The Committee on the State of the Church
(1994-1997)

CONTENTS

MEMBERSHIP

   The Very Rev. H. Scott Kirby (Eau Claire, V) *Chair*
   Mrs. Jane Cosby (Pennsylvania, III) *Vice-Chair*
   The Rev. Henry N. Parsley* (North Carolina, IV) *Secretary*
   Ms. Adelia Beltre (Dominican Republic, IX)
   Mrs. Betty Connelly (California, VIII)
   The Rev. David C. Fox (Oklahoma, VII)
   The Rev. John A.M. Guernsey (Virginia, III)
   The Rev. Marsue Harris (Rhode Island, I)
   The Rev. MacDonald Jean (Haiti, II)
   Mrs. Audrey M. King (Florida, IV)
   Mrs. Barbara P. MacDougall (Rhode Island, I)
   Mr. Robert J. Maule (South Dakota, VI)
   Mrs. Judy R. Mayo (Texas, VII)
   Mrs. Nancy Moody (Northern Indiana, V)
   The Rev. Joel E. A. Novey (New York, II)
   Mrs. Carole Ross (Central Florida, IV)
   The Rev. Thomas M. Van Culin (Hawaii, VIII)
   The Very Rev. Sandra A. Wilson (Colorado, VI)
Ex Officio:
   Dr. Pamela P. Chinnis, *President of the House of Deputies*
   The Rev. Canon Donald Nickerson, *Secretary of the General Convention*
   Dr. Rhoda Maxwell (Eau Claire) *Recording Secretary*
* Elected Bishop Coadjutor of Alabama - resigned November, 1996.

Staff:
    Mr. Raymond L. Duncan, *The General Convention Office*
    Mr. Bruce W. Woodcock, *The General Convention Office*

SUMMARY OF THE COMMITTEE'S WORK

The Covenant for the Building of Community
The Committee on the State of the Church asks each reader to take a few moments to humbly pray:

> Most Holy Father, so direct my mind and spirit that I will be truly open; to you, your word, and your will for me. Please God, empower me to witness to your love and peace in all that I say and do. Amen.

> Gracious Father, we pray for thy holy Catholic Church. Fill it with truth, in all truth with all peace. Where it is corrupt, purify it; where it is in error, direct it; where in anything it is amiss, reform it. Where it is right, strengthen it; where it is in want, provide for it; where it is divided, reunite; for the sake of Jesus Christ thy Son our Savior. Amen.
> (Book of Common Prayer, 861)

We are called to be the People of God. Yet we live within a world that seems to turn more and more away from God. Fifty years ago, Bible texts and references were frequently used to frame conversations and debate on many topics. At all levels of our shared lives, ranging from family conversations to national debates, there was a common knowledge and a confidence in relying on and using scripture, and the religious heritage of our ancestors.

Much has changed. The use of Bible references has been largely lost. Some say pluralism and secularism have been major contributors to this erosion; others point to the rapid movement of society toward materialism which has moved us away from the spirituality of our ancestors' religious heritage. We can reasonably conclude that all Christian communities are experiencing tension between God's call and the response to that call. The New Covenant clearly calls us to love one another as Christ loved us (BCP, 851).

How have we responded? Our response has too often been through sin. We are reminded in the catechism that we distort our relationship with God, creation, and other people by doing our own will instead of God's will. When we fall out of relationship with one another and with God, we tend to stop listening, our voices rise and intimidate, and our good nature is tested. At this point polarization is likely to occur in the Body of Christ. As a direct result of this polarization, we are hurt and we, in turn, hurt others, sometimes unintentionally, but sometimes, unfortunately, deliberately. We have indeed fallen from grace and need to repent and not repeat our destructive behavior.

As we break our relationships with others, our relationship with God is in jeopardy. We are called to stand in the midst of a secular and pluralistic society to proclaim and witness to Truth and Light. We are called to treat each other with respect and dignity, confident in knowing that if we are created in the image of God, so are others, even those with whom our views may strongly

differ. We, as members of the church, must stand in opposition to the trends in society that use words which deride and divide. Where we find society's influences drawing us away from the call of God, we must acknowledge the reality of what is happening.

If we are to return to a "middle way" of building, maintaining, and enhancing community, then we must acknowledge our need to be intentional and prayerful in the doing. Jesus stayed present in the midst of tension. He asked his Father to remove the cup he had been handed and yet expressed a willingness to do the will of his Father (Luke 22:42). Are we not asked to remain present in the tension of our own time and in our own church?

In Ireland at the Anglican Cathedral of St. Patrick in Dublin there is a door with a hole in it. The door once opened into the Chapter House. In the 1400s two feuding families were massacring each other, fighting on the battle field and across the land. Finally, one group fled into the cathedral for sanctuary and hid behind the closed door into the Chapter House. The opposing family came into the cathedral where the head of the family cut a hole in the door, lay down his arms, and put his hand through the opening as an offer of peace. Peace was accomplished because one dared to step out in faith and take a chance that he would not be harmed. The door is kept as a symbol of one person reaching out to another. Can our Convention do the same?

Toward this purpose, the Committee on the State of the Church calls the General Convention into the following Covenant:

<div align="center">

THE COVENANT

</div>

Recognizing that God is truth and that we discern truth through prayer and dialogue in community, and desiring to avoid untested assumptions about one another, we seek to understand our various theologies and opinions by committing time to listen and talk together with honest and mutual respect within any tension we may be experiencing, in order to live together in this House and in the provinces and congregations, and that we work together to do the mission of Christ.

• We will avoid pejorative labels for those who disagree with us. Words such as apostate, homophobe, heretic, or fundamentalist do not edify our debates.

• We will assume that those with different points of view also desire the best for the church. We are all members of Christ's Body and he prays to the Father: "The glory that you have given me I have given them, so that they may be one as we are one, I in them and you in me, that they may become completely one, so that the world may know that you have sent me and have loved them even as you have loved me" (John 17:20-24).

• We will not analyze the psychological or spiritual state of others. Jesus called us not to judge. We often forget the "others" in "that you be not judged" (Matt. 7:1).

• We will listen lovingly and carefully to what others have to say.

• We will commit ourselves to pray for those who disagree with us and with whom we disagree. Jesus said, "You have heard that it was said, 'You shall love your neighbor and

hate your enemy.' But I say to you, love your enemies and pray for those who persecute you" (Matt. 5: 43-48). [1]

Each deputy will have the opportunity to sign this Covenant at the General Convention. The Committee on the State of the Church hopes and prays that you accept the Covenant as part of your own commitment to the life and work of the church, holding out to your fellow Christians the olive branch of peace, promising your forgiveness and asking for theirs.

Letter from the Chair
Dear Dr. Chinnis, Bishop Browning, Members of the House of Deputies, and Members of the House of Bishops:

When we met in Minneapolis in October 1995, the Committee agreed to divide itself into four working subcommittees. Meeting separately and together, the subcommittees tackled an enormous amount of work. The scope of their work is contained in the reports that follow. You will see that the committee as a whole has dealt with more than just figures lifted from the Parochial Report. The Committee on the State of the Church is about more than numbers. It is charged to put its finger on the pulse of the church and to tell the church about its health or unhealthiness. It is an impartial witness telling about the good things in the church as well as the problems.

You will find herein an honest and forthright evaluation of the church — an evaluation that is independent and without conflict of interest. We urge and challenge the church to deal with the information we present. We ask for compliance to the resolutions that are presented for adoption. We ask that the Convention live within the Covenant for the building of Community, the care of which was based on the work of the Rev. Edward S. Little, II and to whom the committee is indebted.

As a Committee, we believe that focused groups cannot evaluate themselves. There must be an external body that can act as a generalist, not as a specialist, in offering observation and defining vision. Thus, we believe there is a role for the Committee on the State of the Church in whatever reorganization plans Convention adopts.

We ask for your response to our report and elicit your comments about the role of the Committee. Please feel free to write to me directly before General Convention.

Faithfully,

The Very Rev. H. Scott Kirby
Christ Church Cathedral
510 S. Farwell
Eau Claire, WI 54701

---

[1] These points are drawn from an article by the Rev. Edward S. Little, II that appeared in *The Living Church*, January 26, 1997.

Parochial Subcommittee Report

Overview

This subcommittee has worked closely with the General Convention office staff to review and reform the Parochial Report in both form and content. Primary goals have been to create a more efficient and user friendly document, which produces information pertinent to documentation of the state of the church (as defined by canons), and which is also useful for program and staff planning. Additionally, the subcommittee developed a Mission Census distributed on a pilot basis to 1/3 of the congregations of the church. A discussion of the project appears later in this report.

Background Information for 1997

The Parochial Report, until 1995, had been under the direction of the Office of the Treasurer. The abrupt changes in that office early in 1995, and the necessarily immediate concerns for the financial stability of the church, left the administration of the parochial reporting process in temporary limbo. For whatever reasons, major non-compliance by congregations and dioceses further complicated the ability of anyone to issue national statistics in any reliable manner.

When responsibility for the Parochial Report was transferred from the Office of the Treasurer to the Office of the General Convention, by action of the Executive Council in November 1995, (an action advocated by this subcommittee), immediate steps were taken to analyze and coordinate all phases of the reporting process, beginning with aggressive tracking of all outstanding reports.

