

HOUSE OF DEPUTIES COMMITTEE ON THE STATE OF THE CHURCH

Roster

Ms. Kathryn Nishibayashi, Chair	Los Angeles, VIII	2024
The Rev. Rowan Larson, Vice-Chair	Massachusetts, I	2024
Ms. Karma Quick-Panwala, Vice-Chair	California, VIII	2024
Deputy Nathan Brown, Secretary	Washington, III	2024
The Rev. Erin Betz Shank	Northwestern Pennsylvania , III	2024
The Rev. Megan L. Castellan	Central New York, II	2024
Dr. Dawn Conley	Arizona, VIII	2024
The Rev. Angela Goodhouse	North Dakota, VI	2024
Lillian Hardaway	Virginia, III	2024
Brother Luis Enrique Hernández Rivas	New York, II	2024
Lauren Kay	Maine, I	2024
The Rev. Milquella Mendoza	Dominican Republic, IX	2024
The Rev. Dr. Nina Ranadive Pooley	Western Massachusetts, I	2024
The Rev. Nelson Serrano Poveda	San Joaquin, VIII	2024
The Rev. Kelly Steele	Georgia, IV	2024
Ms. Evangeline Warren	Ohio, V	2024
Ms. Julia Ayala Harris, Ex Officio	Oklahoma, VII	2024
Adia Milien, Representative of the President of the House of Deputies		2024
Mr. Michael Glass, Consultant	San Joaquin, VIII	2024

Changes in Membership

Angela Goodhouse did not participate in meetings, no reason given.

Acknowledgements

First, we wish to thank President Ayala Harris for being a source of wisdom and guidance as we undertook our work. Additionally, we wish to acknowledge Chancellor Michael Glass who served as a valuable consultant to our committee. We wish to acknowledge members of the following committees who we consulted with throughout our work: Task Force on Parochial Report Finance Page, Standing Committee on Structure, Governance, Constitution, and Canons, Task Force on the State of Membership, and the previous HOD State of the Church committee. We also wish to thank those in the wider church who emailed feedback to us with input on the parochial report.

Mandate

Our work as a committee was guided by two mandates: one from Canon I.6.5.b “A Committee of the House of Deputies shall be appointed following the close of each General Convention, to serve ad interim, and to prepare and present to the next meeting of the House of Deputies a report on the State of the Church; which report, when agreed to by the said House, shall be sent to the House of Bishops.”

Our second mandate came directly from the President of the House of Deputies, Julia Ayala Harris, who, when she formed this committee, charged us to focus on the following: “To address how the pandemic has accelerated the pace of change...we have found that the future church is already upon us. As a church, what have we learned as we adapted to the pandemic and post-pandemic life? What questions do we need to be asking ourselves as we move into our future?”

President Ayala Harris has used three lenses to guide her leadership: accessibility, inclusivity, and safety. We as a committee felt that these were important priorities to consider as we discerned the State of the Church.

Review of Prior Work and how it informed our work

We began our work by reviewing what the previous State of the Church committee had worked on to see where there might be areas that our committee could build on. However, we were also mindful that we had a shortened time frame compared with previous iterations of this committee and could not address as many areas as we would have liked. Like the previous committee, we also spent time discussing what it means to belong to or be a member of an Episcopal Church, but we could not delve too deeply into it, though we did have conversations with the Task Force on the State of Membership in The Episcopal Church around what it means to be a “communicant in good standing.” It seemed like that task force was better equipped to address the issue more fully. The areas that we were able to build upon—but not fully address— included the lack of research capacity, improving the quality of data received through said research, and the need for greater tools for digital collaboration in TEC. Additionally, we used the previous committee’s desire for further expansion of what encompasses “church ministry”, especially those not traditionally captured by worship services, to inform some of the changes we proposed for inclusion in the parochial reports

Current Work

Meeting dates

The committee met in person in Linthicum Heights, MD November 14—17, 2022. The committee also met via Zoom on December 17, 2022, January 31, March 15, April 27, June 28, August 3 and October 19, 2023.

Subcommittee on Resources

When our full committee met for the first time in November 2022 in Baltimore, we established three committees, each employing a different focus through which to wrestle with the mandate set before us.

When thinking about what kind of questions The Episcopal Church needs to ask itself as we move into our future, the Subcommittee on Resources took a particular interest in our church's stewardship and use of resources of all kinds. While financial and material resources are an important consideration, we also considered staffing, land use, ways of thinking, and the gifts and skills that lay and ordained leaders in our church bring.

