

# TASK FORCE ON WOMEN, TRUTH AND RECONCILIATION

## Membership

Ms. Alexizendria Link, <i>Chair</i>	Western Massachusetts, I	2021
The Rt. Rev. Susan Goff, <i>Vice-Chair</i>	Virginia, III	2021
Mr. Neel Lane, <i>Secretary</i>	West Texas, VII	2021
Ms. Julia Ayala Harris	Oklahoma, VII	2021
The Rev. Laurie Brock	Lexington, IV	2021
Dr. Damaris De Jesus	Puerto Rico, IX	2021
The Rt. Rev. Ian Douglas	Connecticut, I	2021
The Very Rev. Dr. Kelly Brown Douglas	New York, II	2021
The Rt. Rev. Dr. DeDe Duncan-Probe	Central New York, II	2021
Ms. Robin Hammeal-Urban	Connecticut, I	2021
The Rt. Rev. Craig Loya	Minnesota, VI	2021
The Rt. Rev. Dr. Shannon MacVean-Brown	Vermont, I	2021
Mr. Alan Murray	Oregon, VIII	2021
The Rev. Kurt Wiesner	Utah, VIII	2021
The Rev. Deacon Carolyn Woodall	San Joaquin, VIII	2021
The Most Rev. Michael Curry, <i>Ex Officio</i>	North Carolina, IV	
The Rev. Gay Clark Jennings, <i>Ex Officio</i>	Ohio, V	

## Mandate

### 2018-Do16 Seeking Truth, Reconciliation and Restoration

*Resolved*, That the 79th General Convention as members of the Body of Christ, confess our sins of gender-based discrimination, harassment, and violence against women and girls in all their forms as we understand these sins, which include, but are not limited to, sexual and gender harassment, sexual assault, physically, spiritually, and emotionally abusive behavior, and oppression based on gender, particularly as these sins have denigrated and devalued women and their ministries; acknowledge that within our patriarchal culture, the misuse of power and authority is primarily exercised by men with the vast majority of victims being women; acknowledge that we have created a culture of excuses, justifications, enabling, and dishonesty around gender-based discrimination and violence; have not heard the experiences of women with the goal of justice through acts of contrition, restoration, and reconciliation; declare that we as the Church seek to turn from the systems of oppression, patriarchy, ableism, heteronormativity, white supremacy, and our colonial legacy, among others, and seek to engage in restoration of the dignity of women and reconciliation

from past acts, beginning with confessing to God and to one another the truth that we have not loved God with our whole heart, and mind, and strength, and that we have not loved, respected, and honored the presence, gifts, equality, and ministry of women, seeing in them the presence of Christ; confess that we have embraced patriarchal power, and in doing so, have exploited women and been blind to injustice and prejudice; and declare that we seek to repent and be restored to God and to each other, with the Church and each diocese declaring a period of fasting and repentance for this sin; and be it further,

*Resolved*, That the 79th General Convention authorize the establishment of a Task Force for Women, Truth, and Reconciliation for the purpose of helping the Church engage in truth-telling, confession, and reconciliation regarding gender-based discrimination, harassment, and violence against women and girls in all their forms by those in power in the Church, making an accounting of things done and left undone in thought, word, and deed, intending amendment of life, and seeking counsel, direction, and absolution as we are restored in love, grace, and trust with each other through Christ; and be it further,

*Resolved*, That this Task Force be appointed jointly by the President of the House of Deputies and the Presiding Bishop, with 15 members - 6 lay people (at least 4 of whom identify as women), 6 priests or deacons members (at least 4 of whom identify as women), and 3 bishops members (at least 2 of whom identify as women). The overall composition of this task force shall include members of the LGBTQ community, people of color, and reflect regional diversity. The overall composition of this task force shall include at least 5 members who have experienced gender-based discrimination, harassment, and violence against women and girls and at least 3 members who have personal and recent (within the last 5 years) experience working with complaints within the general Church and/or secular community on matters of gender-based discrimination, harassment, and violence against women and girls. This Task Force shall report its progress to Executive Council, present a public timeline, summary of ongoing work easily accessible by members of the Episcopal Church, and report back to the 80th General Convention on the following tasks:

-To develop a survey on gender-based discrimination, harassment, and violence against women and girls in all their forms as we understand these sins, which include, but are not limited to, sexual and gender harassment, sexual assault, physical, spiritual, and emotionally abusive behavior, and oppression based on gender. This survey shall be modeled on the survey used to gather information and compile the 2017 report “Sexual Misconduct in the United Methodist Church: US Update,” and the task force shall create said survey no later than December of 2019 and shall work with appropriate general Church organizations, dioceses, and church leadership, both lay and clergy, to distribute widely in the Episcopal Church for access by both laity and clergy no later than spring of 2020, said survey being available primarily on-line, and with adaptations made as determined by the task force to enable responses by those members of the general Church who may not have ready and easy access to the internet;

-To conduct a review of survey responses and data regarding gender-based discrimination, harassment, and violent behavior that has been experienced by those who identify as women in our church; and present this information in accessible, public, and informative ways as a truthful reality of the treatment of women; and the impact of this treatment on lay and ordained women and girls, their ministries, and the ministry of the Church to the following members and organizations of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States of America: The House of Bishops, The Executive Council, The National Association of Episcopal Schools; all Episcopal Seminaries (including diocesan formation programs for ordination); Episcopal Camps and Conference Centers; Diocesan Youth Directors; all Canons to the Ordinary; all Transition Officers; all diocesan Chancellors; and any other bodies, organizations, or committees that the President of the House of Deputies or the Presiding Bishop deem necessary;

-To coordinate and receive reports from the aforementioned persons and organizations no later than six months after the publication of the survey response report with the following written responses to the report, a copy of the same responses shared with the Presiding Bishop and the President of the House of Deputies: How their body and/or institution has contributed to a church culture of gender-based discrimination, harassment, and violence against women and girls in all their forms, when appropriate detailing specific examples of this culture that has approved of this behavior, ignored and/or excused this behavior, and how this culture has damaged the body and/or institution; The body and/or institution's plan of action within their body or institution that can bring about a culture of truth telling, repentance, reconciliation, and justice in our church; including a timeline of said plan of action; and any other questions the task force, in consultation with the Presiding Bishop and the President of the House of Deputies, deem helpful and necessary for the general Church to confess the truth of the impact of the sin of gender-based discrimination, harassment, and violence against women and girls in all their forms and to engage the process of restoration and reconciliation;

-To create a Truth and Reconciliation process to guide churches, dioceses, provinces, and the general Church as they develop their own paths for reconciliation and restoration, with emphasis given to discerning the *qualities* of methods churches, dioceses, provinces, and the general Church may implement to witness the truth and to seek justice, restoration, and reconciliation; recognizing a one-size-fits-all process will not be helpful given the diversity of our Church, and that identifying qualities for a process invites churches, dioceses, provinces, and general Church to map their ways forward to justice, restoration, and reconciliation with guidance;

-To conduct a comprehensive audit and analysis of the internal church-wide structures that exist, or are needed, to educate and inform the church about realities and consequences of gender-based discrimination, harassment, and violence against women and girls in all their forms; to develop programs to proactively reduce incidences of gender-based discrimination, harassment, and violence within the church; as well as to develop resources that build the capacity of our church to provide trauma informed pastoral care for victims;

-To oversee an audit done by an outside auditor of the culture within church-wide structures to identify systemic expressions of power and leadership that create and continue gender-based discrimination, harassment, and violence against women and girls in all their forms, particularly the impact of this system as it manifests in access to leadership, pay inequity, imbalances in power, inequality in leadership, gender-based discrimination, sexual harassment and violence, and the enabling of gender-based violence by those in positions of power throughout the church that diminishes, excuses, and discounts discrimination, abuse, and harassment, contrary to the Gospel of Christ;

*Resolved*, That the General Convention request that the Joint Standing Committee on Program, Budget, and Finance consider a budget allocation of \$320,000 for the implementation of this resolution which will provide funding for regular meetings, including bi-annual in-person meetings throughout the triennium (\$150,000); costs associated with creating and distributing the survey and subsequent reports (\$40,000) contract with external firm to conduct a culture audit (\$65,000); website, communications, and staff support (\$50,000); and expenses associated with in-person presentations of findings to strategic groups, including Executive Council, the House of Bishops, and other groups as determined by the Task Force, the Presiding Bishop and the President of the House of Deputies (\$15,000).

## Summary of Work

### I. Meetings and Scope of Work

The Task Force gathered initially in-person for two days in November 2018 in Linthicum Heights, Maryland as part of a wider church-wide gathering of committees, commission, agencies and task forces. During the in-person meeting, the Task Force had a detailed discussion on the creation of the Task Force, including the concerns that led to Resolution 2018-Do16 of the 79th General Convention. Following the Liturgy of Listening service developed by Bishop DeDe Duncan-Probe and members of the House of Bishops and offered to the members of the church, the reality of gender-based discrimination, harassment, and violence in our culture and in our church could no longer be ignored or excused as outlier behavior. The service featured stories from women and men who were victims of sexual misconduct perpetrated by someone in the church. However, simply revealing the reality of these gender-based sins of the church is not where we as Christians can rest. We are called to make a fearless and honest accounting of our sins, and then to do the work of reconciliation. This work includes taking responsibility for a long history of gender-based discrimination, harassment, and violence; reflecting on how gender-based discrimination, harassment, and violence has become so deeply entrenched in the culture of the church; and repairing the damage that has been done. A significant strand of conversation regarding repairing the damage led our group to consider what a just outcome would look like to those who have experienced inequality, harassment, and other forms of oppression based on gender (particularly those who identify as women).

We coordinated with the Office of General Convention to schedule future meetings. These meetings occurred on the following dates in 2019: January 18th and 31st, September 10th, November 19th, and December 19th. All 2020 meetings were held online via Zoom in January, March, April, October and December (January 18, March 6, April 2, April 22-23, October 1-3 and December 17). Members of the Task Force with particular insight and expertise in specific areas were in contact regularly, particularly during the creation and distribution of the survey. We also regularly used the General Convention Message Board / Extranet to update members of actions taken, additional insights gained, and other relevant information regarding the work assigned to us.

Given the enormous tasks mandated to this Task Force by The General Convention, and after an honest assessment of what could reasonably be accomplished well in the triennium, the Task Force further focused our work by creating 3 subcommittees - a subcommittee to prepare, distribute and review the survey; a subcommittee to examine, implement, and oversee a systemic audit of gender-based violence and discrimination; and a subcommittee to create a process for truth and reconciliation.

We realized much of the work of the subcommittees for the audit and the truth and reconciliation process would be dependent upon the results of the survey and the responses from various Church leaders and institutions regarding the survey results. All subcommittees, however, did move forward with their assigned areas.

The subcommittee for the audit worked to define the terms justice, truth, reconciliation, and abuse of power so that as a church, we can begin with a common language of key terms in order to enable common conversation. Further, the terms as defined by this subcommittee and the Task Force will be incorporated into the results of the survey when they are shared with the church. The survey subcommittee identified and worked with a consultant prior to and during the survey process to develop, distribute, and examine the results of the survey. More about this process is in the survey section of this report. The subcommittee for the process of truth and reconciliation began to explore various ways these processes have been used at institutional levels and the methods, practices, approaches, and resources that are available as we as a church move forward. We also discussed the various models of truth and reconciliation that have been used within The Episcopal Church, particularly by various dioceses, regarding gender discrimination, harassment, and violence.

The Task Force reviewed and discussed in detail the Report on Sexual Misconduct used in the United Methodist Church. After discussion of various options, the Task Force decided to conduct a similar survey, engaging the professional researcher who developed and compiled the results of the United Methodist Church survey. Among the areas of concern the Task Force highlighted were: ensuring the survey results were as anonymous as possible; asking questions that addressed the many ways gender-based discrimination, violence, and harassment are inflicted upon victims; and making sure the survey was available to as many people as possible who wanted to share their experiences, including those who may no longer be active members of The Episcopal Church because of their experience with gender-based discrimination, harassment, and abuse.

The Task Force recognized that the mandates of D-016 may also be appropriately addressed by other interim bodies during this triennium. Members agreed that those mandates that were more correctly suited to the mandates of other interim bodies would be referred to those bodies to avoid duplication of tasks and to use the time and creativity of all interim bodies efficiently. Our Task Force unanimously agreed that the scope of work would be to focus on creating, distributing, and reviewing the results from the comprehensive survey and developing guidelines for the survey results to be distributed to appropriate church bodies as we establish a process for a Systematic Review/Audit and Truth and Reconciliation Process.