Other significant initiatives were undertaken by the administration and the General Convention Office, working closely with the State of the Church subcommittee:
- Staffing needs were alleviated through the shifting of personnel and the establishment of a Diocesan and Parochial Reports Coordinator position.
- Evaluations of the form and content of the Parochial Report were sought from every congregation (through written appeal with distribution of the 1995 report forms), department heads of the national church, and every interim body; the interim bodies were all surveyed by the subcommittee while meeting in Minneapolis in October 1995.
- A team of diocesan treasurers and administrators was called together to analyze format and processes of the diocesan reporting system.
- In collaboration, the Church Center staff and the Church Pension Group began the process of developing electronic data capability for parochial and diocesan reporting.
- Extensive analysis, with the Church Center staff, of the existing practices revealed needs for revisions in programming and reporting of vital statistics.
- Consultation with Morehouse Publishing began in order to coordinate revisions of parish registers and Episcopal Church Annual reporting.

This extensive effort, beset by relentless deadlines and fully supported by the administration and Executive Council, has produced significant advances of benefit to the entire church. Tracking of reports has resulted in compliance from 100% of domestic dioceses for the year 1995, allowing publication of reported key statistics (see Compliance Report, Appendix A). Even so, a significant number of parochial reports remain outstanding in certain dioceses. Revised forms and timelines combined with training for those completing the reports are directed toward solving this problem.

Congregations, dioceses, and staff all targeted membership categories as those most difficult to interpret. Canonical changes in 1985 resulted in confusing references to definitions of communicants in differing Canons. Cumbersome forms and timelines were also identified as obstacles to compliance. The shift from three-part NCR forms to photocopiable single response pages (representing a savings of $10,000) and the adjustment of response timelines, both approved by Executive Council and endorsed by this committee for pilot use in the 1996 Parochial Report, are reflected in the proposed amendment to Canon 1.6.1.

The 1996 report form reverts to the prior practice of asking for pledging households or units, a change advocated by the Office of Stewardship as well as other correspondents. Another innovation for the 1996 report separates distinct sections (Vital Statistics, Finance), so that, when necessary, the sections can be completed simultaneously by different individuals.

The subcommittee reiterates the need for education and training workshops for those in the local and diocesan offices who complete the reports. Such training workshops have been proposed by at least two previous Conventions, and have been rated highly effective by participating administrators. The Committee strongly urges dioceses to provide this education and training, and supports the diocesan business administrators in their efforts. We also support the idea that such workshops be conducted for seminarians and bishops. This training takes on even greater significance as the initiatives for electronic reporting and transferal systems are being developed. Pilot electronic systems are being tested in five dioceses for the 1996 report year, through the auspices of the Church Pension Group.

The extensive review of prior programming decisions revealed how discrepancies have come to exist in reporting vital statistics. The addition of adjustment categories for reported membership figures described in Appendix B, as well as the proposed canonical changes, should help establish correct figures. Improved data entry and timely compliance should alleviate the problems with which we are now struggling.

As Morehouse Publishing collaborates with the staff to coordinate reporting formats, an additional concern of the subcommittee will be addressed as well. Working with the Office of the Bishop of the Armed Forces, the subcommittee will develop listings of the specific ministries of the currently reported "non-parochial" clergy.

Two particular matters involving the Parochial Reports and charges to this Committee remain. Inadequate reporting processes for Province IX and "Other Jurisdictions" remain a concern. These anomalies are being addressed under the new administrative oversight of the General Convention Office. The 71st General Convention, by Resolution 1994: DO44s, directed this Committee to report "an analysis of long term church growth trends" (Journal, 1994 pg. 291). The Committee, confronted with the administrative and statistical difficulties addressed in this report, considers it impossible to document accurate reliable trends at this time.

While we have had to face difficult and disturbing aspects of the official report systems occurring in the past few years, we are firm in our conviction that these problems are in the past. With determined openness, the General Convention Office staff, the Presiding Bishop, the entire administrative arm of the national church, the Executive Council, diocesan and congregational

personnel, and the Church Pension Group have moved to resolve the problems together, in a true resurrection experience. As members of this Committee on the State of the Church, we wish to recognize the ever-present support of the President of the House of Deputies throughout our considerable involvement.

In addition to our involvement with the foregoing process, our subcommittee undertook a unique project: a *Ministry Census*, projected to be a prototype for a triennial survey of every congregation's involvement in ministry. Information will be available by phone, and eventually internet, for networking and ministry development. This plan grew from our absolute conviction that the true state of the church is measured not by crunching numbers but by the ministry of the membership. "The Church carries out its mission through the ministry of all its members." (BCP 855) Additionally, as the focus of mission moves from centralized to local arenas, it is increasingly necessary for those in local ministries to have a forum through which they can tell their stories, and network with those desiring to learn from and share with them.

While the current parochial report asks for "Other" ministry descriptions (beyond food pantries), and the information reported has been transcribed faithfully, as of January 1995 no requests for this information had been received, nor had all congregations reported their ministries. The Committee found an energizing and exciting wealth among the accounts of ministries reported. We concluded that a simplified "user friendly" form would encourage congregations to participate in a ministry networking process. Therefore, in consultation with department heads and with all interim bodies meeting in Minneapolis in October 1995, and through studying the mandates of the General Convention as well as general brainstorming, the Committee developed a short survey form. In spite of financial and staff limitations, but with tremendous cooperation and encouragement from the Episcopal Church Center administration, the survey was developed in a scanable form and distributed as a pilot to 1/3 of the congregations of the church. To date, a 48% response rate has been achieved, with favorable reactions whole-heartedly supporting our convictions that the true state of the church cannot be assessed without the understanding of the ministry of the local congregations, and that enthusiastic committed ministry exists regardless of controversy. When programmed, the database could be made accessible through a central agency of church headquarters. This is presently being explored with the Episcopal Church Center administration. (see Appendix C for preliminary *Ministry Census* data and a copy of the survey)

Throughout this venture, we have been privileged to be supported by dedicated and skilled administrators and staff who have shared our vision. The *Ministry Census* has also served as a test for the application of scanable electronic data base retrieval for possible use throughout the church. The *Ministry Census* format itself is intended to replace the non-descript "Other" category of the parochial report, providing a substantial data base available for networking, planning, and resource sharing.

In living through the process of the Parochial Report revision, it has become evident to us that our advocacy/catalyst role as a committee has been vital. The cooperation and coordination experienced by diverse entities has been highly encouraging as newly vitalized operating patterns emerge.

Ministry Subcommittee Report
Ministry Today: From Scarcity to Abundance

In an effort to hear and feel the mind and spirit of the church, a subcommittee of the Committee on the State of the Church solicited responses to a series of questions addressed to the dioceses of the church, and we are grateful to the 56% that responded.

From these responses, it is clear that there is a great passion in the church for the training and nurturing of both lay and ordained ministries in the church and the world. A deeper understanding of mutual ministry is emerging, with an emphasis on the empowerment, training, and nurture of the laity for ministry, as the role of the clergy continues to change. This causes some tension in the church, as role identification and expectations do not always change at the same pace. There is a plethora of training opportunities to be found in:
   - diocesan schools and institutes;
   - leadership opportunities and events;
   - ministry discernment processes;
   - continuing education, with an emphasis on training for lay leaders as well;
   - gatherings of leaders;
   - deacons' schools;
   - education for ministry;
   - Alpha Course, a relationship-based evangelistic "reaching out" program; and
   - similar opportunities for growth.

We recognize that financial resources are not keeping pace with increased costs of the support of ordained ministry, especially in small congregations; in the meantime, we are called to model leadership with new and creative approaches, moving through the stress of scarcity to focus on mission more than maintenance. It is also clear that additional financial resources are needed to support the mission of the church.

We perceive the need for greater linkage among the agencies of our church to promote the selection, preparation, and nurture of lay and ordained leadership. As this paradigm continues to shift, it will be important to educate all of the people of God about the gifts inherent in each order, to maximize mutual effectiveness and minimize competition. One order should not emerge strengthened at the expense of any other. Particular clarity is needed to distinguish the roles of vocational deacons and laity.

The church is hungry for meaning, teaching, direction, and leadership, and particularly for leadership that makes relationship possible. It is this leadership that we seek to share, which, as Palmer Parker says, can build a bridge from scarcity thinking to abundance, and which is done only in the context of community.

There was a time when ordained ministry was identified as high status, even if remuneration was low. In a time of weakened confidence in both leadership and religion in this society, this role is being redefined. The clergy now deal with:
   - an empowered laity;
   - authority issues;

- the secularization of society;
- the marginalization of clergy;
- the loss of mobility and a placement process that is not always fair;
- loss of some support systems;
- polarized agendas which often weaken morale;
- deployment issues;
- anti-clericalism;
- personal investigations; and
- emphasis on wellness.

The laity is also experiencing changing patterns of being in response to:
- an increased awareness of shared ministry opportunities;
- interest in spirituality;
- sometime discomfort with values of the culture;
- disintegration of the family with the stress and suffering in people's lives;
- pressures in work, home, and play as people deal with competing values and interests; and
- polarization around issues in the church and the world.

Trends that are strengthening our lay and ordained ministries in our church include an increased emphasis on:
- spirituality and Christian formation;
- intentional recognition and strengthening of lay ministry;
- increased opportunity for lay ministry training;
- increased understanding of the diaconate;
- leadership training opportunities for all; and
- emphasis on wellness and clergy support groups.