We feel that using the focus of “resources” helps keep in mind what it takes to keep The Episcopal Church going and able to move into the future. President Ayala Harris’ guiding principles of accessibility, inclusivity, and safety mean nothing without a church left to embody them.

Therefore, we have proposed four questions for The Episcopal Church to consider.

1. What can we put down?
2. Are we being as transparent as possible with the resources that we have?
3. What does system breakdown cost us in material and immaterial resources?
4. How could we reimagine using the resources we have to better facilitate collaboration on all levels: parish, diocesan, and within and beyond the whole Episcopal Church. How do we encourage partnership and mutual ministry before organizations (parishes, dioceses, etc.) are on the brink of collapse?

The first question that this subcommittee recommends The Episcopal Church ask itself is: “**What can we put down?**” In other words, what can we stop doing, or begin to do in a different way that’s better adapted to our present reality?

As leaders in our own contexts across the Church, subcommittee members have noted the ways in which The Episcopal Church is changing, and the ways that the pandemic has accelerated some of those changes. Many Episcopalians look at these changes and fall into a scarcity mindset, focusing on

decline. We recognize that this question, “What can we put down?” may sound like it comes from a place of scarcity. However, our thinking behind this question is about prioritizing what we do so that we can do it to the best of our ability; to be able to bring an abundance mindset to what it is that we have discerned is most important to continue to do as the future of the church is upon us.

Each year at Diocesan Conventions and every Triennium at General Convention, resolutions are adopted that call for the Church to do more and more things. It is much less common for a resolution to be adopted that asks the church to be doing less. By doing more and more without thinking about what work is no longer ours to do, we take our limited resources as a Church and stretch them more thinly each year.

This is no easy task; [research has shown](#) that when faced with a problem to solve, people are much more likely to try to add something to fix the problem rather than take something away, even when the subtractive option is obvious.

We invite the Church to ask itself on all levels what we can stop doing. One way forward would be to look back at the recommendations that the [Task Force for Reimagining the Episcopal Church \(TREC\) made to General Convention in 2015](#) and considering if we have met the adopted recommendations or if there are others that make even more sense in 2023 than they did in 2015.

The second question the Subcommittee on Resources recommends that The Episcopal Church, dioceses, and congregations and worshipping communities consider is: **“Are we being as transparent as possible with the resources that we have?”**

When determining the capacity of the whole Church to continue to do the work of the Jesus Movement in 2023 and beyond, it is imperative that all the scope of our resources is known and easily accessible.

While there have been some attempts to map resources, such as the [Episcopal Asset Map](#), which maps our buildings, ministries, and other resources, and the General Convention Office’s [Study your Neighborhood](#) tool, using data from the annual Parochial Report, we believe that there are likely ways in which The Episcopal Church, our dioceses, and our congregations and communities can be more transparent about the resources that they steward.

As one subcommittee member who is on their Diocesan Budget Committee notes, while much of the data about the financial resources of The Episcopal Church is out there, it is not easily accessible or easy to understand without a background in finance and deep experience with the way financial data is reported. We recommend that The Episcopal Church consider making all its data, especially its financial resource data, more accessible and easier to understand, which we believe will help future State of the Church committees and other governing bodies be able to ask difficult questions which need to be asked.

The third question the Subcommittee on Resources recommends the Church ask itself is: **“What does system breakdown cost us in material and immaterial resources?”**

What does it cost us when there is a breakdown in the canonical systems of the church? There is often the hidden cost of lawsuits and legal fees, especially when the system breakdown leads to real harm for Episcopalians and others. However, the true cost of such challenges is unknown by most of the church.

What does it cost us when churches slip through the cracks, and instead of needing a smaller intervention, end up needing a much larger infusion of resources—of diocesan staff time, of money, and more?

This question does not have a clear answer—related to the previous question on transparency—but it leads to an interesting thought experiment on how our systems might be adjusted to minimize resource expenditure when things go wrong.

The final question that the Subcommittee on Resources recommends The Episcopal Church consider is two-fold. **We wonder how we could reimagine the resources we have to better facilitate collaboration on all levels: parish, diocesan, and within and beyond the whole Episcopal Church.** The second part of this question is: **“How do we encourage partnership and mutual ministry before organizations (parishes, dioceses, etc.) are on the brink of collapse?”**

The number of dioceses in partnership continues to increase, as dioceses begin to collaborate and share resources, like the active partnership between Northwestern Pennsylvania and Western New York begun in 2018, the collaboration between the three dioceses of Northern New England that is beginning, and the proposed reunifications of the three dioceses in Wisconsin. In the last year, the two dioceses of Indiana and two Pennsylvania dioceses have also voted to begin considering possible reunification. Our subcommittee sees all of these collaborations and partnerships as a very good thing, especially when a partnership is begun while all parties are still in a strong financial position.