The Task Force discussed their progress and concerns with the presiding officers in a virtual Task Force meeting in April 2020. Additionally, during the two-day April meeting, the Task Force met with other interim bodies including the Task Force to Study Sexism and Develop Anti-Sexism Training, and the Task Force on Theology and Social Justice Advocacy to share resources and determine which task force may be best suited for mandates from General Convention regarding 2018-D016. Members of the Task Force also met with the Reverend Lester V. Mackenzie who shared his experience, thoughts, and guidance in both national and local truth and reconciliation practices. Father Mackenzie brought his insights from when he lived in South Africa during apartheid and the healing process of truth and reconciliation after apartheid.

## **II. Survey**

### **A. Creation of the Survey**

In Resolution D016, the 79th General Convention of The Episcopal Church resolved to take concrete steps toward addressing “the sins of gender-based discrimination, harassment, and violence against women and girls in all forms.” Part of the resolution mandated a study of the experiences from the past, so the church and its members had concrete evidence of the scope and impact of gender-based discrimination, harassment, and violence on those who are victims, those who are victimizers, and the church as a whole. As stated earlier in this report, the Task Force unanimously agreed that this survey was the important first step for the work of truth. We admitted we could not know how to address this insidious sin in our church without knowing the scope of it in our church.

In consultation with the Task Force, the survey was created by The Rev. Dr. Gail Murphy-Geiss, Ph.D. an ordained minister in The United Methodist Church and a Professor of Sociology at Colorado College in Colorado Springs, Colorado. Dr. Murphy-Geiss assisted the United Methodist Church when they sought to obtain insights regarding their church’s experience with gender-based discrimination through a quantitative survey. Dr. Murphy-Geiss consulted with members of the Task Force as to the scope of the survey for The Episcopal Church. Dr. Murphy-Geiss created the survey using Qualtrics software. The survey was created; in both English and Spanish, and distributed electronically in the Winter of 2020 through The Episcopal Church Communications Department and Directors of Communication in various dioceses. The survey was offered in an electronic format and a printed

format for those who may not have access to the internet. The initial time for the survey to remain open was extended to respond to the impact of Coronavirus. The survey remained open through the Spring and into the Summer of 2020.

Of note is that the Task Force expressed concern that asking people who recall and share, even anonymously, an event or events of harassment, discrimination, and violence may be traumatic for those who are completing the survey. The Task Force planned to offer lay and ordained Episcopal chaplains, contracted specifically for this purpose, as one resource. After lengthy conversations with leadership of The Episcopal Church and the Office of the General Convention, it was decided during the April 2020 meeting of the Task Force that this plan was not feasible if the survey was to be distributed by mid-2020.

Another factor as we developed the survey was the very real duty of clergy to report in accordance with Title IV (the clergy discipline canon) of the Constitution and Canons of the Episcopal Church. The mandate of 2018-Do16 involves, by necessity, hearing the stories of victims of gender discrimination, abuse, harassment, and misconduct: all of which would require a mandatory reporting per Title IV. After repeated consultations with the Chancellors for the Presiding Bishop and the President of the House of Deputies, we were able to develop survey questions and a summation process of survey responses that alleviated most concerns from the Chancellors.

## **B. Survey Results**

Results and data for our survey entitled *Gender-Based and Sexual Misconduct in The Episcopal Church* are detailed in a 29-page report with tables at the end of this report. The data categories included tables for 1) Demographics, 2) Knowledge and Awareness, 3) Experiences of Misconduct, 4) Responses to Misconduct, 5) Impact of Responses to Misconduct, 6) Impact of Misconduct on Lives, and 7) Witnessing Misconduct of Others. The last survey question allowed respondents to add anything else important to them including personal stories.

After an initial review of the report, members from the Task Force met with the consultant for an in-depth analysis and clarification of data results. This meeting was recorded and made available to members of the Task Force who could not attend the meeting, as the discussion was deemed vital to our next phase of work.

## **III. Processing Initial Information from the Survey**

### **A. Consultation Regarding the Results of the Survey**

The pandemic has created complexities in obtaining and reporting information, a reality not unexpected by our Task Force. However, one of the mandates of 2018-Do16 is to share the information gathered in this survey with church leadership and agencies. To that end, the Task Force

has made arrangements to present the survey report in April 2021 to the Mission Within the Church committee of the Executive Council for their reflection and responses.

Although General Convention is rescheduled to 2022 due to the effects of the Coronavirus pandemic, the Task Force plans to work diligently to present results of the survey to other interim bodies for their insight and work including the Task Force to Study Sexism and Develop Anti-Sexism Training, and the Task Force on Theology and Social Justice Advocacy.

We would like to see the results of the survey shared with all dioceses, schools, camps and conference centers, and other agencies and organizations affiliated with The Episcopal Church, including the House of Bishops. Given the final report was completed in December 2020, the planning to present survey results is continuing to unfold as we consult with various church leaders.

## **B. Immediate Areas of Focus**

While gathering factual information regarding gender-based harassment, abuse, and violence is an important initial step as we face the history and legacy of this sin in the church, this information must lead to serious reflection about why this behavior has been permitted and even encouraged, its long-lasting damage to the body of the Church and its members, and steps that church leadership and its agencies can take to repair and restore the damage caused by gender-based harassment, abuse, and violence and ensure a new way forward in reconciliation.

Based on the survey results, the Task Force identified 3 main areas ripe for the work of repair, restoration, and reconciliation. They are 1) developing a useful, helpful, and safe process for reporting and investigating abuse, 2) developing more churchwide training that includes clergy and laity; and 3) updating materials to reflect a new-found awareness of gender-based violence, including working to develop common understandings of what constitutes gender-based harassment, discrimination, misconduct, and violence as well as to end the quiet toleration of said behaviors within the church, particularly among the cis male demographic.

### ***1. Developing a useful, helpful, and safe process for reporting and investigating abuse***

Current procedures for reporting and investigating gender-based harassment, misconduct, and abuse are limited to clergy misconduct guided by Title IV of the Constitution and Canons of the Episcopal Church. State and federal criminal and civil avenues may be available, as well. However, there has long been concern that the existing procedures do not allow any review or investigation of gender-based misconduct perpetrated by laity, as well as a long history of clergy misconduct being excused or ignored, while the victim is often the focus of retaliation. Clergy and employees particularly expressed fear that any report would be held against them, resulting in retaliation by the perpetrator, dismissal from the ordination process, removal from a church position, or being labeled as “problem clergy” by bishops and others in authority. The survey suggests that our current procedures are both lacking in protections, both short and long term, for victims and are still associated with practices of the past, where gender-based misconduct is ignored or excused or, in



some cases, encouraged, while those victimized are discredited. Serious examination of the current misconduct process for clergy and laity for reporting gender-based harassment, misconduct, and violence is needed.

While procedures for reporting and investigating misconduct are needed, as important is the awareness that prevents a situation of gender-based harassment, misconduct, or abuse from happening in the first place. This awareness comes, in part, from training of both clergy and laity on what constitutes gender-based harassment, misconduct, and abuse, and the awareness of church policy and procedures regarding this area. In particular, the data found that most perpetrators are cisgender laymen. Therefore, the absences of guidance and awareness for the laity is important, and cisgender laymen should be of particular focus.

At the same time, support structures should be developed for the most common victims and survivors of this harassment, misconduct, and abuse - clergywomen and transgender/nonbinary clergy. Those who have been victimized need to be made aware of avenues or restitution and justice available to them.

## ***2. Developing more church-wide training that includes clergy and laity***

Although past training has received positive reviews overall, the awareness of what constitutes gender-based harassment, misconduct, and violence is changing. Comments that were seen as “cute” 25 years ago to the new young female priest regarding her appearance or her body are now recognized for what they are—gender-based misconduct. Training should pay particular attention to gender-based micro-aggressions, which are often subtle but are still damaging. One reality is that men and women, particularly of certain demographics, do not have a common language of what we mean by gender-based harassment, misconduct, and violence. Widespread training would begin to help with a common language and a church-wide understanding of behaviors that constitute harassment and violence.

Focus should also not only be on discrimination to cisgender women, but also to transgender and nonbinary persons, who are very likely to experience abuse in the church while having said misconduct ignored, excused, or encouraged.

A challenge with any training is to ensure that training and formation programs are widely attended. Mandatory attendance is certainly easier for clergy and lay employees. Our survey noted that most perpetrators are laypersons, work colleagues and fellow students, which makes required participation more challenging. One counter is that the training includes a section on tactics used to respond when a person witnesses an incident. This may help begin to create a culture where gender-based harassment, misconduct, and abuse is not only unacceptable in policy; it is also unacceptable from colleagues and fellow members of one’s congregation.

Another focus is not only to limit the training to typical power differentials that bishops, rectors, supervisors, and professors are the typical offenders (although a focus on these power differentials

is certainly needed), but also to explore the more common dynamics around the harassment of service providers and peers.

### ***3. Updating materials to reflect a new-found awareness of gender-based violence***

The demographic realities of The Episcopal Church present challenges for any substantial shift in culture around gender-based harassment, misconduct, and abuse. Most notable of these demographics is one of age and gender. The average member of The Episcopal Church is older than the average citizen of the United States. As social changes bring past norms and behaviors into new light, and groups who were previously admonished to stay silent speak out, those who benefited from and enjoyed the freedom to belittle and abuse women, to use female traits as insults, who have enjoyed the financial benefits of the wage disparity, and the many other ways gender-based sins have been legitimized by our culture, may be resistant to changes and new awareness. Certain groups may want to dismiss any attempts at restoring and repairing the damage, and they may sabotage our collective work to create a culture in the church that respects and values all genders, ensures safety, and protects the dignity of all genders.

### **C. Create a Truth and Reconciliation Process**

Alongside the tasks that have been listed in the previous section, the Task Force takes seriously the process of telling the truth as necessary for reconciliation in our church. We continue this work by further examining survey results to understand more fully the scale and impact of past injustice within the church prior to starting the process. Foundational to the truth and reconciliation process are personal stories. The personal stories obtained through the survey that remain confidential may prove to be a valuable resource. We are also exploring a way for other personal stories to be told, as well as a path for those who have been perpetrators and enablers to hear the impact of their actions and/or inaction and offer their repentance. This truth and reconciliation process is just beginning with regard to gender-based violence.

## **IV. Actions to other bodies**

The Task Force members agreed that the expansive mandate of Resolution 2018-D016 is beyond the capacity and budget of one Task Force to accomplish in time to report to the 80th General Convention. We have consulted with other interim bodies and standing commissions as we determine which ones may be best equipped to address particular sections of the Resolution. One area of particular concern was the mandate to “oversee an audit done by an outside auditor of the culture within church-wide structures” for the purposes described in the sixth point under the third resolve of Resolution 2018-D016.

The hope for such an audit is to discover those adaptive challenges that face the church regarding gender-based harassment, discrimination, misconduct, and abuse. A reality is that gender-based abuse and misconduct has worked for men in the church for centuries, and simply creating training modules and a more responsive misconduct procedure cannot unearth the long-entrenched beliefs, attitudes, and fears that lead to gender discrimination and abuse. These audits require the cooperation and collaboration of those in leadership positions, as well as the trust of all involved to respond to the information and insights uncovered by the audit. After thoughtful discernment and deliberation, the Task Force recommends the audit portion of 2018-Do16 is better handled by the Executive Council and/or other bodies within the Church.

## **V. Enabling Continuing Work**

The breadth and scope of the work mandated in Resolution 2018-Do16 is substantial. Paired with the significant disruption caused by the coronavirus pandemic, the Task Force recognizes the mandates of 2018-Do16 is more than can be accomplished within the current triennium. To meet all the mandates will require several triennia, if not decades, of work and effort to make significant inroads into creating new approaches and systems that value gender equality within the church. Gender parity in leadership opportunities, equality in wages, and attention to structures and cultures that value women are significant goals that will take time.

We have, however, begun the journey and are called by our faith in Jesus Christ to do this work and to strive for justice and dignity among all genders in the Episcopal Church, as well as be a witness to equality in our wider society.