The trends that are having a negative/stressful impact on the well-being and effectiveness of our clergy and laity are:
- an overload by demands of career;
- stress;
- institutional racism and sexism;
- issues of the church and the world;
- lack of clear vision and teaching;
- clergy anxiety about the foundational relationship between clergy and lay leadership;
- the challenge of preaching in a secular society that no longer understands the Gospel as formative;
- pressure on clergy to be omni-competent often without training; and
- 6500 retirements from active ministry are predicted in the next five years, and comparable numbers do not seem to be forthcoming.

We have identified some trends in the lists of key needs as we seek to nurture and empower lay and ordained leadership ministries in our congregations:
- visionary leadership in all orders;
- lay empowerment, and deeper understanding of mutual ministry and training for this ministry;

- money and resources;
- diocesan support and nurture for clergy and their families;
- Episcopal Search and Election Processes that are normative;
- affordable continuing education on the local level for developing diocesan resources to support clergy and laity;
- learning how to present the Gospel in appealing and compelling ways rather than turning inward; and
- training in how to comfort and disagree in Christian and healthy ways.

We recognize that scarcity is a demon pervasive in our society, with many believing that they don't have enough money, fun, time, love, esteem, or affection; however, it is the stuff of the inner spirit and inner world that many find too scarce. Jealousy and greed are the inner versions of the scarcity mentality that causes us to horde while others go wanting. It is our belief that as we continue to say our prayers, honor Christ in each other, and support the development of leadership which makes relationship possible, we will, as a church, continue to know ourselves to be people of abundant life.

World Mission, Evangelism, and Stewardship Subcommittee Report

World Mission

World mission is one area of the life of the Episcopal Church that is growing and capturing the attention and hearts of our people. We are encouraged by the vision, cooperative spirit, and sacrificial commitment of those in our church who are engaged in missions beyond our borders.

A central feature of the Episcopal Church's world mission efforts is the formation of community among those involved in international mission. In particular, we point to the work of the Episcopal Council for Global Mission, (ECGM), a network created in 1990 to foster cooperation instead of competition. ECGM links some 30 mission organizations, seminaries, dioceses, specialized ministries, and church agencies, and includes the Anglican and Global Relations unit of the Church Center and the Standing Commission on World Mission. It is a network of equals, sharing their stated common purpose, "to promote the unity and effectiveness of the mission of the Body of Christ."

ECGM unites groups from widely divergent theological stances in a covenanted partnership. All ECGM members subscribe to and annually reaffirm certain covenants which undergird their efforts. Their Theology Covenant reads:

> Recognizing that God is truth and that we discern truth through dialogue in community, and desiring to avoid untested assumptions about one another, we will seek to understand our various mission theologies by committing time and resources to listen and talk together with honesty and mutual respect, in order to live together within tension and work together in the mission of Christ.

They have also agreed to share mission information, coordinate program activities as they are able, and promote the extension of the church among groups where the Gospel is not known.

Another emerging organization that links numerous dioceses is the Global Episcopal Mission Network. The GEM Network, which is itself a member of ECGM, seeks to help dioceses do world mission more effectively by offering education and supporting dioceses in the receiving and sending of missionaries.

A further indication of the broad commitment of our church to world mission was seen at the 1994 General Convention. The Executive Council had proposed to Convention that missionaries no longer be sent on a normative basis. A groundswell of support for missions arose across the church in response to the proposal, resulting in the General Convention not only restoring, but increasing funding for missions. At a time when some are questioning the role of the national church, it is clear that world mission is widely viewed as one of its priority functions.

In 1995, the Episcopal Church was privileged to host a conference sponsored by the Anglican Consultative Council to assess progress at the mid-point of the Decade of Evangelism. Called Global Conference on Dynamic Evangelism, or G-CODE, this gathering brought together delegates and observers from throughout the Communion. Keynoted by the Archbishop of Canterbury, the conference featured reports on the creative and effective evangelistic ministries being done around the world. Many Americans in attendance saw themselves connected with the Anglican Communion in ways they had not known before. They became aware of their Anglican family and were excited about what God is doing across the globe.

The G-CODE conference underscores the relationship between evangelism and world mission and the need for these two efforts to be more closely linked. We strongly urge greater coordination between the world mission community and those engaged in domestic evangelism. This is especially important as ECUSA receives more and more missionaries from our Anglican partners. We are seeing that God is sending missionaries to us, not only on friendship visits, as valuable as they are, but also to do direct evangelism in the United States.

World mission is no longer restricted to a north-to-south pattern, that is, from the developed to the developing world. Mission is now from everywhere to everywhere. While career missionaries remain the backbone of mission strategy, short-term missions are growing exponentially. Many members of our church, both youth and adults, are transformed by the experience of serving Christ for a few weeks in a cross-cultural context. Technological developments, particularly in electronic communications, are making possible closer linkages with our sisters and brothers in Christ throughout the world.

One of the emerging trends across denominational lines is the growing commitment to present the good news of Christ in word and deed to unreached peoples; that is, people who have no indigenous church able to carry out the ministry of Christ. These are the least evangelized peoples of the world and increasingly, as evidenced by one of the Covenants of the Episcopal Council for Global Mission, the church is turning its attention to this long neglected area of world mission. Similarly, we are encouraged that the Convocation of the American Churches in Europe is beginning to explore evangelism of the indigenous peoples in the places it serves.

We also note the plight of the suffering church, those of our brothers and sisters who seek to be faithful to Christ in the face of overwhelming adversity of war, poverty, famine, and persecution.

Many in the West have little understanding of the pressures experienced by Christians who live in nations where their worship is restricted, their evangelism is prohibited, and their civil rights are denied. We must call for guaranteed human rights for all and we must be faithful in prayer for those who suffer.

Evangelism

In 1993, the members of the Partners in Mission Consultation reported that they found the ECUSA so issue-driven as to be nearly immobilized. Sadly, there is still much truth in that observation. The report on our church's evangelistic work at the G-CODE conference was seen by many to stand in stark contrast to what was heard about other parts of the Communion. The dynamism and zeal for proclamation of the Gospel so evident among our Anglican partners seems lacking in the United States.

Our church needs to be evangelized. Only then will we be instruments of transformation for our communities, offering love and hope and new life in Christ. We urge a renewed commitment to the Decade of Evangelism. As the Most Rev. George L. Carey, Archbishop of Canterbury, said at G-CODE, "Evangelism is not incidental to the life of the Church; it is fundamental to it. A church which does not engage in God's work of reconciliation is simply a disobedient church." If we are to fulfill our calling, we must learn from those congregations in the Episcopal Church and throughout the communion which are experiencing revival, and are growing in Spirit and numbers. We need to recognize their strength and investigate their tools for evangelism (such as the Alpha Course developed in England to reach the unchurched in the community.)

We must also address the painful divisions among those engaged in evangelism in our church. Hugh Magers, the new evangelism officer, has called for closer relationships with the evangelical and charismatic wing noting that "their energy, prayer, interest, and personal involvement are vital." We echo that call and urge that every effort be made toward reconciliation and cooperation among all evangelistic groups in our church.

We are heartened that the Standing Commission on Evangelism is sponsoring dialogue among divergent ministries to explore a covenanted evangelism coalition along the lines of the Episcopal Council for Global Mission. We must stop our bickering and focus on our unity in Christ and our common calling to proclaim Him to all people. We do not deny our disagreements, but must love one another and cooperate to the fullest extent possible.

We believe there should be a greater development of the relationship between our Church's ministries of evangelism and world mission. The bringing of missionaries to the United States from our Anglican partners underscores this linkage and opens new possibilities for strategic cooperation. Missiologists widely agree that church planting is the most effective evangelistic strategy; new people are most easily reached through new congregations. In 1991, the General Convention called for the planting of 1,000 new congregations in the Decade of Evangelism, and the Standing Commission on Evangelism, at the direction of the 1994 General Convention is monitoring our progress. We are encouraged that our historic commitment to church planting is re-emerging and we call for renewed dedication to the establishment of new congregations, particularly among ethic communities.

We call on our church to adopt as a high mission priority the evangelization of our inner cities. We must live out the values of Jesus, who reached across every human barrier both to proclaim the Kingdom of God and demonstrate the Kingdom with acts of mercy, justice, and healing. Racial reconciliation and ministry with the poor must be at the heart of our work. To this end, we call for an unprecedented partnership among all segments of our church, those whose primary calling and training is in direct evangelism, and those in social justice. We need each other. None can carry out this task alone. It is not enough to write a check or to send others; our personal engagement is vital. It is not enough for the Episcopal Church to sit passively while reassuring ourselves that we welcome all. We must actively reach out with the love of Christ, going where our church has never been or where our church has been and left. We commend those individuals, congregations, and specialized ministries who have long been engaged in this work. We are inspired by their sacrifice and learn from their experience. We note, among many others, Pueblo de Nuevo, a church planted among the homeless in Los Angeles, and Emmanuel Episcopal Center, a congregation started in the housing projects of Memphis. Both groups powerfully and lovingly proclaim the Gospel in word and deed.