We hope that these brave collaborations between dioceses will inform other collaborations at all levels of the church. We acknowledge that true collaboration is difficult work. Trying new things, learning to think in new ways, and experiencing the changes in identity that result from collaboration takes dedicated and persistent commitment from leadership and buy-in from communities affected by the collaboration.

However, we would like to name that collaboration alone will not address the ongoing clergy shortage. Simply combining quarter time jobs to make a full-time job is not true collaboration. Artificial collaboration creates untenable positions across multiple parishes to be filled by one priest. This often adversely affects young clergy, clergy of color, women clergy, and queer clergy. We feel that we must name the ways that artificial collaboration does not lead to communities that are accessible, inclusive, and safe.

Healthy collaboration allows the Holy Spirit to move in new and empowering ways that were previously unimaginable, and there are examples for the church to look to within and beyond itself for inspiration.

During our time together as a committee, we solicited feedback from across the church on the Parochial Reports fielded in 2022 and 2023. Much of the feedback we received highlighted how onerous the Parochial Report has become, with a significant number of essay questions and a duplication of data that the Church collects through other research and data vehicles. With this in mind, we turned our attention towards revising the Parochial Report to become more streamlined and easier to complete. Recognizing that expansive and innovative thinking happens best when undertaken without constraint, we rebuilt the report from the ground up, starting from scratch and working together to understand which data might be of interest to the church to collect and, more critically, which data was appropriate for the Parochial Report *specifically* to collect. We celebrate the desire for greater knowledge and data collection across the Church, but we must balance this desire with the resources required to collect, fill out, and analyze the data in the Parochial Report.

The new version of the Parochial Report drafted by our subcommittee represents a compromise between our need for information about the state of the church and our care for the overworked parish administrators and clergy who take time to fill out these survey instruments. We have met with stakeholders across the Church to ensure that our new measures provide continuity with past surveys and that canonical reporting requirements are fulfilled. A key change to this parochial report includes the elimination of many of the clergy-related questions. We are able to accomplish this due to the robust data sharing infrastructure between the General Convention Office (GCO) and Church Pension Group (CPG). Other significant changes include the reduction of open-ended responses, which minimizes the resources required to complete the form as well as to analyze it, and updated language to measure racial diversity and age diversity in our parishes, information which is critical to our understanding of the health of the church. Finally, we included explainer text and definitions for terms that are unclear, ambiguous, or critically important, thereby eliminating the workbook.

Our hope is that this new version of the report will be fielded concurrently as an optional alternative to the current version in 2024 (capturing data from 2023) and that it will fully replace the current version in 2025 (capturing data from 2024). This multi-stage release allows us to minimize burden on parishes in 2025 who may have otherwise been surprised by the new questions and their structures and the year of overlap allows for data quality monitoring internally to ensure that continuity of data can be achieved for critical measures. The version included as an appendix at the end of this report has been adopted by Executive Council as the report of record. At the time of the writing of this report (Nov 2023), changes to the finance page have yet to be finalized and approved by this committee or Executive Council.

Making Data a Longer-Term Priority

As stated above, the committee's mandate includes analyzing the state of the church but found the parochial and diocesan report data to be insufficient for such analysis. We also share a desire to task professional data collectors and analysts with collecting the more onerous data that burdened the current parochial or diocesan report. Put simply, we have been asking the parochial report to do too much heavy lifting for our data needs.

Why does a church need good data and analysis? To make critical decisions regarding our health and potential weaknesses. We need to step beyond fear- and/or intuition-based decision-making at all levels of governance and move toward data-driven decision-making. In a time of enormous change, we wish to know exactly what is going on in and around our church to find answers to critical questions such as, but not limited to: "Where is our growth? Decline? Who is innovating well, and with what grant awards, if any? What can our demographic, financial, and/or numerical trends teach us about our faithfulness to God's mission? What has allowed recent church starts to flourish or fail? What people groups are being underserved and/or overlooked? How might we be able to track the flow of resources through the entire church? What can we faithfully let go to more fully embrace God's mission?" We seek information beyond anecdotal stories, good metadata on which we can pray and strategize about our collective future. The areas of The Episcopal Church which could benefit from this are unlimited.