Our Task Force requests that we be allowed to continue our work as a Task Force of the General Convention for the next 2 triennia, recognizing the continued challenges the current pandemic has created for the entire world. We ask that a budget of \$157,000 be allocated to our work for the next triennium. This will allow for three in-person meetings over the next triennium, consulting fees as we develop training modules, and costs associated with the beginning work for truth and reconciliation.

We also note that we as a Task Force and as the wider church need time for further discussion and evaluation of the survey results. If granted an additional triennium for the Task Force to do its work, we plan to share the findings with to the following members and organizations The Episcopal Church: The House of Bishops; The Executive Council; The National Association of Episcopal Schools; all Episcopal Seminaries (including diocesan formation programs for ordination); Episcopal Camps and Conference Centers; all Canons to the Ordinary; all Transition Officers; and any other bodies, organizations, or committees that the President of the House of Deputies or the Presiding Bishop deem necessary. We would then continue our work, as stated in 2018-Do16, of receiving responses from these organizations and members, reflecting on the information in the survey. These reflections include but are not limited to the following:

- How a specific church body and/or institution has contributed to a church culture of gender-based discrimination, harassment, and violence against women and girls in all their forms, when appropriate detailing specific examples of this culture that has approved of this behavior, ignored and/or excused this behavior, and how this culture has damaged the body and/or institution.
- The body and/or institution's plan of action that can bring about a culture of truth telling, repentance, reconciliation, and justice in our church; including a timeline of said plan of action.
- And any other questions the Task Force, in consultation with the Presiding Bishop and the President of the House of Deputies, deem helpful and necessary for the general Church to confess the truth of the impact of the sin of gender-based discrimination, harassment, and violence against women and girls in all their forms, and to engage the process of restoration and reconciliation.

Once this information has been received, the Task Force can begin to form the guidelines for the process of truth and reconciliation. The Task Force would seek, as stated in 2018-D016, not to create a one-size-fits-all process, but a process that would invite and guide churches, dioceses, provinces, and the general church to map their ways forward to justice, restoration, and reconciliation.

The Task Force will submit a Resolution at the upcoming General Convention reporting on the mandates met thus far and asking the General Convention to approve continuation of their work for the next two triennia.

## **Report on Gender-Based and Sexual Misconduct in The Episcopal Church for The Task Force for Women, Truth and Reconciliation**

December 2020

Prepared by:

The Rev. Gail Murphy-Geiss, Ph.D.

Professor of Sociology

Colorado College

Colorado Springs, CO

### **INTRODUCTION**

In 2018, the 79th General Convention of The Episcopal Church approved a resolution to take concrete steps toward addressing “the sins of gender-based discrimination, harassment, and violence against women and girls in all forms.” Part of that resolution mandated a study of the experiences from the past, as well as an audit of institutional structures currently in place and the identification of those needed to address the problem going forward. This document is a report of the survey results, with analysis and recommendations based on the data. Because gender-based and sexual misconduct are experienced by not only women and girls, but also men, transgender persons and nonbinary persons as well, this survey included questions for persons of all genders in The Episcopal Church. The survey’s focus was on knowledge about the problem, opinions on Church-based training programs and processes for reporting, and perhaps most important, a reporting of personal experiences of misconduct, as well as attempts to support others who are victim/survivors. This study is intended to inform the longer process of seeking justice, reconciliation and restoration at all levels of the Church: local churches, dioceses, provinces and the full denomination.

### **METHODS**

The survey (see Appendix A) was created by the Rev. Gail Murphy-Geiss, Ph.D., United Methodist clergywoman and Professor of Sociology at Colorado College, in consultation with a subcommittee of The Task Force for Women, Truth and Reconciliation. Modeled after a similar survey done in the United Methodist Church which focused on sexual misconduct, this survey was expanded to include questions related to gender-based misconduct as well, and the language was made more appropriate to the structures and culture of The Episcopal Church. The survey was created using Qualtrics software, in both English and Spanish, and distributed electronically in the Winter of 2020 through Directors of Communication in every diocese. It was left open through the Spring and into the early Summer of 2020.

Because the survey was not distributed to a random sample of Episcopalians, it is statistically impossible to generalize from these data to the entire Church. For example, just over 40% of survey respondents indicated that they had experienced some kind of gender-based or sexual misconduct in an Episcopal Church setting, but because victim/survivors are more likely to complete a survey on this topic, that percentage is surely higher than it would be if all Episcopalians had participated. Still,

the numbers can be helpful in delineating the types of experiences people have had, as well some measures of knowledge and opinion, especially as compared across demographic groups. Again, an example: it was expected that clergy would have better knowledge about reporting procedures than laity – that is confirmed here. In sum, readers should use these numbers with caution, knowing that they might not represent everyone in the denomination, but because the sample is very large, these respondents surely represent **many** in the Church.

## DEMOGRAPHICS

There were 2415 usable responses, defined as those who filled out more than just a few demographic items, such that analysis of their experiences and opinions was possible. Tables 1a through 1c list the pertinent demographics examined, along with the number (N) and percent of respondents in each category. Table 1a specifically delineates the demographic breakdown of respondents by age, gender identity, sexual orientation and race/ethnicity.

**Table 1a: Age, Gender, Sexual Orientation and Race/Ethnicity of All Respondents**

Variables	N	%
<b>Age by Decade</b>		
Teens and 20s	77	3.3
30s	205	8.7
40s	253	10.7
50s	452	19.1
60s	731	30.9
70s	538	22.8
80 and up	106	4.5
TOTAL	2362	100.0
<b>Gender Identity</b>		
Cisgender Female	1608	67.3
Cisgender Male	740	31.0
Non-Binary	26	1.1
Transgender Male	8	0.3
Transgender Female	7	0.3
TOTAL	2389	100.0
<b>Sexual Orientation</b>		
Heterosexual	1822	76.4
Gay	209	8.8
Bisexual	135	5.7
Lesbian	105	4.4
Asexual	76	3.2
All Others	38	1.6
TOTAL	2385	100.0

Variables	N	%
Race/Ethnicity		
White	2235	93.3
Black	46	1.9
Hispanic/Latinx	42	1.8
Asian/Pacific Islander	35	1.5
Native American	30	1.3
Others	7	0.3
TOTAL	2395	100.0

Note that the large majority (58.2%) of participants were 60 or older, and in fact, almost half of that group were 70 or older. While the average American is 37 years old, the average Episcopalian is 57, so this sample is likely to be fairly representative of the members by age (Smith, 2019). Similarly, respondents are overwhelmingly white (93.3%) which is also close to the denominational figure of 87% (Smith, 2019). The 1.3% figure for Native Americans is likely high, as based on their responses to other questions, a few respondents clearly read the question in terms of their birth/citizenship as Americans, rather than as their race.

Surveys on sexual misconduct always attract more cisgender women than cisgender men, and a good number of nonbinary and transgender persons, often because they are more likely to have had experiences as victim/survivors. The same is true regarding sexual orientation: lesbian, gay and bisexual (LGB) people experience sexual violence at equal or higher rates than heterosexuals, while the rates of violence reported by transgender persons is even higher, up to 47% in some studies (Human Rights Campaign, 2015). So, while these numbers may not indicate the prevalence of misconduct in the denomination, they point to the persons who care most about the issue, and many who are likely to be the focus of reconciliation efforts.

Table 1b shows a second set of demographics: income, education level, and role in the Church. These respondents included more middle-income people (46.1%) than the denomination overall (34.0%) (Masci, 2014), and about 19% fewer from each of the other categories, both younger and older groups. Education levels map heavily onto clergy/lay status, as the large majority of clergy have completed graduate school, while graduate education is much rarer for the laity. Role in the church was reported in the survey in many more detailed subcategories, particularly for clergy (bishops, rectors, priests, deacons, etc.) but many and small groups are not viable for statistical analysis, so subgroups were combined as appropriate to each area examined. Also, because respondents reported incidents in the Church primarily, but also in schools (including seminary) and in workplaces (including Church-related offices), the latter two may also include a few incidents outside of The Episcopal Church entirely.

**Table 1b: Income, Education Level and Church Role of All Respondents**

Variables	N	%
Income Group		
\$0-\$25,000	188	8.0
\$25,001-\$50,000	406	17.3
\$50,001-\$75,000	537	22.9
\$75,001-\$100,000	545	23.2
\$100,001-\$150,000	427	18.2
\$150,001 and up	245	10.4
TOTAL	2348	100.0
Education Level		
Some HS, HS, GED	75	3.2
Associate's or Professional Certificate	170	7.1
Bachelor's	507	21.1
Graduate Degree	1646	68.6
TOTAL	2398	100.0
Church Role		
Clergy	924	39.3
Preparing for Ordination	47	2.0
Employees	306	13.0
Laity	1075	45.7
TOTAL	2352	100.0

A last demographic table (Table 1c) shows the Provinces from which respondents came, and the size of the churches they serve/attend. Response rates varied across the Church, probably based on the effectiveness of the dissemination efforts of those in charge of Communications in each diocese. The overwhelming majority of respondents were from the United States (only 9 came from outside the US), including participants from every state except New Mexico. As a result, these data should be seen as an assessment of the American Church only, since the experiences of Episcopalians outside of the United States are likely to be quite different. Regarding church size, 5% noted that they do not attend an Episcopal Church at all. That could be because they are responding as employees who work for the Church but who do not attend, or they have left the church and found the survey online.



**Table 1c: Province (participants' states/regions/nations noted) and Church Size of All Respondents**

Variables	N	%
Province		
I (CT, ME, MA, NH, RI, VT)	335	14.1
II (Europe, NJ, NY, VI's)	204	8.6
III (DE, MD, PA, VA, DC, WV)	294	12.4
IV (AL, GA, FL, KY, E. LA, MS, NC, SC, TN)	361	15.2
V (IL, IN, MI, E. MO, OH WI)	287	12.1
VI (CO, IA, MN, MT, NE, ND, SD, WY)	101	4.3
VII (AR, KS, W. LA, W. MO, TX, OK)	166	7.0
VIII (AK, AZ, CA, HI, ID, NV, OR, UT, WA)	592	25.0
IX (Dominican Republic, PR)	5	0.2
Don't Know/DNA	29	1.2
TOTAL	2374	100.0
Church Size		
1-49	466	19.8
50-149	1076	45.8
150-349	530	22.6
350	158	6.7
Do Not Attend	118	5.0
TOTAL	2348	100.0

## KNOWLEDGE AND AWARENESS

The first set of substantive questions addressed awareness of policies, knowledge of incident reporting processes, and any training respondents had attended. Because awareness/knowledge/training often differs between clergy/professionals (for whom it is required) and laity, Table 2 depicts responses in terms of role in the Church by percent (number). As would be expected, for each measure, level of knowledge is statistically significantly higher for clergy, candidates for ordination and employees (combined for x2 analysis) than for laity ( $p < .0001$ ). Just under half of the laity have attended a training, and fewer know about Church policies or where to report an incident. For the clergy, those with the highest awareness/knowledge/training, there are still many who are not adequately informed; for example, a full 20% say they would not know where to report an incident.

Those who indicated they knew where to report were invited to identify that resource in a text entry box. About two thirds (63.5%) named the Bishop and/or the Intake Officer. Another 6.8% named the Canon to the Ordinary, who was often identified as the Intake Officer. A small number (14.2%) said they would tell a priest and even fewer referenced the Warden or Vestry (1.4%) or the Police (1.8%). Clearly, the nature of the incident and the persons involved would lead people down different reporting paths. A notable minority (9.0%) recognized that complexity and said "it would depend" and named the persons to whom they would go in specific situations.

Respondents were also asked if they knew of an “agency” in the Church that provides support to victims. Only 9.2% (205) said they did. Those respondents were then asked to name that agency, and 125 people did so. Over half (52%; n = 65) of those respondents named something related to their diocese. The next most common response was a counseling services provider (14.4%; n = 18), followed by a local agency (12.0%; n = 15), most commonly a domestic violence shelter.

For those who attended an educational or training event (n = 1476), the large majority found it to be somewhat (44.8%) or very (43.7%) helpful. For those who identified the training more specifically, the most commonly reported was Safeguarding God’s Children/People (37.2%; n = 515), followed by Safe Church (24.3%; n = 335). Smaller numbers identified various unnamed trainings as simply “online” or “in-person” or “in the Diocese.”

