

Wayne County Pastoral Planning

May 2018 Update



Where are we with pastoral planning?

The members of the Wayne County Planning Team continue to work diligently to form recommendations to address the areas requested by Bishop Matano. ***Please visit oprp.dor.org and click the “Active Pastoral Planning Groups” tab to follow all of the updates and information.*** Two areas of priority at this point are:

1) Continuing to discern the best scenario for clustering parishes to recommend to the bishop, in light of the number of priests anticipated to be available. Please note, the planning team is looking at ***clustering*** parishes under one pastor. Clustering parishes means that one pastor is responsible for multiple parishes, but those parishes stay separate, both canonically (in church law) and civilly (as incorporated businesses).

2) Assessing parish ministries to find our strengths, challenges, and opportunities as we look to support the clusters with the necessary staff and volunteer leadership. In order to continue and to expand the ministries that embody our mission, and in light of the reality with our available priests, there needs to be the strong and active support of all parishioners. Surveys will be available as hard copies or by going online at oprp.dor.org under the “Active Pastoral Planning Groups” or ***www.surveymonkey.com/r/WayneCountyParishes***

What are the configuration scenarios being discussed by the team?

The team started with 15 configurations scenarios that incorporated the projection of 4 priests (not necessarily 4 pastors). Using factors such as long term sustainability, natural affiliations between communities, distance, weather, age of priests and parishioners, buildings and parish data, and potential for staff and volunteer leaders, the planning team narrowed the list to 5 for consideration. Last month that list went to Pastoral and Finance Councils for further input. Based on that input the team narrowed the scenarios for consideration to 4. The team will continue to discern their recommendation. ***Highlights*** of the benefits and challenges of each scenario is on the back, and maps of each configuration are available at each parish. Parish Abbreviations: St. Maximilian Kolbe (**SMK**); Community of the Blessed Trinity (**CCBT**); St. Katharine Drexel (**SKD**); St. Michael (**SM**); St. Joseph the Worker (**SJW**)

The full list of benefits and challenges identified for each scenario (those rejected and those still under consideration) is available at oprp.dor.org.

Configuration Scenario of 2 Pastors and 2 Parochial Vicars:

Cluster SMK and CCBT; Cluster SKD, SM, and SJW

Benefits: The 2 pastor/2 parochial vicar models offer the longest sustainability in light of diocesan priest ages; all share in the change; balanced general populations for both clusters; 1 large parish in each cluster; follows major roads; some natural affiliations

Challenges: Distance issues are the most difficult and would need to be addressed for priests and parishioners; southern cluster has fewer natural affiliations; Sacramental responsibilities including funerals and baptisms would need to be addressed; summer challenges for North cluster

Configuration Scenario of 2 Pastors and 2 Parochial Vicars:

Cluster SKD and SMK; Cluster CCBT, SJW, and SM

Benefits: The 2 pastor/2 parochial vicar models offer the longest sustainability in light of diocesan priest ages; all share in the change; more balanced attendance numbers; both clusters have more natural affiliations; better staffing possibilities; better distances than the other 2+2 scenario (though still a challenge)

Challenges: Still a managerial challenge for the pastors; not as many natural affiliations; travel for pastors/parochial vicars would need to be offset with deacon, staff, and volunteer support; more North-South travel which may be difficult in winter; while population and attendance are more equal there would be more sites in the Eastern cluster

Configuration Scenario of 3 Pastors and 1 Parochial Vicar:

Cluster SKD and SM; Cluster SJW and CCBT; Keep SMK the same

Benefits: A large parish with multiple sites would not have to make a change; some natural affiliations between the other 2 clusters; relatively easy to adjust staff; closer distances than the 2+2 scenarios

Challenges: Not all share in change; 3+1 scenarios offer less long term stability than the 2+2 in light of priest availability; this scenario puts the poorer, smaller parishes together which does not help their vitality; population and needs distribution is not equitable; the Parochial Vicar could be assigned to the Eastern cluster to support the size and distance issues. However, this would leave the SKD/SM with a significant challenge in the Sunday Mass schedule and number of funerals.

Configuration Scenario of 3 Pastors and 1 Parochial Vicar:

Cluster SMK and SKD; Cluster CCBT and SJW; Keep SM the same

Benefits: A parish with many additional ministries to the hospital and nursing/assisted living facilities would not have to make a change; good balance of Mass attendance numbers; travel distances are still a challenge but achievable; if looking for a transition stage this scenario could eventually move to a 2+2 configuration relatively easily

Challenges: Not all share in change; doing a transitional stage mean another change in the near future; only one Parochial Vicar available with two large clusters in need; does not strengthen the Eastern side of the county, especially if the population on the Western side of the county requires the Parochial Vicar to be there