To this end, we collaborated with the Standing Commission on Structure, Governance, Constitutions & Canons to explore methods of canonically instituting a new, long-term commitment to data collection and analysis. To quote the resolution explanation birthed from our partnership:

"When is the best time to plant a tree? Twenty years ago. When is the second-best time to plant a tree? Now. The Episcopal Church is woefully behind our sister denominations in the collection, study, and use of data for decision making at every level of the Church, and in a perfect world, this resolution would be designed to create a high-level staff position for such work. Given the realities of a new Presiding Bishop who will want to organize their own staff, this stop-gap measure is presented to a) require the next Presiding Bishop to offer a full data analysis and b) urge the Church-wide structure, dioceses, congregations, committees, commissions, agencies, and boards to make use of data in their decision making. Outsourcing this work in the first triennium will allow the Presiding Bishop, the House of Deputies Committee on the State of the Church, and the Standing Commission on Structure, Governance, Constitutions, and Canons to take an iterative approach in understanding what data is helpful, how it is best collected, and in what form the report should be produced."

In sum, our intention is to show that the current House of Deputies Committee on the State of the Church, a very young and diverse group, supports this resolution and long-term investment. This committee has been charged with creating and adapting the parochial and diocesan reports and discerning the current state of ecclesial matters, and agrees with the urgent need to collect, analyze, and disseminate good data and conduct research decision-making from that data. The church, now more than ever, needs to evaluate its own processes and bring them into conformity with our true

realities and God's priorities. Parochial and diocesan reports are not sufficient to know the state of the church in full nor is that data easily accessible in a format for leaders at various levels. Good, accessible data is paramount; we see the limits of a transitory committee of non-experts writing and amending the parochial and diocesan reports as well as soliciting and receiving usable data from those reports. We wish to see a church-wide effort to employ more professional methods for conducting research and gathering and analyzing data. We envision, from this resolution, an enhanced ability to make more fully informed decisions at all levels of church governance to meet the challenges of our time.

Subcommittee on Discipline

Title IV

As part of the discernment of the State of the Church Committee, it was impossible for us to overlook the current state of our Title IV procedures. While Title IV has been a significant step forward in fostering an environment of safety and accountability, we still have further progress to make to ensure a safer Church. A safe Church is directly related to the State of the Church. Most of us likely know several people who have left their respective Church homes after unfortunate encounters, feeling a lack of justice, a lack of safety, and feeling like their voices were not heard during an often-traumatic encounter. Recently, several high-profile Title IV matters have shown that, while we have taken important steps forward in ensuring that our churches are safe for all, we still have room for improvement.

First and foremost, this Committee concurs with the Presiding Bishop's determination that the issues surrounding Title IV require detailed reflection and review by the Standing Commission on Structure, Governance, Constitution and Canons. This body is best equipped to deliberate on the strengths and weaknesses of our current Title IV structure, and how to improve weak points in the Canonical framework that it lays out. We recognize, however, that this process will take time, and urge the Church to reflect on actions that can be taken now to ensure that every person can be assured that the Episcopal Church is a safe place for them, and that clergy at all levels will be held accountable for misconduct.

We encourage everyone interested in Title IV to submit their recommendations to the Standing Commission on Structure, Governance, Constitution and Canons, and to closely follow their work in the next triennium and continue to offer constructive feedback and comments as this process progresses. We all recognize that the Church is not a perfect institution, and Title IV will never be a perfect process, but by continuing to collaborate, we can create a stronger process that creates a safer church.

This committee recognizes that there are many mechanisms within the current Canonical framework that are not being fully implemented by the respective authorities. First and foremost, we urge

Ecclesiastical Authorities to use the powers granted to them in Canon IV.7.3 to place a cleric accused of misconduct on administrative leave and/or to restrict their ministry in some way when there is a reasonable concern about safety to and welfare of the Church. We particularly urge these actions to be routine when there is an allegation of harassment or sexual misconduct. It is important for us to remember that the powers granted in this Canon are temporary, and do not assume the guilt of the Respondent. Rather, its sole purpose in our Canonical framework is to ensure the immediate safety of our Church when there is an allegation, understanding that that allegation has not yet been proven or sustained. We cannot continue to strengthen the state of the Church without our congregations feeling safe in their churches.

This Committee also expresses its concerns about the disposition of cases where sexual misconduct is alleged and substantiated that were referred to pastoral response rather than continuing the Title IV process. While we recognize the important role that a pastoral response must play for both the Complainant and Respondent, we must also recognize that a pastoral response cannot be the sum total of our efforts towards accountability and reconciliation. Accountability, reconciliation, mercy, and justice are not mutually exclusive concepts in the Gospel, but rather, are all complementary and needed for true healing and safety in our communities. We have observed often that, with all the best intentions, the Church has sometimes sought to protect the reputation of the Church and provide grace to Respondents rather than providing support and justice to the Complainants. We believe these are not mutually exclusive aims, but rather are all needed to ensure an ideal resolution.