**Table 2: Percent (n)s of Respondents Who Are Aware of Policies, Know Where to Report, and Participated in Education/Training by Role in the Church**

Variables			
Awareness of Policies	Know Them Well	Know They Exist	No/Not Sure
Clergy (910)	77.0 (701)	21.5 (196)	1.4 (13)
Candidates for Ordination (44)	50.0 (22)	45.5 (20)	4.5 (2)
Employees (303)	59.7 (181)	35.0 (106)	5.3 (16)
Laity (1053)	34.4 (361)	54.6 (575)	11.1 (117)
Know Where to Report	Yes	No/Not Sure	
Clergy (909)	79.9 (726)	20.1 (183)	
Candidates (44)	59.1 (26)	40.9 (18)	
Employees (303)	59.4 (180)	40.6 (123)	
Laity (1053)	43.8 (461)	56.2 (592)	
Attended Training	Yes	No	
Clergy (885)	84.6 (749)	15.4 (136)	
Candidates (42)	71.4 (30)	28.6 (12)	
Employees (296)	70.6 (209)	29.4 (87)	
Laity (1016)	48.0 (488)	52.0 (528)	

Respondents were also asked an open-ended question as to what would have made the training they attended better. The largest single group (15.8%; n = 78) said the information was outdated while another 10.3% (51) said it was repetitive of previous programs or trainings already done, often at work or in school. Quite a few respondents (17.2%; n = 85) named various topics that should be included or covered more fully, the most common being 1. boundaries, 2. power dynamics, 3. definitions and rules, and 4. reporting processes and enforcement. A few (9.3%; n = 46) hoped to see more case studies and get handouts while others (8.1%; n = 40) would like to have more interaction and group activities. A notable minority (6.7%; n = 33) noted the poor quality of the facilitator.

## EXPERIENCES OF MISCONDUCT

Table 3 lists the percentages (numbers) of respondents who reported having experienced any misconduct at all, as well as those who experienced misconduct in an Episcopal Church setting, broken down into multiple subcategories. Variable categories are listed by number of respondents, highest to lowest. Cramer's V scores for strength of association are noted where statistically significant. Note that in some cases, variable categories had to be combined for the analysis. Where there is no association, not significant (n.s.) appears.

**Table 3: Percent (n)s of Respondents Who Experienced Misconduct at All/In an Episcopal Church Setting by Demographic**

Variables	At All	In Church Setting
<b>Gender Identity</b>		
Cisgender Female (1608)	90.2 (1451)	45.7 (735)
Cisgender Male (740)	85.4 (632)	31.9 (236)
Non-Binary (26)	84.6 (22)	61.5 (16)
Transgender Male (11)	87.5 (7)	50.0 (4)
Transgender Female (7)	71.4 (5)	71.4 (5)
V/p for FC v MC v NB/MT/FT	.071/0.0008	.151/<.0001
<b>Sexual Orientation</b>		
Heterosexual (1822)	88.4 (1610)	39.5 (720)
Gay (224)	87.9 (197)	44.6 (100)
Lesbian (111)	90.1 (100)	58.6 (65)
Bisexual (143)	91.6 (131)	55.9 (80)
Queer (17)	100.0 (17)	94.1 (16)
V/p for H v GLBQ	n.s.	.101/<.0001
<b>Race</b>		
White (2287)	88.9 (2033)	41.8 (957)
Black (47)	87.2 (41)	42.6 (20)
Hispanic/Latinx (45)	86.7 (39)	51.1 (23)
Asian (34)	79.4 (27)	32.4 (11)
Native American (32)	87.5 (28)	46.9 (15)
V/p for W v. People of Color (POC)	n.s.	n.s.
<b>Age Group</b>		
60 (1373)	57.7 (792)	34.7 (476)
40-59 (705)	88.5 (624)	50.1 (353)
18-39 (282)	86.2 (243)	56.0 (158)
V/p	.210/<.0001	.175/<.0001
<b>Role in the Church</b>		
Laity (1075)	88.5 (951)	24.6 (264)
Clergy (924)	89.7 (829)	61.5 (568)
Employees (306)	89.2 (273)	44.4 (136)
Candidates (47)	87.2 (41)	57.4 (27)
V/p	n.s.	.347/.000

Note that there is no difference by race in either category, and regarding sexual orientation and role in the Church, differences only exist for experience of misconduct in Church settings. Where there are differences, cisgender women are most likely to have experienced any misconduct at all, but transgender/nonbinary persons are most likely to have experienced it in a Church setting. Older persons are less likely than the other two age groups to have experienced misconduct in either condition, but it is hard to know whether such reports indicate fewer experiences or less awareness in earlier eras. Clergy and candidates for ordination are far more likely to experience misconduct in the Church than lay persons, with employees falling in between.

Another analysis of interest is the different rates of misconduct experienced at the intersection of gender and role in a Church setting, particularly out of concern for cisgender clergywomen, transgender and nonbinary clergy. Table 4 shows the percentages (numbers) for those subgroups, with statistically significant strength of associations noted as Cramer's V scores/p values. Cisgender clergywomen and transgender/nonbinary clergy have similar and very high reporting rates, as compared to cisgender clergymen, with a fairly high V-score of .324 indicating a strong correlation between gender and having experienced misconduct. Likewise, transgender/nonbinary laity have higher rates than cisgender laywomen, who have somewhat higher rates than laymen. Still, most of these cisgender laity have not experienced misconduct, while half of the 14 trans/nonbinary lay respondents have. For employees, cisgender men are the most likely to report misconduct, but not statistically different than cisgender women. The difference for employees is only notable when compared to trans/nonbinary respondents. Though only five people, 100% of these trans/nonbinary employees reported misconduct of some kind.

**Table 4: Percent (n)s Who Experienced Misconduct in a Church Setting by Gender and Role in the Church**

Role and Gender Identity	Yes	No	V/p
Cis Clergywomen (595)	73.1 (435)	26.9 (160)	.324/.000
Cis Clergymen (308)	39.6 (122)	60.4 (186)	
Trans/Non-Binary Clergy (7)	71.4 (5)	28.6 (2)	
Cis Female Employees (195)	42.6 (83)	57.4 (112)	.148/.036
Cis Male Employees (106)	45.3 (48)	54.7 (58)	
Trans/Non-Binary Employees (5)	100.0 (5)	0	
Cis Laywomen (753)	25.9 (195)	74.1 (558)	.092/.011
Cis Laymen (301)	19.9 (60)	80.1 (214)	
Trans/Non-Binary Laity (14)	50.0 (7)	50.0 (7)	

Specific behaviors were provided and respondents indicated if and where they had experienced such behaviors – in a local church, at school or in a workplace. Table 5a lists those percentages (numbers), listed in order from the most to the least commonly experienced in a Church setting. Percentages are

taken from all 2415 respondents; note that they were invited to check all that apply, both for behavior and location.

**Table 5a: Percent (n)s of Those Reporting Specific Behaviors by Location (N = 2415)**

Behaviors	Church	School	Workplace
Comments/Teasing/Jokes	31.8 (767)	9.9 (238)	18.2 (439)
Touching/Closeness	23.9 (577)	4.4 (107)	8.5 (205)
Looks/Leers	22.3 (539)	6.0 (144)	10.1 (243)
Pressure to Engage in Comments	16.5 (399)	5.9 (143)	10.5 (253)
Attempt to Fondle/Kiss	11.1 (268)	2.6 (62)	4.3 (104)
Pressure to Date/Sexual Activities	7.8 (189)	3.1 (76)	4.1 (100)
Emails/Texts/Letters	6.3 (152)	1.6 (39)	4.0 (96)
Attempted Assault/Rape	2.9 (71)	1.6 (38)	1.4 (34)
Offer to Influence for Sexual Favors	2.1 (51)	0.6 (15)	1.9 (47)
Completed Assault/Rape	1.9 (47)	0.9 (22)	0.7 (17)

Note that comments/teasing/jokes are the most commonly experienced types of misconduct in all three settings, but #2 in a Church setting is touching/closeness, as compared to in school or the workplace, where it is #4. Because touching, through the ritual of the passing of the peace or more casual greeting/hugging is common in many churches, these behaviors can become problematic more easily than in professional settings. One clergywoman wrote, “One man made passing the peace an assault routinely.” Sometimes, the misconduct is intentionally inappropriate, but often, although offered innocently, it is received with discomfort. One respondent wrote, “The church, by its very nature, fosters emotionally intimate relationships. As a cisgendered white heterosexual man, I naturally assume the best about a situation, others might potentially find problematic, so I just need to be aware.”

Another way to look at these behaviors is based on demographic group. Table 5b shows the percentages of each statistically significantly association of behavior by gender identity, with statistically significant scores indicated. The statistically significant differences are seen only in the most commonly experienced/least egregious behaviors. For behaviors not listed, there was no difference by gender.

**Table 5b: Percentages of Those Reporting Specific Behaviors by Gender Identity**

Behaviors	Cis Female (1608)	Cis Male (740)	Trans/N-B (41)	V
Comments/Teasing/Jokes	36.8	19.9	56.1	.181***
Touching/Closeness	27.2	16.4	39.0	.126***
Looks/Leers	26.4	13.5	34.1	.146***
Pressure to Engage in Comments	18.5	11.9	31.7	.097***
Attempt to Fondle/Kiss	12.9	7.4	14.6	.077***

Table 5c shows the same behaviors regarding sexual orientation. Again, only statistically significant associations are included, but in this case, all behaviors show differences by sexual orientation except for “completed sexual assault,” and all are more commonly reported by LGBQ persons than others.

**Table 5c: Percentages of Those Reporting Specific Behaviors by Sexual Orientation**

Behaviors	Heterosexual (1822)	LGBQ (475)	V
Comments/Teasing/Jokes	30.3	39.8	.082***
Touching/Closeness	22.7	29.9	.068**
Looks/Leers	21.3	28.8	.073***
Pressure to Engage in Comments	15.7	21.3	.136***
Attempt to Fondle/Kiss	10.3	14.9	.059**
Pressure to Date/Sexual Activities	6.5	12.8	.095***
Emails/Texts/Letters	5.6	9.7	.067**
Attempted Assault/Rape	2.4	5.3	.068**
Offer to Influence for Sexual Favors	1.8	3.8	.056*

\*p ≤ .05. \*\*p ≤ .01. \*\*\*p ≤ .001

Table 5d shows the same behaviors regarding role in the Church. All behaviors are differently experienced by role, with laity the least likely to experience every type and clergy the most likely to experience every type except for completed assault, which was slightly more often reported by employees.

**Table 5d: Percentages of Those Reporting Specific Behaviors by Role in the Church**

Behaviors	Clergy (924)	Employees (306)	Laity (1075)	V
Comments/Teasing/Jokes	50.3	31.4	16.5	.337***
Touching/Closeness	39.6	25.2	10.9	.311***
Looks/Leers	36.0	23.9	10.8	.280***
Pressure to Engage in Comments	28.5	17.6	6.1	.279***
Attempt to Fondle/Kiss	18.8	10.8	4.7	.207***
Pressure to Date/Sexual Activities	12.7	9.1	3.7	.154***
Emails/Texts/Letters	11.6	6.5	1.8	.187***
Attempted Assault/Rape	4.9	3.2	1.4	.094***
Offer to Influence for Sexual Favors	3.7	2.6	0.6	.098***
Completed Assault/Rape	2.7	2.9	1.2	.055*

\*p ≤ .05. \*\*p ≤ .01. \*\*\*p ≤ .001

A last comparison of behaviors to consider is by clergy status. There were many subgroups, but most of the differences between priests were negligible. The difference between priests, including

bishops, and deacons was statistically significant and therefore notable, as seen in Table 5e. For every behavior listed, priests were more likely to report misconduct than deacons.

**Table 5e: Percentages of Clergy Reporting Specific Behaviors by Ordination Status**

Behaviors	Priests (573)	Deacons (84)	V
Comments/Teasing/Jokes	59.5	30.9	.192***
Touching/Closeness	55.3	20.2	.166***
Looks/Leers	43.6	13.1	.208***
Pressure to Engage in Comments	34.7	14.3	.146***
Attempt to Fondle/Kiss	21.5	5.9	.131**
Pressure to Date/Sexual Activities	13.3	8.3	.821***
Emails/Texts/Letters	14.6	5.9	.085*

\*p ≤ .05. \*\*p ≤ .01. \*\*\*p ≤ .001

Another set of questions focused on specifically gender-based harassment, asking about behaviors that do not use sex as weapon, but slurs, taunts, stereotypes, or even threats of violence based on one's perceived gender (see Appendix A for full wording of the questions). Table 6 shows the first set of behaviors examined for all respondents. Here, the response of "not sure" is important because many of these behaviors are subtle and often hard to identify as gender-based, and even harder to report or investigate.