Our evangelism efforts must be based on the priority of Jesus Christ. "We preach not ourselves but Jesus Christ as Lord and ourselves as your servants for Jesus' sake" (2 Corinthians 4:5). We are not called to make more Episcopalians. We are called to make more disciples of Jesus. We believe if we do the latter, the former will take care of itself.

Stewardship
In 1989, dioceses gave an average of 26.3% of their budgets to the national church. By 1996 this dropped to 18.3%. While there are many factors underlying this change, it is important to understand that, at least in part, this reflects a shift from a centralized national program to more locally based mission. Many dioceses expressed to the Executive Council and staff liaisons a desire to be more directly and personally connected with the mission endeavors of the church. In light of the General Principles in the draft report of the Standing Commission on Structure, we encourage full discussion of the trend to grass-roots ministry which is emerging in our church, in many other denominations, and generally in the United States. Stewardship is inextricably linked to evangelism and mission.

In the wake of the embezzlement by the former Treasurer, it is important to ensure that the trust funds of the Domestic and Foreign Missionary Society are used for their established purposes in order that members of our church have full confidence in our stewardship. We are encouraged that the Executive Council has directed that one-third of our trust funds are audited each year on an on-going basis and that the audit results be fully disclosed.

The General Convention Subcommittee Report

Introduction
Our subcommittee was charged with examining and evaluating the health and wellness of the three bodies of the General Convention: the House of Bishops, the House of Deputies, and the Executive Council. We began our task with a general discussion; then our focus settled on the House of Bishops where controversies, which always attract attention, seem to arise with more frequency than in the other two bodies. Our subcommittee's assignment fell into two categories, as was suggested by the Committee of the State of the Church: What is working well and building up the church? and What is not working well and pulling us apart?

The House of Bishops
The House of Bishops is comprised of a large number of individuals who are accustomed to being the leaders and the final authorities in their home dioceses; personality clashes will always occur in such an environment. The bishops now meet semi-annually, so they naturally receive more publicity than does the House of Deputies, which meets triennially.

The bishops face difficult, diverse issues whose resolutions might be attained, if at all, only after years of study and deliberation. The House of Bishops is not designed to solve every dilemma, but rather to concentrate on certain issues: mission, leadership, the truth, and how the truth impacts on current culture and events. The issues were different thirty years ago: theology, churchmanship, and social justice beginning with the 1967 General Convention Special Program. In the past, the House of Bishops was controlled by a few voices. But in the last fifteen years, a growing diversity in both the House of Bishops and the whole church has changed the old patterns forever. The course of change has been predictably rocky.

What, then, in the House of Bishops is working well and building up the church? The most recent and perhaps most significant example of what strengthens the House is the thoughtful, and specifically-designed long-range plan undertaken by the bishops in 1991. This plan counters the generally acknowledged disjointedness and lack of community in the House before and during the General Convention in Phoenix. This situation finally erupted into shouting matches, and resulted in closed sessions of the House at that convention.

Knowing the seriousness of the problems and the need to deal with them, the Presiding Bishop, while still in Phoenix, appointed a committee to find a way to bring the bishops back into a collegial, healthy community. Chaired by the Rt. Rev. Sam B. Hulsey, Bishop of Northwest Texas, the committee met for the first time in the fall of 1991 to formulate the plan that would guide them for the next six years — the remainder of Bishop Browning's term.

In March 1992, the first of the annual spring meetings designed to heal and rebuild the House of Bishops was held at Kanuga Conference Center in Hendersonville, North Carolina. These special meetings, with the committee in charge of the agenda, were held in addition to the regular fall gatherings of the House. Here the members of the House began to intentionally live their theology or episcopate, examining and defining what it means to be a bishop, striving to work together as a corporate whole rather than as unrelated and disparate dioceses, discussing candidly the important issues that will shape the church in the years to come.

Kanuga's rural retreat setting and the structure of the meetings provides the atmosphere and time for intensive, in-depth work. The use of round tables for small groups of bishops who work together for five or six days provides a unique opportunity for knowing and understanding each other. Bible study and the Baptismal Covenant are the established wellspring of all worship and work.

The study emphasis since 1991 has focused on the elimination of racism to which the House committed itself for a six year period, on deep work in spirituality, on combating sexism, on promoting economic justice, on discussing the causes of women in Holy Orders and in our national life in general, on promoting economic justice, and on the study of the Lutheran-Episcopal Concordat.

Sharing has been an important aspect of this movement toward renewal. Personal sharing of sorrows and joys, one on one, as well as corporate sharing of the seemingly endless blows to the church's unity have served to forge, rather ironically, a partnership that is in itself a true blessing. This partnership, the birth of other new partnerships, and the strengthening of existing bonds are certainly causes for celebration. The House of Bishops and the House of Deputies, under the cooperative leadership of the Presiding Bishop and Dr. Pamela Chinnis, respectively, have enjoyed a working partnership that benefits the whole church. The dioceses are finding new ways to partner with each other and with the national church in mission and in ministry, in educational methods and tools, and in administrative and communicative skills and techniques. The vitality of our partnerships within the Anglican Communion and with other faith bodies in our ecumenical work is a witness to our sincere commitment to Christian unity.

Most agree that progress has been made in the last four years in restoring the House of Bishops to health and wellness. However, others deny that the House has attained community. Not all will leave a meeting with a common vision, but they will go on their way knowing they are loved and supported by their brother and sister bishops.

What then is not working well and is pulling the House of Bishops apart? Despite having made great advancement toward becoming a healthy, cooperative community, a perfect accord has not been achieved, nor will it ever be. Rather, in a very Anglican way, the House seeks to be inclusive of many different voices, personalities, and agendas, and to debate the issues with everyone remaining at the table and all having opportunity to argue his or her position, always "endeavoring to keep the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace." This is not asking or expecting too much.

Over the years, situations and actions by individuals or groups have torn at the fabric of Episcopal unity. There have been bitter competition, distrust of leadership, and a plethora of splinter groups. The House ceases to function effectively when one-issue political groups obstruct the orderly process and progress of the business of the House, causing other bishops to become discouraged and, eventually, to drop out.

The House does not work well when all do not play by the same rules, before the General Convention has spoken, or before the Canons have been amended to change our practice or tradition. The House does not work well when ordination vows are ignored or flouted. There is a

lack of commitment to the community of the House by perhaps 10% of the bishops. Sporadic or shortened attendance at meetings of the House by any bishop is destructive of unity.

Also, there is a problem likened to a family systems issue, wherein the transgressions of one strong member make the entire family maladaptive, finding ways to maintain the shape of the family at any cost, and continuing to cling to the established patterns of behavior as the only way to function. This dysfunction that countenances abuse is the payment for remaining a family or community.

The Planning Committee for the special retreats/meetings of the House of Bishops will continue, although its membership will change. Very intentionally, each province has been represented on the committee, as have opposing views and backgrounds. There are fourteen members, plus the ex-officio Vice-President and the Secretary of the House of Bishops, the head of the Office of Pastoral Development, the Chaplains, the consultant, and several members from the office of the Presiding Bishop. This committee will serve through the 1997 General Convention; a continuing committee will be in place for Bishop Browning's successor.

The House of Bishops has a great vitality and a strong will to overcome the problems of the past; these are signs of great hope for the future.

House of Deputies
Among the factors that are working well in the House of Deputies, and, as a consequence, are building up the church, are a number of recent innovations. Communication is greatly increased between the President of the House and the deputies and alternates. Semi-annual letters convey her insights and concerns about the church and advise this group, now approaching 2,000, of current events and pertinent information, all of which is shared with members of the Executive Council at their meetings.

Prior to the 1994 General Convention, the chairs of the cognate legislative committees (which are the corresponding committee chairs in both Houses) met on-site in Indianapolis in a first ever pre-convention gathering. Roundly applauded as an important contribution to the subsequent orderly processes of the Convention, plans now call for a similar meeting before the 1997 General Convention in Philadelphia.

During the first post-Indianapolis year in October 1995, Dr. Chinnis and the Presiding Bishop called the members of the Interim Bodies to convene in Minneapolis in an unprecedented joint meeting which proved to be a resounding success. As hoped, it greatly facilitated the communication and planning for 1994-1997 triennial work of the commissions, committees, boards, and agencies that study and make recommendations for the ongoing work of the church. Plans are underway for another such combined meeting in 1998. Appreciating the value of direct communication, many dioceses encourage their General Convention deputations to meet on a regular basis throughout the intervals between conventions for frequent updates on the news and events.

The excellent working relationship of Dr. Pamela P. Chinnis and the Presiding Bishop has benefited the church locally, nationally, and internationally. During the course of the Convention,

Dr. Chinnis is ably assisted by many qualified and faithful persons who quietly oil the wheels of our legislative body, serving either on-site or as preliminary resources. In 1994, for the Indianapolis Convention, experienced deputies were designated as senior deputies to provide answers to those whose questions would otherwise consume Convention time.

In addition, the Church Archives has collected and collated all General Convention proposed and concurred resolutions from 1976 onward. This data base, first used in 1994, will be on-site in Philadelphia and will enable anyone to access legislation introduced since 1976.

Large screens situated on the convention floor will allow the deputies to view the speakers at the several floor microphones. Video material, the text of resolutions, and simple amendments to resolutions can be screened, thus eliminating the need for expensive newly printed corrections.