Truth-telling is the cornerstone in shining light on the State of the Church. It is essential for maintaining trust, protecting our congregations, promoting healing, and serving as a positive witness to the world. Part of that truth telling is the need for honest discernment about how we implement the existing Title IV canons in our Church, and encourage all people involved at every level of the Title IV process to do the same. Who is best served by the way our current system is administered? How can we improve it to create a culture of integrity and safety in our Churches while respecting the rights and dignity of every person involved? While these questions are daunting in scope, we must remember Christ's commandment to "tend my sheep" and be reminded that all of us, especially Bishops in the Church, are entrusted with both shepherding and safeguarding the flock of the faithful in our Churches.

A specific area of the Title IV process that we feel needs addressing is the process concerning intake officers. All too often, complaints submitted to the intake officer are "investigated" by well-meaning intake officers—a role outside their Canonical scope. Part of this issue appears to be a deficiency in Title IV training, which we discuss later in this report, and another is likely a very human impulse to want to collect "all the available facts" before making a decision that could result in some sort of adverse action down the line for a member of the clergy. It is vital that Churches provide ample training to all persons involved in Title IV matters, but most especially to Intake Officers who generally serve as the point of first contact for Complainants in these matters.

In addition to greater training and emphasis to Title IV intake officers of the scope of their Canonical role to determine “if the complaint is true, would it constitute an Offense?” as outlined in Canon IV.6.7, there is a greater need for communication and transparency when a determination is made by an intake officer to a Complainant. We have noted that, far too often, a Complainant may not hear about the intake officer’s determination on their Complaint, or if they do, well after a determination has been made. While there is a Canonical requirement of a notice if the complaint is dismissed, there is not clear Canonical mandates requiring a notice that the matter has been referred to a Reference Panel to be sent to the Complainant. Unfortunately, we have observed that often even when the Complaint is dismissed, the Canonical requirement of notification to the Complainant is not made, depriving them of their rights to appeal under the Canons. These areas are in urgent need of addressing.

In discerning how to address these deficiencies, the Committee recommends that the Standing Commission on Structure, Governance, Constitution and Canons consider creating a more uniform Title IV intake process. At present, intake officers throughout the Church have a variety of different levels of training, understanding, and experience with the Title IV process. We ask the Standing Commission on Structure, Governance, Constitution and Canons to discern the wisdom of creating a church-wide intake officer process for all complaints to provide greater uniformity to how these complaints are handled by individuals with expert knowledge of the Title IV process. We also believe such a process would increase faith in the integrity and impartiality of the Title IV process.

We also encourage the Standing Commission on Structure, Governance, Constitution and Canons to consider the use of a third-party specialized organization to oversee the Intake phase of Title IV proceedings. We note that others in the Anglican Communion, such as the Dioceses of Melbourne and Bendigo in the Church of Australia, have adopted the use of a third-party agency known as Kooyoora to provide independent oversight of this process. We also note organizations such as the Godly Response to Abuse in the Christian Environment (GRACE) which is utilized by some Churches in the United States. While we recognize that such a change would have a funding implication for the Church, we believe there is great value in having an independent party examining initial complaints and applying them to our Canons. We encourage the Standing Commission on Structure, Governance, Constitution and Canons to wrestle with this question as it discerns the next best steps for Title IV.

Of great concern in our current Canonical framework is the level of discretion given to the Church Attorney in the Title IV process. The powers defined in Canon IV.2 include “to exercise discretion consistent with this Title and the interests of the Church by declining to advance proceedings or by referring any matter back to the Intake Officer or the Bishop Diocesan for pastoral response in lieu of disciplinary action.” We urge the Standing Commission on Structure, Governance, Constitution and Canons to consider revising the scope of powers granted to the Church Attorney. First and foremost, we are concerned that nothing in the wording of the mandate of the Church Attorney provides any duty to provide advocacy for the Complainant if the Church Attorney’s investigation shows that there is merit to the complaint. As stated in the Canons, the role of the Church Attorney is to represent the Church, not the Complainant, yet significant powers are given to the Church Attorney to make

unilateral decisions on how a complaint is handled, including referring a complaint out of the Title IV process to a pastoral response without any oversight of relevant Title IV bodies or any input by the parties involved.