**Table 6: Percent (n)s of Those Reporting Gender-Based Harassment Behaviors**

Behaviors	Yes	Not Sure	No
Targeted Rules	9.6 (202)	14.1 (296)	76.3 (1603)
Treated Discourteously	41.7 (878)	7.3 (154)	50.9 (1071)
Contributions Overlooked	31.8 (670)	13.4 (282)	54.8 (1154)
Participation Discouraged	23.1 (486)	11.7 (246)	65.2 (1373)

The next set of behaviors are most likely to be experienced by transgender and nonbinary persons, provided in Table 7. Even though a small sample overall, note that the majority of trans or nonbinary persons reported having experienced many of these behaviors.



**Table 7: Percent (n)s of Those Reporting Specific Gender-Based Harassment Behaviors by Gender Identity**

Behaviors	Trans Female (7)	Trans Male (8)	Non-Binary (26)
Misgendered	57.1 (4)	75.0 (6)	23.1 (6)
Rejection/Ostracization	57.1 (4)	50.0 (4)	19.2 (5)
Failure to Recognize Your Gender	42.9 (3)	62.5 (5)	34.6 (9)
Excluded from Activities	14.3 (1)	37.4 (3)	34.6 (9)
Restroom Restrictions	0	50.0 (4)	11.5 (3)
Name Calling	25.6 (2)	12.5 (1)	11.5 (3)
Violence or Threats of Violence	14.3 (1)	12.5 (1)	0
Deadnaming (use of previous name)	25.6 (2)	62.5 (5)	7.7 (2)

As expected, the large majority (83.1%; n = 2004) of perpetrators of all problematic behaviors (sexual and gender-based) were cisgender men, with 16.2% (n = 390) as cisgender women and less than 1% (n = 18) as transgender or nonbinary ( $\chi^2 = 2772.63$ ;  $p < .0001$ ).

In Church settings, the most common perpetrators were church members (38.8%; n = 446), followed by local church priests (28.8%; n = 331); in employment settings, the most common perpetrators were colleagues (44.2%; n = 168), followed by supervisors (33.9%; n = 129); in seminaries, the most common perpetrators were fellow students (48.0%; n = 84), followed by teachers and administrators (34.9%; n = 61). Notably, the most common perpetrators in all three settings were not the traditionally most powerful persons. Church members, work colleagues and fellow students have been more problematic than priests, supervisors and professors. Perhaps credential leaders have undergone training that helps minimize the chances of them being offenders, while ordinary members of a community do not necessarily receive that training.

Among the 673 who answered the question regarding their awareness of other victim/survivors of that perpetrator, 43.6% said they were aware of others. It is also likely that other perpetrators had additional victim/survivors unknown to the survey respondents. Not surprisingly, many perpetrators, from the most innocent to the most egregious, misbehave regularly, so most have multiple victim/survivors.

## RESPONSES TO MISCONDUCT

Respondents who had been the recipients of misconduct were provided with a list of possible reactions.

Responses differed by gender identity, as depicted in Table 8, listed in order of percent, high to low, of all respondents.



**Table 8: Percent (n)s of Those Reporting Specific Reactions to Misconduct by Gender Identity**

Reactions	All	Cis Female	Cis Male	Trans/N-B	V
Ignored/Went Along	28.7 (694)	35.5 (539)	18.6 (138)	41.5 (17)	.156***
Avoided the Person	27.1 (654)	31.4 (505)	17.7 (131)	43.9 (18)	.152***
Told Colleague/Friend	19.4 (468)	23.6 (379)	9.9 (73)	39.0 (16)	.178***
Told Person to Stop	18.6 (449)	21.9 (352)	12.2 (90)	17.1 (7)	.112***
Told Supervisor	11.1 (268)	13.9 (224)	5.1 (38)	14.6 (6)	.131***
Transferred/Quit	4.7 (114)	5.7 (92)	2.4 (18)	9.7 (4)	.079**
Threatened to Report	2.3 (55)	2.9 (46)	1.1 (8)	2.4 (1)	.055*

\*p ≤ .05. \*\*p ≤ .01. \*\*\*p ≤ .001

The majority of respondents took the path of least resistance and either ignored the behavior or avoided the person. The next largest group, looking for support, told a colleague or friend. Only after that did respondents indicate that they had taken the difficult step of telling the perpetrator to stop or reporting to a supervisor.

Respondents who indicated that they reported to a supervisor were also asked how that went. Were they believed and supported, or dismissed, or even disciplined? Table 9 provides all of the response options with the few demographic variables which yielded statistically significant associations – race, gender identity and sexual orientation. Responses are listed in order of percent selected by all respondents. Note that people of color were more likely to be trivialized, and cisgender males and LGBTQ persons more likely to be believed. There were no differences by role in the Church and the other supervisor responses did not differ by any group.

**Table 9: Percent (n)s of Supervisor Responses by Race, Gender and Sexual Orientation**

Responses	All	White	POC	Hetero	LGBQ	Cis F	Cis M
Trivialized	51.1 (137)	16.7 (42) V =	38.9 (7) .1434*				
				36.8 (77)	54.0 (27)	36.2 (81)	55.3 (21)
Believed	39.9 (107)			V =	.138*	V =	.138*
Too Minor to Pursue	24.2 (65)						
Not Believed	20.5 (55)						
Investigation Done	18.3 (49)						
Discounted	10.8 (29)						

\*p ≤ .05. \*\*p ≤ .01. \*\*\*p ≤ .001

The survey acknowledged that there are many good reasons NOT to report, which is actually much more common. The following tables show the reasons people said they did not report an incident, with the demographic variables of difference and Cramer's V scores for strength of association. The large number of statistically significant associations warrants separate tables for each demographic analysis, but only those reasons with such a correlation are included. For each table, reasons are listed in the order selected by all respondents; the first table includes all reasons, even if no difference by demographic.

**Table 10a: Percent (n)s of Those Reporting Specific Reactions not to Report by Gender Identity**

Reasons	All	Cis Female	Cis Male	Trans/N-B	V
Too Minor	18.3 (338)	19.8 (243)	15.0 (89)	21.4 (6)	.059*
Nothing Would be Done	17.0 (314)	19.4 (238)	10.8 (64)	42.8 (12)	.137***
Would be Held Against Me	16.2 (300)	17.8 (219)	11.8 (70)	39.3 (11)	.109***
Too Embarrassed	9.0 (167)	9.8 (120)	6.6 (39)	28.6 (8)	.099***
Wouldn't be Believed	7.6 (141)	9.0 (110)	4.2 (25)	21.4 (6)	.105***
Would be Blamed	7.5 (139)	9.0 (110)	3.7 (22)	25.0 (7)	.124***
Didn't Know the Process	6.9 (127)	7.3 (90)	5.4 (32)	17.8 (5)	.064***
Not Hurt the Person	6.3 (117)	6.3 (77)	5.7 (34)	21.4 (6)	.078**
Loss of Income	3.6 (66)	3.8 (47)	2.9 (17)	7.1 (2)	n.s.
Retaliation Threatened	2.0 (38)	1.9 (24)	2.0 (12)	7.1 (2)	n.s.

\*p ≤ .05. \*\*p ≤ .01. \*\*\*p ≤ .001

Regarding gender differences, it is notable that the first and second choices for all cisgender respondents was that the incident was too minor, or that they feared nothing would be done. For transgender/nonbinary respondents, the top two reasons were fear that nothing would be done, followed by fear that it would be held against them. For the latter group, the idea that the incident was too minor was much further down the list at #5, after fearing embarrassment and blame. Note also that the last two reasons in Table 10a show no difference between cisgender males and females, but there is a big difference between those groups and transgender/nonbinary persons, the latter being much more likely to not know the process and to not want to hurt the person.

**Table 10b: Percent (n)s of Those Reporting Specific Reactions not to Report by Sexual Orientation**

Reasons	All	Hetero	LGBQ	V
Nothing Would be Done	17.7 (315)	14.8 (207)	24.8 (93)	.109***
Would be Held Against Me	16.8 (299)	13.4 (188)	25.6 (96)	.136***
Too Embarrassed	9.4 (168)	7.6 (106)	15.2 (57)	.108***
Wouldn't be Believed	7.9 (141)	6.8 (96)	10.4 (39)	.055*
Would be Blamed	7.8 (139)	6.6 (92)	10.9 (41)	.068**
Financial Loss	3.7 (66)	2.7 (38)	6.4 (24)	.082***

\*p ≤ .05. \*\*p ≤ .01. \*\*\*p ≤ .001

In the case of sexual orientation, LGBQ persons were more likely than heterosexual respondents to identify each of the reasons listed in Table 10b. Note that the most common response above, of seeing the incident as too minor, was not among those that differed by sexual orientation – LGBQ and heterosexual respondents were equally likely to select that.

**Table 10c: Percent (n)s of Those Reporting Specific Reactions not to Report by Age Group**

Reasons	All	18-39	40-59	60	V
Too Minor	18.3 (336)	25.1 (51)	23.5 (119)	14.7 (166)	.116***
Nothing Would be Done	16.9 (310)	22.7 (46)	21.3 (108)	13.8 (156)	.102***
Would be Held Against Me	16.1 (295)	27.1 (55)	19.9 (101)	12.3 (139)	.139***
Too Embarrassed	9.1 (167)	14.3 (29)	11.2 (57)	7.2 (81)	.166***
Would be Blamed	7.5 (137)	12.3 (25)	10.0 (51)	5.4 (61)	.101***
Not Hurt the Person	6.2 (113)	9.8 (20)	7.1 (36)	5.1 (57)	.066*
Financial Loss	3.5 (65)	7.9 (16)	3.7 (19)	2.7 (30)	.087***

\*p ≤ .05. \*\*p ≤ .01. \*\*\*p ≤ .001

Regarding age differences, younger respondents were more likely to identify all of the reasons listed in Table 10c, with older people less likely, and those in middle life falling in between. Note that for the two most commonly cited reasons, the differences between younger and middle-aged persons are negligible. But surprisingly, older respondents were much less likely to think an incident was minor or that nothing would be done than all other respondents. If standards around these behaviors have been changing, one would expect the older respondents to be more tolerant of “minor” offenses. The differences by age group for the other reasons are more evenly spread.

Table 10d shows differences in reasons by income. Not surprisingly, lower income respondents were most likely to fear being blamed, while upper income respondents were the least likely to fear that nothing would be done.

**Table 10d: Percent (n)s of Those Reporting Specific Reactions not to Report by Income Group**

Reasons	All	0-\$50K	\$51K-\$100K	\$101K	V
Nothing Would be Done	17.0 (309)	16.1 (75)	19.4 (158)	14.1 (76)	.061*
Wouldn't be Believed	7.6 (139)	10.3 (48)	6.9 (56)	6.5 (35)	.059*
Would be Blamed	7.5 (136)	9.4 (44)	7.8 (64)	5.2 (28)	.061*
Didn't Know the Process	6.9 (125)	6.9 (32)	8.3 (68)	4.6 (25)	.062*

\*p ≤ .05. \*\*p ≤ .01. \*\*\*p ≤ .001

The last examination of reasons not to report considers role in the Church. Employees were the most likely to fear financial losses, which makes sense given that the misconduct occurred in their

workplace. Otherwise, clergy were the most likely to cite each of the reasons listed in Table 10e. Also notable is the strongest V-score of .224 regarding fear that the report would be held against them. This was a major concern for clergy and a bit less so for employees, both of whom might be worried about their jobs and possibilities for advancement.

**Table 10e: Percent (n)s of Those Reporting Specific Reactions not to Report by Role in the Church**

Reasons	All	Clergy	Employees	Laity	V
Too Minor	18.5 (339)	26.8 (173)	23.1 (53)	11.4 (105)	.188***
Nothing Would be Done	17.1 (313)	23.8 (154)	18.8 (43)	11.8 (108)	.149***
Would be Held Against Me	16.4 (299)	26.5 (171)	21.8 (50)	7.5 (69)	.244***
Too Embarrassed	9.1 (166)	12.4 (80)	8.3 (19)	6.5 (60)	.095***
Wouldn't be Believed	7.7 (140)	9.6 (62)	7.4 (17)	6.2 (57)	.059*
Would be Blamed	7.5 (138)	9.7 (63)	10.5 (24)	5.2 (48)	.090***
Not Hurt the Person	6.3 (116)	9.0 (58)	7.9 (16)	3.9 (36)	.098***

\*p ≤ .05. \*\*p ≤ .01. \*\*\*p ≤ .001

There were very few differences by race in the entire survey, but there was one statistically significant association in the case of reasons not to report: the threat of retaliation. People of color were more likely (5.9%; n = 7) to report such a threat than white people (1.8%; n = 31; V = .071\*\*).

