolutions are Nos. 150205 (re Governing Bodies) and 15026 (re National Office functions.) [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. Efficiency was defined within the evaluation tools as “*Efficiency here defined as ‘doing things* ***right****’, i.e. increasing the resources, including time, that your group can deploy to work on mission”.* [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. Effectiveness was defined within the evaluation tools as “*Effectiveness defined here as the ability of your group to focus on ‘doing the* ***right*** *things’ (e.g. Your group’s contribution to achieving/ progressing the LCA Strategic Directions and achieving more results in / progressing core missional work)”* [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. Efficiency was defined within the evaluation tools as “*Efficiency here defined as ‘doing things* ***right****’, i.e. increasing the resources, including time, that your group can deploy to work on mission”.* [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. Effectiveness was defined within the evaluation tools as “*Effectiveness defined here as the ability of your group to focus on ‘doing the* ***right*** *things’ (e.g. Your group’s contribution to achieving/ progressing the LCA Strategic Directions and achieving more results in / progressing core missional work)”* [↑](#footnote-ref-5)