Both Houses of Convention now require the signatures of either three deputies or three bishops (from different dioceses) to co-endorse a resolution. This practice will limit the submission of frivolous resolutions. It is gratifying that the total number of resolutions presented at the 1994 General Convention was about half that of 1991. Deputies and constituencies are responding to the pleas of the President of the House of Deputies and the Legislative Committee Chairs to be more selective in submitting legislation.

The tradition of beginning the days of Convention with Bible study groups endures. The bishops, deputies, Triennial delegates, visitors, and volunteers who form these circles of prayerful discourse value this time together as providing a focus for the work and decisions to be made as the days of the Convention unfold.

What in the House of Deputies is not working? What is pulling us apart? There was strong concurrence in the Committee on the State of the Church and agreement from others in the wider church when we sought to name our foremost problems: dismay and distress at increasing incidents of what can be described only as sinfulness. There is intimidation by the strong and the powerful; there are those with unforgiving private agendas who turn a deaf ear to an opposing view—not listening, not learning, not open to the voice of God. There are underlying divisive currents, murmurings, mutterings, and polarization. Our behavior suggests that we allow weariness, anger, and rigid positions to interfere with rational thinking and opportunities to reach consensus. We forget the common courtesies and our moral obligation to engage in civil debate. At times we do not behave in a Christian manner. We get so caught up in the political aspect of a situation that we fail to recognize the Holy Spirit working among us. In the heat of the moment, we forget that we are the church, the Body of Christ. This failure is serious and needs to be acknowledged. How the individual deputies and the House, as an institution, deal with these discourtesies and unrepentant attitudes will affect, for good or ill, the quality and life of this and future conventions.

Frequent and extended private conversations can be annoying to all within hearing range. Inattentiveness to the speaker and to the conduct of business is disrespectful and embarrassing, as is the clicking of notebooks after business has resumed and speakers are straining to be heard. Floor time should not be wasted by those who simply repeat what the previous speaker just said.

Disrespect is displayed when deputies leave the floor for breaks early before being dismissed by the Presiding Officer.

It is not good that General Convention often does not address the most important issues until the very last day or two. Committee chairs should be sure that the most crucial, far-reaching decisions of the Convention can be arrived at in good time, early on, when deputies are fresher and before early departures.

A serious problem concerns the authority of concurred General Convention resolutions. If they are only advisory and not binding, as recent events would seem to suggest, why do we spend inordinate amounts of time discussing and debating them?

Of equal concern is the felt absence of a fair representation on the Interim Bodies of General Convention of all theological points of view held throughout the church. It appears to more than a few deputies that "conservatives" and "moderates" have not been proportionally appointed vis-a-vis the "liberals."

The pressure of business and some early morning legislative committee meetings cause deputies to miss part or all of the Bible study group time, diminishing the impact of the Bible study. Also, for future reference, we feel it would make sense to have more input from the House of Deputies in the selection process of the next Presiding Bishop.

Remedial recommendations from the Committee on the State of the Church include:
- living in unity with diversity;
- reclamation of the *Via Media*;
- less vilification;
- more trust;
- more patience;
- more discussion;
- more civility;
- remedial processes and resources if necessary; and
- the "Talk it Out, Check it Out" booth, as in 1979.

Executive Council
The Executive Council has two distinct functions. Its main responsibility is to be the Executive Council for the General Convention. The Canons describe this duty in Title I.4.1(a) as carrying out the program and policies adopted by the General Convention:

> *The Executive Council shall have charge of the unification, development, and prosecution of the Missionary, Educational, and Social Work of the Church, and of such other work as may be committed to it by the General Convention.*

Its other capacity is to act as the Board of Directors of the Domestic and Foreign Missionary Society, the corporate legal entity of the Episcopal Church, U.S.A. The Canons state in Title I.4.2(f):

> *the Council shall have the power to direct the disposition of the moneys and other*
> *property of said Society in accordance with the provisions of this canon and the orders*
> *and budgets adopted or approved by the General Convention.*

The Executive Council was not as closely scrutinized for this report as were the House of Deputies and the House of Bishops. The opinions registered here are a compilation of the responses to an informal questionnaire by Council members. Rather than asking, "What is working well and building up the church?" we asked, "What do you think is the most significant accomplishment of the Executive Council over these last three years?"

Almost 100% of the replies named the 1996 Diocesan Consultations as the Council's most important work of the triennium. The visiting teams were made up of one member of the Executive Council and one member of the Presiding Bishop's staff. Ninety-five dioceses have participated in these "Conversations at the Crossroads" to date; over 3,300 diocesan leaders have met with the Council/staff teams to discuss priorities and how developing partnerships between and among dioceses and our national resources can achieve our goals in mission and ministry. Discussions were held in each diocese as to the role of the Episcopal Church within the Anglican Communion and the structure and function of the nine Provinces. Twelve specific recommendations have emerged from the 240 reports of hundreds of hours of conversations and ministry site visits. Some of these recommendations can be implemented immediately. Others will be phased in as part of the 1998-2000 triennial budget.

Other significant accomplishments over these last three years include providing stable and mature leadership for the church while it dealt with the defalcation of 2.2 million dollars. The resultant reorganization of the Office of the Treasurer has proved to be a blessing for the church, bringing in superb new personnel, a new auditing committee, new systems, and vastly improved functions.

Anti-racism training and initiatives have been a major part of the Council's work. Responding in constructive ways to rampant racism, to budgetary constraints, to scandal and tragedy, and to the variety of problems is itself a significant accomplishment.

The criticism most often heard of Executive Council's performance is that it lacks adequate investigative looks at reports from the Church Center, especially from the programmatic and financial areas. This judgment demands more proactive roles of Council members as the executives of the General Conventions and more statements to the church at large as to the stands it takes on crucial issues.

FINANCIAL REPORT FOR THE 1995-97 TRIENNIUM

	1995	*1996*	*1997*
Income	$19,688	$20,156	$20,156
Expenses			
Administration	$174	$4,239	$3,545
Subcommittees	1,464	4,508	112
Full Committee	9,433	9,541	2,347
Total	$11,071	$18,018	$6,004

GOALS AND OBJECTIVES FOR THE COMING TRIENNIUM

Proposed Focus for the Next Triennium
The State of the Church Committee suggests a re-examination and re-evaluation of current seminary curriculum in light of parish life and the times in which we live. The paradigm shift from clergy centrality to increased ministry of the laity has caught many clergy (and lay) persons unprepared to move to a new place of understanding.

The Committee also discussed the benefits gained by parish leadership through a five year parish plan that would provide evaluation of clergy and lay leaders. Such a plan would be positive in nature and outline areas of growth needed by clergy and lay persons alike. The plan would also help develop opportunities to strengthen mutual ministry in the congregation.

BUDGET APPROPRIATION

	1998	*1999*
Expenses	$24,000	$42,000

RESOLUTIONS

Resolution A130 Committee on the State of the Church Budget Appropriation
1 *Resolved*, the House of _____ concurring, That there be appropriated from the budget of the
2 General Convention the sum of $66,000 for the Triennium for the expenses of the Committee on
3 the State of the Church.

Resolution A131 Amend Canon I.6: Parochial and Diocesan Report Instructions
1 *Resolved*, the House of _____ concurring, That Canon 1.6, "Of the Mode of Securing an
2 Accurate View of the State of This Church" be amended as follows:
3 Sec. 1. A report of every Parish and other Congregation of this Church shall be prepared annually
4 for the year ending December 31 preceding, upon the blank form prepared by the Executive
5 Council and approved by the Committee on the State of the Church, and shall be sent in duplicate
6 not later than February 1 *March 1* to the Bishop of the Diocese, or, where there is no Bishop, to

7 the Secretary of the Diocese. The Bishop or the Secretary, as the case may be, shall ~~send the~~
8 ~~duplicate~~ *keep a photo*copy *and send the original* to the Executive Council not later than ~~March 1~~
9 *May 1.* In every Parish the preparation and delivery of this report shall be the joint duty of the
10 Rector and the Vestry; and in every other Congregation the duty of the Minister in charge thereof.
11 This report shall include the following information:

12 *(1)* the number of baptisms, confirmations, marriages and burials during the year; the total
13 number of adult baptized members; baptized members under 16 years of age, and total number of
14 baptized members, the total number of ~~confirmed~~ adult communicants in good standing, the total
15 number of ~~confirmed~~ communicants in good standing under 16 years of age, and the total number
16 of ~~confirmed~~ communicants in good standing*; and the total number of confirmed, adult*
17 *communicants.*
18 [No change in (2),(3), and (4)]; and be it further
19 *Resolved,* That Canon I.6.2 be amended to read as follows:
20 Sec. 2. Likewise, a report of every Diocese shall be prepared annually for the year ending
21 December 31st preceding, upon the blank form prepared by the Executive Council and approved
22 by the Committee on the State of the Church, and shall be sent, not later than ~~February 1st~~
23 *April 1,* to the Executive Council. [Remainder of Canon I.6.2 is unchanged.]

Explanation
The resolution seeks to revise this section of Canon I.6.1. in accordance with Canon 1.17.3(a).,
"Of Regulations Respecting the Laity", which reads as follows "All communicants of this Church
who for the previous year have been faithful in corporate worship, unless for good cause
prevented, and have been faithful in working, praying and giving for the spread of the Kingdom of
God, are to be considered communicants in good standing.