A text box allowed people to name other reasons for not reporting. Of the 55 responses, 38.2% (21) said they handled it themselves, followed by 20.0% (11) who said they left the local church or diocese. Another 12% (7) of respondents said that they went to a therapist instead. The few others said they were too shocked to do anything for a long time, or they were children when the incident occurred.

## IMPACT OF RESPONSES TO MISCONDUCT

Participants were then asked about how their responses affected their lives. As in the previous section, the following tables show the various effects where there were demographic differences. The highest number of differences (8) were based on role in the Church, as seen in Table 11a. For this first table, all of the options are listed, including one (Things Got Worse) that showed no difference by role.

Laypersons were the least likely to report that things had gotten better, while clergy were the most likely to say that things had gotten better for others, but not themselves. Clergy were also the most likely to say that nothing had changed or that they had lost income. Employees were the most likely to say that it was hard to find another position or that the misconduct was still happening.

**Table 11a: Percent (n)s of Those Reporting Specific Effects of Their Responses by Role in the Church**

Effects	All	Clergy	Employees	Laity	V
Little or No Change	17.9 (383)	24.6 (204)	18.7 (51)	12.3 (117)	.185***
Things Got Better	11.1 (238)	16.4 (136)	12.4 (34)	6.5 (62)	.146***
Results Varied (multiple incidents)	10.7 (228)	16.6 (138)	13.2 (36)	4.8 (46)	.180***
Better for Me/System the Same	9.6 (205)	15.9 (132)	7.7 (21)	5.0 (48)	.172***
I Left	9.3 (198)	13.7 (114)	8.8 (24)	5.6 (53)	.131***
Things Got Worse	3.9 (83)	5.1 (42)	5.5 (15)	2.4 (23)	n.s.
Lost Income	3.6 (77)	6.4 (53)	4.0 (11)	1.3 (12)	.126***
It's Still Happening	1.5 (33)	0.7 (6)	4.0 (11)	1.4 (13)	.087***
Hard to Find New Position	1.3 (29)	1.8 (15)	2.2 (6)	0.6 (6)	.057*

\*p ≤ .05. \*\*p ≤ .01. \*\*\*p ≤ .001

Tables 11b and 11c show the demographics with the next highest number of differences (6), gender identity and age group. Note that where respondents indicated varied results, it was because of multiple incidents.

**Table 11b: Percent (n)s of Those Reporting Specific Effects of Their Responses by Gender Identity**

Effects	All	Cis Female	Cis Male	Trans/N-B	V
Little or No Change	17.9 (383)	19.4 (281)	14.2 (90)	29.4 (10)	.072**
Results Varied	10.7 (228)	12.8 (186)	4.7 (30)	29.4 (10)	.142***
Better for Me/System the Same	9.6 (205)	11.1 (162)	5.4 (34)	26.4 (9)	.115***
I Left	9.3 (198)	10.7 (155)	5.4 (34)	20.6 (7)	.097***
Things Got Worse	3.9 (83)	4.8 (70)	1.9 (12)	2.9 (1)	.069**
Lost Income	3.6 (77)	4.3 (62)	2.4 (15)	0	.046*

\*p ≤ .05. \*\*p ≤ .01. \*\*\*p ≤ .001

Although few in number overall, cisgender females were the most likely to say that things got worse or that they lost income, while transgender/nonbinary respondents were the most likely to report little change at all, no change in the system, or that they left the situation (church, job, school).

**Table 11c: Percent (n)s of Those Reporting Specific Effects of Their Responses by Age Group**

Effects	All	18-39	40-59	60	V
Little or No Change	17.9 (383)	26.7 (65)	22.2 (139)	14.1 (174)	.125***
Things Got Better	11.1 (238)	9.9 (24)	13.8 (86)	10.1 (125)	.053*
Results Varied	10.7 (228)	20.6 (50)	14.7 (92)	6.8 (84)	.161***
I Left	9.3 (198)	14.4 (35)	11.4 (71)	7.2 (89)	.090***
It's Still Happening	1.5 (33)	5.3 (13)	2.2 (14)	0.5 (6)	.126***
Hard to Find New Position	1.3 (29)	2.5 (6)	2.2 (14)	0.6 (8)	.071**

\*p ≤ .05. \*\*p ≤ .01. \*\*\*p ≤ .001

In the case of age, younger respondents were more likely to report little/no change or having left the situation. This may be a cohort effect. That is, it is possible that raised awareness over the years has made gender-based and sexual misconduct less tolerable, so younger respondents may have a higher bar for the responses they expect in the church/workplace/school. That is, it may not be that change is not happening for younger people, or more recently, but that smaller changes were more acceptable in the past. Alternatively, it could be that younger people feel less powerful to effect the changes they desire.

Regarding income groups, there were only two differences of note. Unsurprisingly, lower income respondents were most likely to say that they had lost income (5.5%; n = 29) than those in the higher income groups (combined 3.1%; n = 48; V = .015\*), and more likely to say it was hard to find a new position (2.5%; n = 13) than the others (1.0%; n = 16; V = .054\*). Regarding race, people of color were more likely to say that things had gotten better for them but the system had not changed (3.6%; n = 5) than whites (0.9%; n = 19; V = .063\*).

### IMPACT OF MISCONDUCT ON LIVES

The next set of questions asked about impact on one's life, focusing on church/work/school participation and also personal health. Table 12a shows the full list of options, with scores for all respondents, both in percent (n)s in each category, and also the mean (m) scores from 1 to 3, with 1 indicating that things got worse to 3 indicating that they got better. The options are listed in the order they appeared in the survey, based on topic.

As noted in yellow, the most common response to almost all of the options was that there was no change, although feelings about work, mental health and emotional health were more likely to get worse – emotional health by a lot. Based on means, the options that had the best outcomes (noted in green) were school attendance, one's relationship with God and also one's spiritual practices. School attendance is likely required, but relationship with God and spiritual practices are more personal. Means highlighted in purple are the options with the worst outcomes – emotional health and feelings about work again, and also feelings about one's local church. It seems that even when one's feelings about a specific local church are harmed, one's spiritual practices and relationship with God do not suffer similarly.

**Table 12a: Percent (n)s and Means on a Scale of 1-3 of Impact on One's Life**

Impacts	Got Worse	No Change	Got Better	m
Worship Attendance (757)	22.1 (167)	75.6 (572)	2.4 (18)	1.81
Church Involvement (780)	28.2 (220)	68.1 (531)	3.7 (29)	1.76
Feelings about Local Church (838)	47.3 (396)	49.8 (417)	3.0 (25)	1.56
Work Attendance (655)	11.5 (75)	88.1 (577)	0.5 (3)	1.89
Quality of Work (698)	20.1 (140)	75.8 (529)	4.2 (29)	1.84
Feelings about Work (752)	49.5 (372)	47.1 (354)	1.1 (26)	1.54
School Attendance (374)	9.4 (35)	88.5 (331)	2.1 (8)	1.93

Impacts	Got Worse	No Change	Got Better	m
Quality of School Work (374)	16.3 (61)	81.6 (305)	2.1 (8)	1.86
Feelings about School (373)	25.7 (96)	72.9 (272)	1.3 (5)	1.76
Feelings about The Episcopal Church (862)	42.3 (365)	54.9 (473)	2.8 (24)	1.60
Relationship with God (1546)	21.1 (183)	64.2 (558)	14.7 (128)	1.93
Spiritual Practices (1542)	24.5 (214)	59.8 (522)	15.7 (137)	1.91
Feelings about Self (1513)	43.6 (393)	48.3 (436)	8.1 (73)	1.65
Physical Health (1563)	28.3 (241)	67.3 (573)	4.5 (38)	1.76
Mental Health (1511)	46.9 (424)	46.5 (420)	6.6 (60)	1.60
Emotional Health (1487)	56.3 (522)	36.1 (335)	7.7 (71)	1.52
Financial Health (1644)	21.3 (164)	76.4 (589)	2.3 (18)	1.81

Table 12b shows mean scores, indicating the same impacts by various demographics of interest where there was statistically significant difference between groups. Regarding gender identity, cisgender men report a higher mean than others. That is, cisgender men are more likely to report improvement than decline compared to all other respondents. On the other hand, assessment of things getting worse varied by item between cisgender women and transgender/nonbinary respondents. The same is true for heterosexuals in comparison with LGBTQ respondents – the mean for heterosexuals was consistently higher, although there was only a difference on four items. Results vary more by role in the Church, with laity reporting the highest means on the three health measures listed, and clergy reporting higher means on measures related to the local church and spiritual life.

**Table 12b: Means on a Scale of 1-3 of Impact on One's Life by Demographics**

Impacts	CisF	CisM	TrNB	p	Het	LGBQ	p	Clergy	Emp	Laity	p
Worsh Attend	1.78	1.89	1.85	.02	--	--	n.s.	1.86	1.80	1.73	.002
Ch Involve	--	--	--	n.s.	--	--	n.s.	1.83	1.73	1.66	.000
Feel @ Loc Ch	1.51	1.70	1.36	.000	--	--	n.s.	--	--	--	n.s.
Qual Wk	--	--	--	n.s.	1.86	1.78	.05	--	--	--	n.s.
Feel @ Wk	1.48	1.69	1.57	.000	1.57	1.47	.04	1.50	1.47	1.71	.000
Sch Attend	1.93	1.95	1.67	.05	--	--	n.s.	--	--	--	n.s.
Qual Sch Wk	1.83	1.95	1.50	.002	--	--	n.s.	--	--	--	n.s.
Feel @ Sch	1.72	1.88	1.44	.002	--	--	n.s.	--	--	--	n.s.
Feel @ TEC	1.58	1.69	1.59	.04	--	--	n.s.	--	--	--	n.s.
Relat w/ God	--	--	--	n.s.	1.97	1.85	.02	1.98	1.80	1.94	.01
Spirit Pracs	--	--	--	n.s.	1.94	1.82	.02	1.95	1.79	1.90	.05
Feel @ Self	1.61	1.77	1.46	.002	--	--	n.s.	--	--	--	n.s.
Phys Health	1.72	1.90	1.64	.000	--	--	n.s.	1.73	1.75	1.90	.05
Ment Health	1.55	1.74	1.52	.000	--	--	n.s.	1.57	1.54	1.68	.03
EmoHealth	1.46	1.68	1.56	.000	--	--	n.s.	1.49	1.42	1.63	.002



Not included in the table, age by group and race were also examined. There were nine outcomes that showed difference by age group; in every case, older respondents reported higher means/more improvement than the youngest respondents, with middle-aged people falling in between. There were no differences in any outcome by race.

There was also a text box for people to write-in other effects or comments about any impact on their lives; responses varied widely. Of the 127 respondents who wrote something there, 34.6% (44) reported a positive impact, such as that the person apologized or that they developed strong boundaries as a result of the experience. However, the majority (57.5%;  $n = 73$ ) reported something negative, such as lost opportunities or diminished self-esteem. The rest (15.0%;  $n = 19$ ) said something more neutral, such as that the perpetrator happened to move away or retire.

### **WITNESSING MISCONDUCT OF OTHERS**

Almost half of all respondents (42.5%) said they had witnessed someone else as the target of gender-based or sexual misconduct and another 31.2% were told about an incident by someone else, either the victim/survivor or another witness. That means a full 73.7% (812) knew of an incident, whether they themselves had experienced one or not. These respondents were then asked how they responded to that information.

With the option of “check all that apply,” the most common response was to speak to someone else about it (58.2%), followed by speaking directly to the victim (48.4%). All of the other responses were about equally selected: ignored it (14.2%), spoke to the perpetrator (12.4%), initiated the misconduct process (12.1%), and reflected on one’s own behavior (15.9%).