We recognize that there are many situations in which a pastoral response may be the best outcome for all involved rather than proceeding in the Title IV process. It is paramount, however, that there is greater oversight of the discretion of the Church Attorney, and to ensure that the rights and interests of the Complainant are also being looked after. We urge the Standing Commission on Structure, Governance, Constitution and Canons to provide oversight for the use of discretion by the Church Attorney to refer a matter out of the Title IV process for pastoral response to require the approval of the Reference Panel, or the relevant panel which the matter may currently be pending. We also suggest that the Complainant and Respondent be given notice of this recommendation by the Church Attorney and provide all parties an opportunity to respond with a written submission outlining their position, so that the panel can consider the best actions to take.

We have painfully learned the damage caused when institutions place protecting their own interests over the needs of their members. While we in the Episcopal Church have made great strides to addressing this issue, it is clear that even within our current Canonical framework, our system continues to look after the interests of the Church first and foremost, sometimes to the detriment of our congregations and creating a safe Church. We urge the Church to view a safe Church as in its best interest, and recognize that although justice, accountability, and reconciliation are often painful, it is in the best interests of all involved in the Church and provides for greater public trust in our institutions.

As we outlined above, the Church has representation in the process, but the Complainant has few resources with which to navigate the complicated system of Title IV. While Title IV.19.10 requires advisors to be available to Respondents and Complainants to assist with the Title IV process, we find that this Canon is rarely followed in practice. When it is followed, often any contact with the relevant party is rare. It is vital that everyone in the Title IV process have someone available who can help them navigate this complex process, and who is regularly informed (and therefore can inform) the person they are advising about the current posture of their pending matter.

We also encourage the Church to provide greater pastoral support to all parties involved in a Title IV matter. Too often, both Complainants and Respondents alike are not overtly offered pastoral care. We understand there may be a well-meaning assumption in the Church that if someone is in need of pastoral care, they will contact their priest or some other person in the Church for help, but this is not always the case. We encourage the Church to always make pastoral support available to all involved, and to let the parties know who to contact for this support whenever they may wish it.

We recognize a competing interest in privacy and safeguarding which are aptly represented in the portions of the Title IV Canons requiring a Title IV database but imposing strict privacy requirements. We believe that the current Canonical limitations on the access of this information are far too

stringent, and urge the Standing Commission on Structure, Governance, Constitution and Canons to review the limitations in Canons IV.19.3(i) and IV.19.4 to allow for the database to contain information about the Respondents in cases where there is a sustained finding, either through order or accord, that a Canonical offense occurred. Further, we believe there should be greater accessibility of this information for any institution in the Church that is considering hiring a cleric.

It is important for our Churches to have all relevant information to them when they are discerning hiring a cleric, and it is important that any previous sustained Title IV findings are made available to the relevant authority discerning making this call. We recognize and stress that not every sustained Title IV complaint should be disqualifying for a member of the Clergy, and recognize the importance of forgiveness and reconciliation, but it is vital that bodies that are discerning calling that member of the clergy to a position consider this as part of their discernment process.

As we have noted in our report, a systemic problem of Title IV implementation has been training deficiencies concerning those involved in the Title IV process. We encourage Dioceses and Provinces to place an emphasis on Title IV training for all those involved in all levels of Title IV, including Bishops and Canons to the Ordinary. We also encourage regular Title IV training refreshers to ensure that understanding about the Canonical process remains fresh for all individuals who are handling Title IV issues.

We reiterate this Committee's opinion that the vast majority of issues in how the Title IV process is carried out in the Church is not done nefariously, but rather by well-intentioned people who are trying to navigate a process that is both procedurally and emotionally complex for all involved. Through making greater training resources available to those who may be called upon to fulfill the Title IV process, as well as making pastoral support more freely available to all parties in a Title IV proceeding, we believe we can help mitigate these issues.

We call upon the next Presiding Bishop of the Church to make Title IV a priority as they take over that office, recognizing their central role in the process for Bishops. We encourage our next Presiding Bishop to also join our Church in discerning the best steps for the entire Title IV process. While there has been significant attention about the perceived mishandling of the Title IV process for Bishops, we recognize that these issues are not confined to the handling of such matters for Bishops but are also present in how Title IV is applied to other clerics.

The President of the House of Deputies made increasing safety in the Church one of the key pillars of her Presidency. Having a robust, just, and consistent Title IV process is key to ensuring that our Churches and institutions are safe environments, and that accountability and reconciliation are administered uniformly throughout the Church.