Confusion has resulted from prior years parochial reports and instructions which has included
"confirmed" in accordance with Canon I.6.1, when counting "members in good standing" defined
as per Canon I.17.3. "Confirmed" was eliminated from the definition by canonical amendment in
1985 and the "effective date of this amendment was established as January 1, 1986 so as to allow
the several interim bodies of General Convention ample opportunity to review the effect of this
amendment on the entire body of the Canons and prepare appropriate remedial legislation and to
allow the Dioceses opportunity to adjust their canons."[2] The Committee affirms this action but
recommends that the classification of "confirmed *adult* communicant" be counted as well as those
"communicants in good standing".

And, further, this resolution seeks to amend the annual diocesan and parochial reporting
deadlines and procedures in Canon 1.6.1 and I.6.2 to improve reporting and compliance.

---

[2] *The Annotated Constitution and Canons, 1991 Supplement,* White and Dykman, page 35.

Resolution A132 Refine Long Term Growth Trends Analysis

1 *Resolved*, the House of _____ concurring, That the Committee on the State of the Church and
2 other appropriate resources continue to develop and refine the analysis of long term church growth
3 trends and report to the 73rd General Convention.

Resolution A133 Executive Council to Refine Statistical and Ministry Census Reporting

1 *Resolved*, the House of _____ concurring, That this 72nd General Convention commends the
2 Office of General Convention and the Church Pension Group for their extraordinary work of
3 addressing the deficiencies of data gathering for statistical reporting of the State of the Church;
4 and be it further
5 *Resolved* that the Executive Council continue the process of priority support for further refinement
6 of statistical and ministry census reporting pertinent to the discernment of the State of the Church.

Resolution A134 Education of the Laity

1 *Resolved*, the House of _____ concurring, That the Commission on Ministry or other
2 appropriate body in each diocese be urged to provide resources (financial, human, printed or
3 electronic) for the education of the laity for ministry.

Resolution A135 Covenant Signatories to Appear in Journal

1 *Resolved*, the House of _____ concurring, That the Secretary of the House of Deputies, upon
2 adoption of this resolution, circulate for signing to each deputation the *Covenant* presented in the
3 report of the Committee on the State of the Church; and be it further
4 *Resolved*, That signatories to the *Covenant* be listed in the Journal of the 72nd General
5 Convention.

Explanation
The *Covenant* text appears on pages 404-405 of *The Report to the 72nd General Convention*.

APPENDIX A: COMPLIANCE REPORT

PAROCHIAL REPORTS FILED FOR 1995			
Diocese	**(A) Parishes**	**(B) Filings**	**(B) % of (A)**
Connecticut	187	142	76
Maine	70	75	93
Massachusetts	189	166	88
New Hampshire	50	50	100
Rhode Island	66	59	89
Vermont	51	47	92
Western Massachusetts	69	66	96
Totals for Province I	**682**	**595**	**87**
Albany	125	111	89
Central New York	109	100	92
Long Island	153	124	81
New Jersey	166	155	93
New York	199	190	95
Newark	129	111	86
Rochester	55	54	98
Western New York	69	64	93
Totals for Province II	**1,005**	**909**	**90**
Bethlehem	57	51	89
Central Pennsylvania	68	63	93
Delaware	38	17	45
Easton	41	34	83
Maryland	120	114	95
Northwestern Pennsylvania	37	37	100
Pennsylvania	174	145	83
Pittsburgh	74	64	86
Southern Virginia	123	112	91
Southwestern Virginia	60	55	92
Virginia	184	174	95
Washington	96	93	97
West Virginia	83	77	93
Totals for Province III	**1155**	**1036**	**90**
Alabama	84	76	90
Atlanta	91	88	97
Central Florida	83	74	89
Central Gulf Coast	61	61	100
East Carolina	76	63	83
East Tennessee	47	41	87
Florida	71	69	97
Georgia	70	66	94

PAROCHIAL REPORTS FILED FOR 1995 continued			
Diocese	**(A) Parishes**	**(B) Filings**	**(B) % of (A)**
Kentucky	41	40	98
Lexington	38	36	95
Louisiana	51	49	96
Mississippi	87	64	74
North Carolina	121	118	98
South Carolina	77	75	97
Southeast Florida	82	77	94
Southwest Florida	82	78	95
Tennessee	47	43	91
Upper South Carolina	61	58	95
West Tennessee	37	36	97
Western North Carolina	61	61	100
Totals for Province IV	**1368**	**1273**	**93**
Chicago	146	127	87
Eau Claire	28	26	93
Fond Du Lac	40	37	93
Indianapolis	49	45	92
Michigan	105	97	92
Milwaukee	67	65	97
Missouri	58	53	91
Northern Indiana	36	33	92
Northern Michigan	30	30	100
Ohio	112	69	62
Quincy	22	19	86
Southern Ohio	82	80	98
Springfield	43	41	95
Western Michigan	59	58	98
Eastern Michigan	56	56	100
Totals for Province V	**933**	**836**	**90**
Colorado	108	98	91
Iowa	68	64	94
Minnesota	126	119	94
Montana	47	37	79
Nebraska	68	60	88
North Dakota	24	21	88
South Dakota	100	87	87
Wyoming	50	46	92
Totals for Province VI	**591**	**532**	**90**
Arkansas	58	55	95
Dallas	70	61	87
Fort Worth	58	53	91

PAROCHIAL REPORTS FILED FOR 1995 continued			
Diocese	(A) Parishes	(B) Filings	(B) % of (A)
Kansas	52	49	94
Northwest Texas	39	35	90
Oklahoma	80	66	83
Rio Grande	59	46	78
Texas	158	152	96
West Missouri	52	51	98
West Texas	93	88	95
Western Kansas	31	29	94
Western Louisiana	51	48	94
Totals for Province VII	801	733	92
Alaska	44	32	73
Arizona	65	61	94
California	85	85	100
Eastern Oregon	23	22	96
El Camino Real	48	47	98
Hawaii	43	42	98
Idaho	30	29	97
Los Angeles	151	141	93
Navajoland Area Mission	17	11	65
Nevada	34	33	97
Northern California	70	62	89
Olympia	99	85	86
Oregon	81	77	95
San Diego	51	49	96
San Joaquin	54	51	94
Spokane	46	44	96
Utah	21	21	100
Totals for Province VIII	962	892	93
NATIONAL TOTALS	7497	6806	91

APPENDIX B: KEY STATISTICS

KEY MEMBERSHIP AND FINANCIAL STATISTICS FOR 1995

Diocese	*Baptized Members	Communicants	Avg Sunday Attendance	Total Revenue	To Diocese & Gen. Church	Pledges for 1996
Connecticut	79,256	51,067	23,056	43,520,643	3,333,520	19,469,246
Maine	17,329	12,128	5,743	7,416,848	938,521	4,058,189
Massachusetts	91,465	51,947	22,940	37,183,809	2,716,665	15,516,084
New Hampshire	16,709	13,058	4,979	6,810,610	752,765	3,708,301
Rhode Island	29,978	19,256	8,161	10,425,540	1,204,939	5,072,095
Vermont	9,009	6,936	3,500	4,436,844	434,027	1,981,625
Western Massachusetts	24,347	16,261	7,719	9,897,979	603,564	5,061,641
Totals for Province I	268,093	170,653	76,098	119,692,273	9,984,001	54,867,181
Albany	24,124	16,978	8,124	10,158,046	943,410	4,149,414
Central New York	25,457	17,697	8,144	10,773,789	1,034,816	4,858,658
Long Island	67,018	43,491	19,151	25,707,269	1,416,745	10,865,132
New Jersey	56,459	35,393	19,055	27,774,088	2,246,580	13,486,194
New York	62,584	42,786	20,984	56,070,221	5,627,518	14,816,896
Newark	44,246	28,900	11,925	21,513,684	2,115,477	10,670,763
Rochester	16,531	11,689	4,981	8,447,281	569,850	4,142,620
Western New York	21,175	15,748	7,532	9,496,397	843,089	5,159,655
Totals for Province II	317,594	212,682	99,896	169,940,775	14,797,485	68,149,332
Bethlehem	17,603	13,180	5,196	7,789,771	869,330	4,432,289
Central Pennsylvania	18,454	13,770	6,253	8,355,936	1,024,002	4,377,582
Delaware	12,205	8,724	3,632	8,714,458	637,307	3,489,231
Easton	9,097	7,852	3,288	5,694,859	373,478	2,338,741
Maryland	48,244	29,579	14,456	22,760,792	1,784,308	11,644,392
Northwestern Pennsylvania	6,964	4,906	2,644	5,086,886	507,409	1,624,985
Pennsylvania	65,027	43,342	19,290	36,700,644	2,081,491	14,414,164
Pittsburgh	21,058	13,908	8,318	12,053,239	958,372	5,951,336
Southern Virginia	34,974	28,387	12,612	19,122,026	1,551,555	10,952,522
Southwestern Virginia	13,694	10,741	4,957	10,876,154	701,630	5,204,211
Virginia	82,638	60,785	29,133	52,907,886	3,222,685	30,304,769
Washington	42,208	31,681	15,892	41,306,920	1,949,483	15,059,614
West Virginia	12,625	9,196	4,474	7,839,652	1,026,223	4,152,095
Totals for Province III	384,791	276,051	130,145	239,209,223	16,687,273	113,945,931