There were a few notable differences by demographic group regarding those responses. Laity were most likely to ignore the behavior (22.6%;  $n = 42$ ), while clergy were the least likely to do so (10.2%;  $n = 50$ ), with employees falling in between (17.3%;  $n = 19$ ;  $V = .152^{***}$ ). Younger respondents were most likely to speak to the victim (60.4%;  $n = 67$ ), while older respondents were the least likely to do so (39.4%;  $n = 157$ ), with middle-aged persons falling in between but closer to the response rate of their juniors (55.6%;  $n = 163$ ;  $V = .177^{***}$ ). Because cisgender men are most likely to be perpetrators of misconduct, it is good to see that they were most likely to reflect on their own behavior (25.5%;  $n = 49$ ) if they witnessed or heard about an incident, with cisgender women (12.7%;  $n = 76$ ) and transgender respondents (10.0%;  $n = 2$ ;  $V = .151^{***}$ ) less likely to do so.

Many people respond to later events differently than earlier ones, based on training, growth in wisdom or courage that comes with age, or just the benefit of experience in general. One of the biggest problems with sexual misconduct in particular is delayed reporting, where an incident is ignored for a while, but is reported, sometimes years later, often with an unsatisfactory outcome because witnesses and evidence have disappeared over time. To capture some of this, an open-ended question was asked regarding what respondents would do if they witnessed a similar incident today. Of the 312 participants who wrote in a response, 59.6% said they would report it. The next most common response was something related to calling out the behavior (39.1%), either in the



moment or quickly thereafter – some speaking to the perpetrator, others to the victim/survivor. It is impossible to predict future reactions based on a hypothetical, unspecified situation, but at least the intent to intercede in a more productive way is promising.

### **ANYTHING ELSE YOU WANT THE EPISCOPAL CHURCH TO KNOW**

The last survey question allowed respondents to add anything else that might be important to them. Over a quarter (27.9%) of survey participants did so, and seven major themes were identified: personal stories, thanks, positive experiences, larger social context, lay/clergy differentials, process critiques and gender identity-related micro-aggressions.

Personal stories made up 19.7% (133) of the comments and they varied widely. Some talked about sexual assault experienced as children, others about the specific dynamics around their experience, such as a small, financially struggling church for whom reporting would have caused too much loss. One woman recounted her discovery years later that ten women had been harassed by the same bishop. Another talked about a history of multiple incidents, from a rape in a childhood parish, to inappropriate behavior of seminary professors, to various biases against them as a gay priest – retirement has finally brought a sense of relief and the ability to seek out a “safe” spiritual community.

Also notable were the 16.9% (114) who gave some message of thanks – for the survey/research and opportunity to tell their story, for the efforts at reconciliation that are underway, for educational events and other ways the Church is trying to improve. One person said simply, “Thank you for not running away from this issue.”

Another large minority (12.7%; n = 86) wanted to be sure to note that their experiences have been positive, even “exceedingly wonderful” in one person’s words. Many said they had not experienced any harm in the church, although they had elsewhere. Others noted that the Church has been one of the safest places in their life. Another said “I’m proud that The Episcopal Church is taking these things seriously.” A few minimized the problem, saying it is not a problem in the Church, that they think the Church does a great job or is impressively open to all persons, or they have simply never even heard of an incident, but such comments were few in number. Of course, surveys on gender-based and sexual misconduct are of much more interest to people who are aware of the problem than others, so those few comments may be more common if asked of the average person in the pew.

The next largest group was the 10.2% (69) who referenced larger social issues, such as patriarchy, paternalism, homophobia, and employment discrimination related to promotions and salary inequities, all of which exist outside The Episcopal Church. These respondents seemed not to want to blame the Church for being particularly problematic, but see it as simply a part of the larger society where these issues are long standing and seemingly intractable.

Another small, but notable group (6.5%; n = 44) made reference to some element of the clergy-lay divide, most (30) concerned about lay perpetrators and the inability to hold laity accountable. There

have been studies on the difficulty of people in service work holding clients accountable for their behavior for fear of losing their jobs (Good and Cooper, 2016), which applies here. Most such harassment is never reported, leaving service workers to manage the situations themselves or with close colleagues. Because many clergy work alone with few if any colleagues close by, this can be especially challenging. In addition, no clergy person wants anyone to leave the Church, but allowing misconduct to continue often serves to keep others away, who come hoping for a safe spiritual community. Still, one clergyperson asked directly, “How do you report your own parishioner?” The other 14 comments focused on the more well-known problem of clergy power, and the inability for many laypeople to effectively resist. There are problems in both directions of the clergy-lay divide, although the dynamics differ – in one case, the power of the client, in the other, the power of the leader.

Critiques of various Church processes were mentioned in 5.5% (37) of the comments. The complaint process was described as “ineffective” and “humiliating”; some simply said that offenders are not held accountable at all. One noted that alleged perpetrators have been promoted or that nothing was done, so they had to leave their diocese to get away. Respondents said that the clergy don’t trust the system, partly because it is run by men. More than one noted that the effectiveness of the “system” actually depends not anything systematic, but on who one’s bishop is at the time, and some bishops were named as offenders themselves.

Finally, a few respondents noted very specific elements in misconduct that are hard to address, most referencing micro-aggressions related to gender inequality. Comments included references to “the old boys club,” men in high positions who lack adequate training, and the relatively small number of clergywomen in lead positions in larger churches. One clergywoman wrote broadly that, “We need models for men relating to women as spiritual leaders/advisor/mentors that do not default to the woman being either mommy or girlfriend.” Another expressed her frustration, saying, “I’ve been afraid to voice my concerns with colleagues because doing so draws anger and hostility. After a point, it’s exhausting.” One clergywoman noted unwanted attention related to her appearance: “I have been told I am too beautiful to be a priest. That my hair is beautiful and requests for me to wear it in a certain way. I have been called ‘spiritual eye candy.’ I have been told by someone that he would need to ‘be careful’ working with me because he had a problem with boundaries and we ‘just can’t f\*\*\* each other’.” Few, if any clergywomen in any denomination would be surprised with any of these comments. Repeating the concern quoted above: “How do you report your own parishioner?”.

This question and others inspired some to include specific suggestions for improvements – some related to policies, processes and structures, others regarding trainings, and a few miscellaneous items. These appear in Appendix B.

## SUMMARY RECOMMENDATIONS

- The demographic realities of The Episcopal Church present a few challenges, the most notable related to these issues is age; the average age of church members is older than of other Americans. The issues of gender-based and sexual misconduct are not limited to any age group, but movements for social change are often pushed and sustained by younger people, and tolerance for such behavior was more common in previous decades. To depend primarily on members who are in their 50s and 60s could make progress difficult.
- More training is needed, particularly for laity, although clergy awareness of policies and procedures should also be increased, ideally to 100%. Indeed, all training efforts could be expanded. In particular though, these data found that most perpetrators are cisgender laymen; hence they should be the main target of training programs. At the same time, support structures should be developed for their most common victim/survivors – clergywomen and transgender/nonbinary clergy. If there was a single theme throughout the comments, it was that clergy do not know how to respond to harassment of themselves without alienating parishioners.
- Although past trainings received positive reviews overall, they might also be improved with updated materials. The challenge here is making sure everyone attends such a training, easier to require of clergy than laity. Because most perpetrators are laypersons, work colleagues and fellow students, it will be especially important to make sure the trainings focus not only on the typical power differentials that lead priests, supervisors and professors to offend, but also the dynamics around the harassment of service providers and peers.
- Training should pay particular attention to gender-based micro-aggressions, which are often subtle. Focus should also be not only on discrimination to cisgender women, but also to transgender and nonbinary persons, who appear to be very likely to experience misconduct in the Church. People should also be trained in tactics to respond when they witness an incident, since respondents indicated a desire to act in such situations. Knowing what to say or do ahead of time will make that more likely.
- Processes for reporting and investigation need to be reviewed to make sure they are effective so they can be trusted by those currently hesitating to make reports. Clergy and employees particularly fear that a report would be held against them, so reporters must be protected from retaliation by supervisors, in their steps toward ordination, and by bishops and others in authority. Many suggested that there be more evenness across dioceses or that complaints be handled by persons outside of the bishops' offices, even outside of the clergy structures, where people perceive there is an attempt to protect each other – an “old boys club.” Some bishops have handled cases well, while others have not.

## WORKS CITED

Good, Laura and Rae Cooper. 2016. “But it's Your Job to be Friendly”: Employees Coping with and Contesting Sexual Harassment from Customers in Service Work. *Gender, Work and Organization*. 23: 448–469. <https://doi.org/10.1111/gwao.12117>.

Human Rights Campaign. 2015. “Sexual Assault and the LGBTQ Community” Washington, DC: Human Rights Campaign. Retrieved on 11/26/2020 at <https://www.hrc.org/resources/sexual-assault-and-the-lgbt-community>.

Masci, David. 2014. “U.S. Religious Landscape Survey” Washington, DC: Pew Research Center. Retrieved on 11/26/202 at <https://www.pewresearch.org/fact-tank/2016/10/11/how-income-varies-among-u-s-religious-groups/>.

Smith, Greg. 2019. “Another Decade of Major Decline in The Episcopal Church” Retrieved on 11/26/20 at <http://sowhatfaith.com/2019/09/07/another-decade-of-major-decline-in-the-episcopal-church/>.

## Continuance recommendation

Our Task Force requests that we be allowed to continue our work as a Task Force of the General Convention for the next 2 triennia, recognizing the continued challenges the current pandemic has created for the entire world. We ask that a budget of \$157,000 be allocated to our work for the next triennium. This will allow for three in-person meetings over the next triennium, consulting fees as we develop training modules, and costs associated with the beginning work for truth and reconciliation. See the summary of work for further explanation of the need for this Task Force to continue.

## Supplemental Materials

Table of contents:

1. [APPENDIX A - SURVEY INSTRUMENT](#)
2. [APPENDIX B - SPECIFIC SUGGESTIONS FOR IMPROVEMENTS](#)

## APPENDIX A: SURVEY INSTRUMENT

The online version of the survey below also included skip logic, programmed to move respondents to subsequent questions based on their responses to previous questions. That skip logic does not appear here.

This first section will allow us to identify patterns in the data based on demographics.

1. In what year were you born?

2. What is your gender identity?

- Female Cis (woman whose gender identity corresponds with that of her assigned sex)
- Female Transgender (woman whose gender identity differs from that of their assigned sex or those who are not exclusively masculine or feminine)
- Male Cisgender (man whose gender identity corresponds with that of his assigned sex)
- Male Transgender (man whose gender identity differs from that of their assigned sex or those who are not exclusively masculine or feminine)
- Non-Binary (one who may express their gender through a combination of masculinity and femininity or neither; aka genderqueer)

3. What is your sexual orientation (select all that apply)?

- Asexual
- Bisexual
- Gay
- Heterosexual
- Lesbian
- Pansexual
- Other (please specify): \_\_\_\_\_

4. What is your race/ethnicity? (select all that apply)

- Asian or Pacific Islander
- Black or African American
- Hispanic or Latinx
- Native American or Alaska Native
- White or Caucasian
- Other (please specify): \_\_\_\_\_

5. What is the highest educational level you have completed?

- Less than HS
- Some High School
- High School or GED
- Associate's Degree or Vocational Certificate
- Bachelor's Degree
- Graduate Degree

6. In what range is your gross annual income?

- 0 - \$25,000
- \$25,001 - \$50,000
- \$50,001 - \$75,000
- \$75,001 - \$100,000
- \$100,001 - \$150,000
- \$150,001 - \$250,000
- More than \$250,000

7. What is your role in the Episcopal Church (select all that apply)?

- Full-time Clergy
- Part-time Clergy
- Non-Stipendiary/Volunteer Clergy
- Retired Clergy
- Member of Religious Order
- Postulant/Candidate for Holy Orders
- Layperson
- Employee at a Local Church
- Employee at an Episcopal Church Institution/Agency (such as Diocesan Office, Camp/Retreat Center, College Chaplain)
- Employee at an Educational Institution
- Seminary Student
- Student in a Local Ordination Training Program

8. I am a (select all that apply):

- Bishop
- Bishop Suffragan
- Dean of Cathedral
- Rector with Clergy (Priest/Deacon) Staff
- Priest in Charge/Interim with Clergy (Priest/Deacon) staff
- Solo Rector
- Solo Priest in Charge/Interim
- Associate Rector
- Priest on Church Staff
- Priest on Non-Church Staff
- Deacon on Church Staff
- Deacon on Non-Church Staff
- Diocesan Canon/Staff
- Military Chaplain
- Hospital Chaplain
- School Chaplain
- Other (please specify): \_\_\_\_\_

9. That educational institution is

- an Episcopal Seminary
- an Episcopal College
- an Episcopal School
- a Deacon or Local Ministry Training Program

10. If you attend/serve a church, approximately how many persons attend on a regular Sunday? If a deacon/priest serving multiple churches, estimate the total for all churches.