Separate from Title IV, we also call upon the Church to consider fair processes to address lay leaders who may be creating an unsafe Church environment. We note that there are procedures in many other mainline denominations, but there are few, if any, recourse for a member of the Church to rectify an

unsafe situation if the alleged offender is a lay person with authority. We recognize these are difficult conversations and emphasize that these conversations must happen separately from the existing Title IV framework.

We also wish to take a moment to recognize the harm that our Church has caused when it has not handled these matters as well as we might have. We grieve for the negative experiences that many have had with this process, and recognize the pain it has caused, even resulting with many leaving our Church as a result of this experience. We as a Church commit to doing better, and to continue grappling with this difficult issue. While we are, and will always be, an imperfect institution who will not always get things right, we understand—and have a sense that the wider Church understands—the need for these reforms to our process.

While reforms will take many years to be enacted in the Canons, much of what we have noted in our report is covered by our existing Title IV structure but is not consistently being followed or implemented by individuals responsible for various stages of the Title IV process. There is much we can do now, in our existing Canonical framework, to make our Churches safer while we continue to prayerfully discern along with the Standing Commission on Structure, Governance, Constitution and Canons the best ways to improve our Canonical process and ensure that we leave our time in positions of governance in this Church with a safer Church than we found it.

We call upon the 81st and subsequent General Conventions to continue to oversee and discern this work and ensure that the winds for reform move our Church to better and safer shores.

Accessibility and Inclusion

Our mandate from the President of the House of Deputies asks us to consider how the [COVID-19] pandemic accelerated the pace of change across the Church, and through the lens of accessibility, inclusion, and safety. The mandate demands that we ponder, “What questions do we need to be asking ourselves as we move into the future?”

We ask the Church to begin with: “What are we as a Church doing to provide full access, inclusion, affirmation, and reconciliation for disabled and Deaf people at all levels of the Church?”

The COVID-19 pandemic is ongoing. Nearly 1 in every 5 adults in the United States who reported having COVID has experienced symptoms of long COVID well after having COVID itself.ⁱ The prevalence of long COVID is thought to be higher in Latin America and South American countries based on limited research that has been done.ⁱⁱ Nearly 1 in 30 Europeans have experienced long COVID.ⁱⁱⁱ Long COVID, and the chronic health conditions that come with it, has meant that millions of people worldwide have acquired a disability, joining the estimated 1.3 billion people in the world already living with disabilities.^{iv}

Simply put, the COVID-19 pandemic resulted in millions of people worldwide, and thousands in the United States, joining the disability and Deaf communities.

We must also ask the Church: How did the COVID-19 pandemic shine a light on the existing, constant, and now ever-growing need for accessibility and inclusion in our walls, our ministry, and in any place that we gather? What work must we do to ensure that all of God's children can access the table, participate in a Zoom meeting for worship or fellowship, or be affirmed and not simply welcomed?

We call on the Church to begin by remembering our Baptismal Covenant: To strive for justice and peace among all people, and respect the dignity of every human being. We also ask the Church to remember the numerous times it has committed to a voluntary adherence to the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990, or to act in the spirit of the United Nations Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities of 2006, yet did not do the work necessary to ensure true access and inclusion of disabled people at all levels and in all work of the Church.

The Church's Previous Work Towards Accessibility and Inclusion

Past General Conventions of The Episcopal Church have voted on or passed a total of ten (10) resolutions going back to the 64th General Convention in 1973 in which the Convention committed the Church to accessibility and inclusion of disabled and Deaf people:

- 1973-B113: Prioritize Assistance to and Participation of the Deaf and Deaf Ministry
- 1985-A087: Encourage Opportunities Within the Church for Persons with Disabilities
- 2003-C006: Welcome the Church's Diverse "New Majority"
- 2006-D070: On the Topic of Programs for Persons with Disabilities (Rejected; Resolution died with adjournment.)
- 2009-D032: Commit to Non-Discrimination in Lay Employment
- 2012-D068: Address Education and Pastoral Care of Developmentally Disabled
- 2015-D043: Ensure Accessibility for Disabled Persons at All Church Events
- 2015-D034: Support the Civil Rights of Disabled Persons
- 2015-A077: Publicize Formation Resources for People with Disabilities
- 2018-D097: Establish a Task Force on Accessibility and ADA Compliance

While we commend the Conventions on their desire to affirmatively include disabled people at all levels of the Church and promise to make the Church accessible, many of the resolutions did not result in significant action being taken by any official body of the Church to ensure access and inclusion Church-wide. Those resolutions that led to the creation of Task Forces or other interim bodies were able to gather resources and continue to push and advocate for accessibility and inclusion.