KEY MEMBERSHIP AND FINANCIAL STATISTICS FOR 1995 continued

Diocese	*Baptized Members	Communicants	Avg Sunday Attendance	Total Revenue	To Diocese & Gen. Church	Pledges for 1996
Alabama	31,810	21,329	11,219	22,347,029	1,785,938	15,059,187
Atlanta	51,588	40,001	16,433	30,763,483	2,175,149	20,412,468
Central Florida	39,620	32,078	16,695	22,472,366	1,714,602	13,828,037
Central Gulf Coast	20,456	15,392	8,568	13,885,503	1,510,653	8,195,264
East Carolina	17,690	14,581	7,246	11,145,485	1,160,995	7,279,337
East Tennessee	17,186	13,369	6,334	15,780,343	1,003,875	7,399,687
Florida	30,102	27,331	11,589	18,749,871	1,663,652	9,801,590
Georgia	17,484	14,157	7,348	10,940,815	1,200,621	6,886,203
Kentucky	10,320	8,009	3,895	7,022,694	729,402	3,971,908
Lexington	8,906	7,571	3,773	6,556,477	861,966	3,528,033
Louisiana	19,713	13,396	6,492	10,184,289	707,627	6,321,421
Mississippi	21,631	21,370	7,773	13,192,320	1,248,158	9,053,851
North Carolina	44,531	39,233	15,770	27,744,940	2,734,185	18,614,197
South Carolina	27,111	21,375	11,011	18,104,415	1,419,599	11,643,186
Southeast Florida	36,518	23,065	15,251	19,710,818	2,060,090	10,860,815
Southwest Florida	39,296	30,848	18,286	22,805,119	2,464,876	13,283,630
Tennessee	12,456	10,107	4,587	8,615,226	812,340	4,987,881
Upper South Carolina	27,291	21,724	10,002	15,381,281	1,908,741	11,539,488
West Tennessee	13,083	8,328	4,554	10,703,109	700,367	5,850,918
Western North Carolina	14,731	12,436	6,326	10,806,605	777,368	6,569,131
Totals for Province IV	501,523	395,700	193,152	316,912,188	28,640,204	195,086,232
Chicago	44,054	35,070	16,257	28,500,152	2,852,856	18,972,017
Eastern Michigan	11,261	8,077	3,902	6,016,289	378,403	2,955,980
Eau Claire	2,582	2,179	1,182	1,568,657	190,321	890,893
Fond Du Lac	9,152	6,692	2,620	3,758,816	342,026	1,846,553
Indianapolis	12,809	10,235	5,349	11,545,158	822,953	4,232,484
Michigan	36,233	21,597	10,250	21,060,385	1,231,314	8,693,307
Milwaukee	14,276	11,648	5,721	10,130,517	1,315,666	4,705,327
Missouri	13,924	11,460	5,378	10,973,276	752,750	5,950,443
Northern Indiana	8,952	5,707	3,279	4,717,157	557,597	2,774,153
Northern Michigan	2,915	1,836	967	1,124,306	205,690	501,457

KEY MEMBERSHIP AND FINANCIAL STATISTICS FOR 1995 continued

Diocese	*Baptized Members	Communicants	Avg Sunday Attendance	Total Revenue	To Diocese & Gen. Church	Pledges for 1996
Ohio	36,417	26,805	12,120	21,442,620	1,736,914	9,774,614
Quincy	2,947	2,572	1,327	2,072,320	160,772	980,468
Southern Ohio	26,374	18,607	9,040	18,714,158	1,743,221	9,419,737
Springfield	7,260	5,889	2,923	4,784,669	571,039	2,266,871
Western Michigan	14,141	10,724	4,896	8,105,146	526,481	4,623,289
Totals for Province V	**243,297**	**179,098**	**85,211**	**154,513,626**	**13,388,003**	**78,587,593**
Colorado	36,423	29,343	13,663	19,848,377	1,428,227	9,172,098
Iowa	12,638	9,709	4,180	7,597,929	938,565	4,034,272
Minnesota	32,425	22,931	9,653	13,908,337	1,412,075	7,855,697
Montana	6,458	5,326	2,294	2,686,969	398,353	1,110,886
Nebraska	11,586	7,866	4,204	6,533,013	621,203	3,397,997
North Dakota	3,370	2,006	898	1,372,267	206,804	674,100
South Dakota	12,753	6,160	3,011	2,842,121	272,042	1,195,515
Wyoming	8,554	6,195	3,110	4,293,591	491,933	1,727,344
Totals for Province VI	**124,207**	**89,536**	**41,013**	**59,082,604**	**5,769,202**	**29,167,909**
Arkansas	13,424	11,208	5,391	9,138,577	814,425	6,108,715
Dallas	34,681	27,878	11,783	20,485,415	2,112,350	13,722,945
Fort Worth	18,097	14,338	7,104	9,366,036	1,046,283	5,441,879
Kansas	14,750	12,046	5,255	8,079,345	1,212,839	4,919,943
Northwest Texas	9,207	8,296	3,369	6,090,328	960,366	3,929,097
Oklahoma	19,513	16,071	7,018	13,431,421	1,550,363	7,320,687
Rio Grande	14,026	12,175	5,559	9,061,147	1,062,516	4,993,862
Texas	78,094	62,839	27,723	47,297,127	4,836,549	29,695,604
West Missouri	12,856	10,993	5,232	9,135,591	1,225,167	5,053,380
West Texas	30,592	23,388	10,705	20,390,579	2,446,401	11,592,749
Western Kansas	2,791	2,106	1,092	1,374,620	233,799	678,086
Western Louisiana	14,434	10,185	5,945	8,832,736	811,588	5,527,690
Totals for Province VII	**262,465**	**211,523**	**96,176**	**162,682,922**	**18,312,646**	**98,984,637**
Alaska	6,693	4,361	2,220	2,552,775	295,866	1,312,925
Arizona	29,033	18,652	10,513	13,585,500	1,607,185	7,906,889
California	29,500	21,423	10,955	25,508,215	2,283,152	11,745,815

KEY MEMBERSHIP AND FINANCIAL STATISTICS FOR 1995 continued

Diocese	*Baptized Members	Communicants	Avg Sunday Attendance	Total Revenue	To Diocese & Gen. Church	Pledges for 1996
Eastern Oregon	3,640	2,526	1,093	1,327,425	276,599	961,998
El Camino Real	15,243	12,729	5,477	8,689,864	864,929	4,804,170
Hawaii	11,328	9,474	4,117	7,006,839	1,162,772	2,871,096
Idaho	5,718	4,644	1,942	2,647,422	441,309	1,621,595
Los Angeles	78,719	55,728	22,943	41,666,163	2,763,494	22,116,795
Navaho Missions	1,486	425	225	412,078	5,000	8,833
Nevada	5,553	4,077	2,149	2,631,645	487,491	1,440,738
Northern California	19,035	15,089	7,220	9,861,562	1,524,996	6,579,437
Olympia	34,157	25,658	12,339	20,021,879	2,623,754	11,495,118
Oregon	23,325	18,386	8,078	11,875,686	1,487,698	10,230,227
San Diego	19,808	16,638	7,469	14,445,565	990,470	6,204,850
San Joaquin	10,484	8,654	4,541	6,525,255	839,738	3,605,565
Spokane	9,825	8,120	3,214	4,400,247	726,492	2,663,678
Utah	6,224	5,246	1,863	2,993,110	233,024	1,229,601
Total Province VIII	309,871	231,830	106,358	176,151,230	18,613,969	96,799,330
NATIONAL TOTALS	2,411,841	1,767,073	828,049	1,398,184,841	126,192,783	735,588,145

*Baptized Membership figures were adjusted as reported to Executive Council in November 1996. The adjustment was based on current membership reported at the beginning of each year plus or minus net increases and decreases reported for that year. Between 1991 and 1995 membership figures were based on the 1990 membership plus (or minus) the cumulative, net increases and decreases reported for each successive year. This "prior year carried forward" method was determined to result in an artificial net increase in membership, which varied from the total membership actually reported at the beginning of each year. The Supplement to the Journal of the 71st General Convention provides a table of the adjusted membership totals for these years. Copies are available in the General Convention Office, 815 Second Ave., NY, NY 10017

APPENDIX C: 1996 MINISTRY CENSUS PILOT SURVEY
(1,202 Parishes Responded)

Description of Ministry	# of Parishes	% of Parishes
AIDS/HIV - Education	258	21
AIDS/HIV - Support those affected	448	37
AIDS/HIV - Other	121	10
Bookstore/Gift Shoppe	138	11
Camps	307	26
Community Gardens for Hunger	49	4
Conference Center	96	8
Clothes Closet	287	24
Child Advocacy Community Group	133	11
College/Univ. Ministry - Chaplaincy	65	5
College/Univ. Ministry - Cong. Outreach	160	13
Companion Diocese	224	19
Companion Congregation	216	18
Council of Churches	226	19
Communicators - Newsletter	992	83
Communicators - Diocesan Paper	341	28
Communicators - Secular Newspaper	250	21
Communicators - Other Publications	122	10
Community Chaplaincies	186	15
Disabled - Blind	77	6
Disabled - Deaf	83	7
Disabled - Mentally	174	14
Disabled - Physically	248	21
Drivers	235	20
Economic Development	86	7
Ecumenical Programs - Roman Catholic	343	29
Ecumenical Programs - Protestant	499	42
Ecumenical Programs - Other	220	18
Education Programs - Adult	880	73
Education Programs - Education for Ministry	294	24
Environment	176	15
Episcopal Legacy Fund	6	0
Food - Persons With AIDS	123	10
Food - Children's Meal Site	40	3
Food - Food Bank Collections	681	57
Food - Food Pantry	554	46
Food - Meals on Wheels	252	21
Food - Senior Meal Site	84	7
Food - Soup Kitchen	332	28