- 1 - 49
- 50 - 149
- 150 - 349
- 350 or more
- I do not attend/serve an Episcopal Church.

11. My Episcopal Province/Diocese (broken down in more detail than appears here) is:

- I (CT, ME, MA, NH, RI, VT)
- II (Cuba, Europe, Haiti, NJ, NY, Virgin Islands)
- III (DE, MD, PA, VA, Washington DC, WV)
- IV (AL, GA, FL, KY, Eastern LA, MS, NC, SC, TN)
- V (IL, IN, MI, Eastern MO, OH, WI)
- VI (CO, IA, MN, MT, NE, ND, SD, WY)
- VII (AR, KS, NM, Western LA, Western MO, TX, OK)
- VIII (AK, AZ, CA, HI, ID, Micronesia, NV, OR, Taiwan, UT, WA)
- IX (Colombia, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Honduras, Puerto Rico, Venezuela)
- Not sure or Does not apply

**The next few questions ask about your awareness of policies and programs in The Episcopal Church.**

12. Are you familiar with The Episcopal Church's sexual misconduct policies? Or that we have sexual misconduct policies?

- Yes, I know the policies fairly well.
- I don't know the exact policies, but I know that they exist.
- I'm not sure.
- No, I really don't know anything about such policies.

13a. Would you know where within The Episcopal Church to report an incident of sexual misconduct?

- Yes
- Not sure
- No

13b. Where would you report such an incident?

14. Are you aware of any Episcopal Church sponsored educational programs dealing with sexual misconduct?

- Yes
- Not sure
- No



15a. Have you ever attended such an event?

- Yes
- No

15b. What event did you attend?

15c. Did you find that event helpful?

- Very much so
- Somewhat
- Minimally
- Not at all

15d. What would have made it better?

16a. Are you aware of an Episcopal Church related agency providing services to victims of sexual misconduct?

- Yes
- Not sure
- No

16b. What agency/ies do you know about and what services to they provide?

**The next section asks about your experiences with sexual or gender-based misconduct in TEC.**

17a. Have you ever received any of the following types of unwanted sexual attention or gender-based aggression/discrimination in an Episcopal Church?

	Church	School	Office	Not in an EC setting
Looks and leers				
Touching or closeness				
Attempt to fondle or kiss				
Gender-based comments, teasing or jokes				

	Church	School	Office	Not in an EC setting
Pressure to engage in gender-based comments, teasing or jokes				
Sexual emails, texts or letters				
Pressure for dates or sexual activities				
Offer to influence in return for sexual favors				
Attempted sexual assault/rape				
Completed sexual assault/rape				

17b. What aspect of your identity was the focus of the misconduct (select all that apply)?

- Your gender
- Your sexual orientation
- Your race/ethnicity
- Your order
- Something else
- Not sure

17c. The unwanted behavior/s was/were initiated by (select all that apply):

	Status		Gender		
	Clergy	Lay	Female	Male	Trans/Non-Binary
Denominational Leader (Bishop, Diocesan Staff, etc.)					
Local Church Priest					
Local Church Deacon					
Other Local Church Leader					

## REPORTS TO THE 80th GENERAL CONVENTION

	Status		Gender		
	Clergy	Lay	Female	Male	Trans/Non-Binary
Local Church Member					
Workplace Supervisor					
Workplace Colleague					
Workplace Client					
Seminary/Formation Program Instructor or Admin					
Field Ed Supervisor					
Seminary/Formation Program Student Colleague					
Other					

17d. Are you aware of anyone else who experienced gender-based or sexual misconduct by this/these person/s?

- Yes
- In some cases, yes, but not all
- No
- Not sure

18. Have rules ever been made in your church, school or workplace which were targeted at you, or enforced for you and not others, because of your sex, gender, gender identity or sexual orientation?

- Yes
- Not sure
- No

19. Have you been treated with less courtesy/respect than other people because of your sex, gender, gender identity or sexual orientation?

- Yes
- Not sure
- No

20. Have your contributions been overlooked or credited to someone else, because of your sex, gender, gender identity or sexual orientation?

- Yes
- Not sure
- No

21. Have you ever been discouraged or pushed out of a position or participation in a church/program because of your sex, gender, gender identity or sexual orientation?

- Yes
- Not sure
- No

22. Have you ever experienced any of the following because of your gender/gender identity (select all that apply)?

- Mis-gendering
- Rejection/Ostracization
- Failure of people to recognize your gender identity
- Exclusion from gender-specific activities
- Restroom restrictions
- Name calling
- Violence or threats of violence
- Dead-naming (use of previous name)
- Other (briefly describe): \_\_\_\_\_
- No

23. Have you ever experienced any of the following because of your sexual orientation? (select all that apply)?[1]

- Rejection/Ostracization
- Failure to recognize your orientation as legitimate
- Failure to recognize your partner/spouse as legitimate
- Name calling
- Other (briefly describe): \_\_\_\_\_
- No

24. In what decade(s) (if at all), did you have any experiences of gender-based/sexual misconduct occur (select all that apply)?

- Before 1970
- 1970s
- 1980s
- 1990s
- 2000s
- 2010s
- I have never experienced gender-based/sexual misconduct in an Episcopal Church setting.

25. How did you respond to any unwanted behaviors (select all that apply)?

- Ignored it, went along with it, minimized it or made a joke of it
- Avoided the person
- Told the person/s to stop
- Threatened to tell others
- Told a colleague/friend/church member
- Told a supervisor
- Requested a transfer or quit
- Other (briefly describe): \_\_\_\_\_

26. How did your supervisor respond (select all that apply)?

- An investigation was done
- I was believed and supported and appropriate corrective action was taken
- My complaint was trivialized, minimized or dismissed
- I was discounted and disciplinary action was taken against me

- I was told the behavior does not meet the threshold for an investigation
- I was not believed
- Other (briefly describe): \_\_\_\_\_

27. People choose not to make a formal complaint for many good reasons. What were your reasons for not reporting to a supervisor (select all that apply)?

- I did not know the reporting process.
- I considered the behavior minor and saw no need to report it.
- I did not want to hurt the person.
- I was too embarrassed.
- I didn't think anyone would believe me.
- I didn't think anything would be done.
- I feared it would be held against me or that it would affect my future.
- I was afraid of losing income.
- I feared I would be blamed.
- I was threatened with retaliation if I reported.
- Something else (briefly describe): \_\_\_\_\_

28. Overall, what difference did your response/s make (select all that apply)?

- Overall, things got better.
- There were multiple incidents and results varied.
- Overall, things got worse.
- Little or no change.
- Things got better for me, but nothing changed in the system.
- Things got better for others, but not for me.
- I had to help myself by leaving.
- I am still in the situation.
- I have lost income.
- I am having a hard time finding a new position.
- Something else: \_\_\_\_\_

29. How did your experience/s affect you?

	Got worse	No impact	Improved	DNA
My worship attendance				
My local church involvement				
My feelings about my local church				
My attendance at work				
The quality of my work				
My feelings about my work				
My attendance at school				
The quality of my school work				
My feelings about school				
My feelings @ The Episcopal Church				
My feelings about myself				
My relationship with God				
My spiritual practices				
My physical health				
My mental health				
My emotional health				
My financial health				

30. Was there any other impact on your life?

- No
- Not sure
- Yes (briefly describe): \_\_\_\_\_

31a. Have you ever witnessed any behaviors noted in previous questions in an Episcopal Church setting?

- Yes, I have witnessed one/some.
- I have not witnessed any, but it has been reported to me by the victim.
- I have not witnessed any, but it has been reported to me by someone other than the victim.
- No, I have never witnessed any of the above behaviors.
- Not sure.

31b. What was your response to witnessing and/or being informed of this behavior (select all that apply)?

- Ignored it/Did nothing
- Spoke with the victim only
- Spoke to the perpetrator only
- Began misconduct proceedings
- Reflected on my own behaviors that may be similar
- Shared my concerns with another person (Bishop, Rector or Colleague)
- Something else (briefly describe): \_\_\_\_\_

31c. Given raised awareness of sexual misconduct today, what would your response be if you saw the same behavior today?

- The same
- Different (briefly describe) \_\_\_\_\_
- Not sure

32. Is there anything else you'd like to say about gender-based/sexual misconduct in The Episcopal Church, related to your own experiences, or more generally?



## APPENDIX B: SPECIFIC SUGGESTIONS FOR IMPROVEMENTS

- There is no recourse against misbehavior by a **lay** church member, and that's a problem. We have to make it safer to report lay people, especially big givers; too bad lay members aren't required to take the training pre-confirmation.
- Attention must be paid to those of us who have been assaulted by **laypeople**. There needs to be action, not talk. Changes must be made in canon law church-wide to protect us. We need to be believed and taken seriously. We need the same procedures and protections that victims of clergy abuse receive. Simply telling us to go to court is neither helpful nor kind.
- It might be helpful to have **separate training programs** for men and women. For men to get really honest about their behavior, even the seemingly innocent stuff and for women to equip then better to protect themselves, recognize the early signs of grooming, and give them some real encouragement and tools to report.
- What sexual misconduct policy applies at **seminaries**? Title IX or Title IV. It is confusing and not clear to seminarians.
- I believe we need to make clear ways for **associates/assistants/curates** to make reports against rectors that protect the victim. The way our polity is set up makes it very scary to report anything against a rector because it currently seems most likely that the victim (associate/curate) will be the one who loses their job and has long-term consequences for the incident. I know so many (mostly female) associates who have experienced this behavior.
- Often, it **depends entirely on the bishop** as to whether there is support. Bishops are beholden to the parish for their paychecks, and not many, in my experience, are comfortable challenging the people who pay their salaries. Unless real, tangible, systemic change is made (more than token liturgies - in transparent misconduct proceedings that do not rely on Diocesan staff to be intake officers while unwilling to challenge their employer - or who themselves are also inappropriate in their behavior) then there will be no accountability and little ability to challenge the status quo.
- The **alcohol culture** at church meetings results in a lot of inappropriate incidents.
- **Leaflets in the bulletins** with training announcements would be great.
- I wish we could have **mandatory misconduct training that has more teeth**. The reporting **process should be the same in every diocese**, and **victims should be able to see the final copy of their own reports**. It is too sensitive an event for it to be simply transcribed by someone who wasn't there, after an interview, with no review by the victim to insure it is accurate.

- One thing I would love to see is the Canon to the Ordinary or appointee check in after 6 months or a year to see how you are doing and see if there is anything to do to help. After a priest does something like this, the Canon is the front line of the church. I would have appreciated more **communication** regarding the progress and ending of the investigation that stemmed from my incident.
- Information about our Title IV processes is still very spotty depending upon the diocese. People still suffer needlessly. There does not appear to be a way to **make sure that our Bishops do their own due diligence** in relationship to our Canons.
- Our current canons, which only have mechanisms that are very punitive, still leave room for a **lot of conduct to go unchecked. There is a lot of conduct that shouldn't raise to the level of "removal from ministry" that should be addressable.** We should also have better mechanisms for holding lay people to account/inviting change.
- Publish **new materials**. Make it online on YouTube, and broadly available. Make it super easy for anyone to learn. Make vignettes. 7 min video about one topic. You will need 20 videos not one or two.
- My only major advice is to do a huge **overhaul of safeguarding**. As someone who experienced sexual assault NOT in the Episcopal Church as a youth, I think the program is poorly done and triggering. Programs should also be available to offer guidance to anyone going through safeguarding who may need additional support afterwards. While I was fine mentally after the sessions, a peer in my cohort left the program obviously distraught. It was obvious that it had an impact on several people within the class, and I think the training could be done with more tact.
- I would like to see churches **post salaries** for open positions (clergy and lay) and stick to them, rather than allowing "room for negotiation" (which always penalizes female and POC candidates), and somewhere to turn when a Title IV complaint quietly fizzles because the priest in question is a friend of the bishop.
- A **simple, clear outline** of applicable offenses and reporting procedures would be helpful.