1996 MINISTRY CENSUS PILOT SURVEY continued		
Description of Ministry	# of Parishes	% of Parishes
Healing Services	653	54
Hospice	243	20
Hospital Ministry - Chaplaincy	277	23
Hospital Ministry - Friendly Visitors	388	32
Housing - Affordable Housing	159	13
Housing - Emergency Shelter	167	14
Housing - Habitat for Humanity	390	32
Housing - Homeless Shelter	227	19
Immigrant Programs	94	8
Interfaith Programs - Christian/Jewish Dialogue	142	12
Interfaith Programs - Muslim	36	3
Intergenerational Programs	247	21
Jubilee Center	36	3
Lay Eucharistic Ministers	841	70
Mental Health - Chaplaincy	34	3
Mental Health - Counseling	183	15
Migrants	64	5
Ministry to Military Families	52	4
Mission Support - Domestic	422	35
Mission Support - Overseas	437	36
Mission Support - Volunteers in Mission	58	5
Ministry to Seniors - Recreation	173	14
Ministry to Seniors - Volunteers in Mission	10	1
Ministry to Seniors - Day Care	47	4
Ministry to Seniors - Transportation	307	26
Ministry to Seniors - Visiting	672	56
Parish Callers for Shut-ins	697	58
Parish Callers for Newcomers	464	39
Prayer Chain/Group	634	53
Presiding Bishop's Fund	705	59
Prison Ministry - Chaplaincy	56	5
Prison Ministry - Ex-Offenders	24	2
Prison Ministry - Half-way House	13	1
Prison Ministry - Prisoners' Families	62	5
Prison Ministry - Visitors	156	13
Racism Education	234	19
Recreation - After School	94	8
Recreation - School Holiday	34	3
Recreation - Other, Community	70	6
Refugees	72	6
Scholarshps	231	19

1996 MINISTRY CENSUS PILOT SURVEY continued		
Description of Ministry	**# of Parishes**	**% of Parishes**
Schools - Day Care	180	15
Schools - Nursery	258	21
Schools - Elementary	80	7
Schools - Middle Schools	41	3
Schools - High Schools	30	2
Scouts	410	34
Self-help Groups - Domestic Violence	114	9
Self-help Groups - Grief Groups	135	11
Self-help Groups - Parenting Skills	168	14
Sexuality Studies	190	16
Support of Seminaries - 1% Fund	450	37
Support of Seminaries - Seminarian	251	21
Singles	70	6
Skills Bank	50	4
Sports Teams	97	8
Teen Program - Own	665	55
Teen Program - Area Episcopalian	223	19
Teen Program - Community	72	6
Teen Program - Ecumenical	99	8
Teen Program - Interfaith	18	1
Theater Group	99	8
Thrift Shop	176	15
Tutoring	179	15
12-step Programs - 1 to 5 Groups	624	52
12-step Programs - 6 to 10 Groups	73	6
12-step Programs - 11 to 20 Groups	21	2
12-step Programs - 20+ Groups	34	3
United Thank Offering	878	73
Vacation Bible School - Own	316	26
Vacation Bible School - Ecumenical	197	16
Young Adult	175	15
Cong. Membs. Minister as - Church Related Staff	476	40
Cong. Membs. Minister as - Provincial Deputies	96	8
Cong. Membs. Minister as - G.C. Deputies	199	17

1996 Ministry Census

Name of Congregation:

Address:

Address if changed:	
Contact:	
Telephone:	( )

Please identify, by marking the circle completely (Correct Mark: ●) those ministries in which members of your congregation take part, your congregation sponsors or provides space for, or community based ministries in prisons, neighborhoods or institutions.

"To seek and serve Christ in all persons . . ." BCP

AIDS/HIV
○ Education
○ Support those affected
○ Other

○ **Bookstore/Gift Shoppe**
○ **Camps**
○ **Community Gardens for Hunger**
○ **Conference center**
○ **Clothes Closet**
○ **Child Advocacy Community Group**

College/University Ministry
○ Chaplaincy (to students, faculty, etc.)
○ Congregation outreach (to students, faculty, etc.)

○ **Companion Diocese**
○ **Companion Congregation**
○ **Council of Churches**

Communicators
○ Newsletters
○ Diocesan Paper
○ Secular Newspaper
○ Other publications

○ **Community Chaplaincies**
(fire, police, hotel, etc.)

Disabled
○ Blind
○ Deaf
○ Mentally
○ Physically

○ **Drivers**
○ **Economic Development**

Ecumenical Programs
○ Roman Catholic
○ Protestant
○ Other

Education Programs
○ Adult
○ Education For Ministry

○ **Environment**
○ **Episcopal Legacy Fund**

Food
○ Persons With AIDS
○ Children's Meal Site
○ Food Bank Collections
○ Food Pantry
○ Meals on Wheels
○ Senior Meal Site
○ Soup Kitchen

○ **Healing Services**
○ **Hospice**

Hospital Ministry
○ Chaplaincy
○ Friendly Visitors

Housing
○ Affordable Housing
○ Emergency Shelter

Housing (continued)
○ Habitat for Humanity
○ Homeless Shelter

○ **Immigrant Programs**

Interfaith Programs
○ Christian-Jewish Dialogue
○ Muslim

○ **Intergenerational Programs**
○ **Jubilee Center**
○ **Lay Eucharistic Ministers**

Mental Health
○ Chaplaincy
○ Counseling

○ **Migrants**
○ **Ministry to Military/Families**

Mission Support
○ Domestic
○ Overseas
○ Volunteer in Mission

Ministry to Seniors
○ Recreation
○ Volunteer In Mission
○ Day Care (respite for care givers)
○ Transportation
○ Visiting

○ Parish Callers for Shut-ins
○ Parish Callers for Newcomers
○ Prayer Chain/Group
○ Presiding Bishop's Fund

Prison Ministry
  ○ Chaplain
  ○ Ex-Offenders
  ○ Half-way House
  ○ Prisoners' Families
  ○ Visitors

○ **Racism Education**

Recreation
  ○ After school
  ○ School holiday
  ○ Other, community

○ **Refugees**
○ **Scholarships**

Schools
  ○ Day Care
  ○ Nursery
  ○ Elementary
  ○ Middle School
  ○ High School

○ Scouts

Self-help Groups
  ○ Domestic Violence
  ○ Grief Groups
  ○ Parenting Skills

○ **Sexuality Studies**

Support of seminaries
  ○ 1% fund
  ○ Seminarian

○ **Singles**
○ **Skills Bank**
○ **Sports Teams**

Teen Program
  ○ Own
  ○ Area Episcopalian
  ○ Community
  ○ Ecumenical
  ○ Interfaith

○ **Theater Group**
○ **Thrift Shop**
○ **Tutoring**

Twelve Step Programs
(# of groups served)
  ○ 1 to 5
  ○ 6 to 10
  ○ 11 to 20
  ○ 20+

○ **United Thank Offering**

Vacation Bible School
  ○ Own
  ○ Ecumenical

○ **Young Adult**

Members of our congregation minister as:
  ○ Church Related Staff
    (community, diocese, national)
  ○ Provincial deputies
  ○ General Convention deputies

Other Ministries not listed
○ _____
○ _____
○ _____

> *"For as much as ye have done it unto the least of these . . . ye have done it unto me."* Matthew 25:40

Please describe your congregation:

SIZE: (choose only one)	TYPE OF CONGREGATION IN 1990:	TYPE OF CONGREGATION IN 1996:
○ Less than 100	○ Mission	○ Mission
○ Greater than 100	○ Aided-parish	○ Aided-parish
○ Greater than 250	○ Parish	○ Parish
○ Greater than 500	○ Area Ministry	○ Area Ministry
○ Greater than 1,000	○ Cluster Ministry	○ Cluster Ministry

PERCENTAGE OF MEMBERSHIP IN 1990:

	0-25%	26-50%	51-75%	76-100%
American Indian	○	○	○	○
Asian	○	○	○	○
Black	○	○	○	○
Hispanic	○	○	○	○
White	○	○	○	○

PERCENTAGE OF MEMBERSHIP IN 1996:

	0-25%	26-50%	51-75%	76-100%
American Indian	○	○	○	○
Asian	○	○	○	○
Black	○	○	○	○
Hispanic	○	○	○	○
White	○	○	○	○

* Based on U.S. Bureau Census definitions

Our congregation:
  ○ has developed and publicizes a mission statement *(please enclose)*
  ○ has placed "Welcome" signs
  ○ is listed in local hotels/motels

Thank you for your time and attention in completing this important survey.

Our deadline for compiling our report is October 25, 1996; each responding congregation will receive the results.