Ultimately, prior to the pandemic, no significant change in policy or structure of the Church led to actual or measurable accessibility and inclusion for disabled people. The resources that were gathered,

while done with every best intention, were not made so widely available as to be both instructive at all levels of the Church for full inclusion and accessibility and, more importantly, easily accessed by all Church institutions and congregations.

By the time all ten resolutions had passed, there were numerous laws in the United States, the United Nations, and across Asia and Europe that guaranteed access and inclusion in all aspects of society. Indeed, multiple and renowned disability rights organizations with abundant information and resources, such as DREDF in Berkeley or the ADA National Network, have been available to any member of the public and any organization that desired concrete information and steps to take towards accessibility and inclusion of disabled and Deaf people in their spaces.

Task Force on Disability and Deaf Access

There is one very significant interim body resulting from a General Convention resolution that we wish to highlight in this Report. In July 2018 at the 79th General Convention, 2018-D097, “Establish a Task Force on Disability and ADA Compliance,” was passed as a result of organized efforts by disability advocates on the floor, their allies, and several deputy caucuses representing multiple marginalized communities in the Church. The mandate of the task force, officially titled the Task Force on Disability and Deaf Access, was “to review progress made toward full compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) and any other relevant statutes; consult with Church staff to ensure that materials, policies, and procedures for accessibility and reasonable accommodations are developed and implemented for each General Convention and ancillary Church events; and develop a means of reconciliation with people who have been excluded from Church events due to lack of accessibility or failure to provide reasonable accommodations.”

While the work of the Task Force was greatly impacted by the COVID-19 pandemic, its Blue Book Report to the 80th General Convention provides an excellent foundation for the work of access, inclusion, and affirmation of disabled and Deaf people to be done by the Church going forward. Because they did an excellent job of laying out the concerns we share regarding accessibility and inclusion in the Church today, we feel no need to repeat much of their report. We deliberately include the link to the Task Force’s Blue Book Report to the 80th General Convention here for all to read and prayerfully consider: https://www.episcopalarchives.org/e-archives/gc_reports/reports/2022/bb_2022-R038.pdf

We wish to strongly highlight the fact that the Task Force’s Report was written by disabled and Deaf members of the Task Force, as experts on the areas of access and inclusion, and able to share with the Church their expertise in the language, cultures, identities, and lived experience as disabled Children of God. This makes their Report recommendations even more urgent:

- **Formation and Ordination:** “Accessible alternatives in formation at all levels, with specific attention to formation for ordination.”

- **Language Access:** “Specific communication access requests for persons who are Deaf or hard of hearing should always be provided as a reasonable accommodation for full participation in meetings and activities of The Episcopal Church, whether the request is for American Sign Language interpretation or Communication Access Realtime Translation (CART) services”.
- **Liturgy:** “We encourage official revisions of the Book of Common Prayer, and all liturgies written for use in the Church, to use language that acknowledges the personhood of Deaf/deaf and hard of hearing people and people with disabilities, rather than categorizing by afflictions, conditions, and other general descriptors, such as referring to “the homeless.” ... [W]e strongly recommend consulting with Deaf and disability communities when revising liturgical language. All references that use terminology of disabilities or deaf as metaphors for sins or failings should be revised.”
- **Funding:** “Creating justice in the present and future Church requires appropriate allocation of funds, which should be considered by leadership bodies at all levels.”
- **Recognition (and Deliberate Inclusion) of the Episcopal Conference of the Deaf as an Interim Body:** “A continued place for the work of ... Deaf/deaf and hard of hearing people in church-wide structures, rather than representation requiring legislation of General Convention every triennium.”
- **Disability Advisory Group:** “We recommend formation of an on-going Disability Advisory Group, to:
 - Offer support for individuals with disabilities
 - Collaborate with the Episcopal Conference of the Deaf
 - Collaborate with disability organizations of other denominations
 - Curate resources and make such resources available online
 - Consult and offer support for congregations, dioceses, and other church institutions and leadership bodies
 - Support advocacy and education”

We asked above, “What questions do we need to be asking ourselves as we move into the future?” Another question might be, “Why haven’t we become a Church that is truly accessible, inclusive, and safe for disabled and Deaf people, despite our long-standing commitment to these values and our Baptismal Covenant of recognizing the dignity of every human being?”

Concrete Actions for Making the Church Fully Accessible, Inclusive, and Affirming

We recognize that many of the Task Force’s recommendations are not possible without the adequate resources and ongoing bodies to support full access and inclusion across the Church and at all levels of the Church. We also recognize that resources have been created, and exist in the Church for immediate Church use.

The Diocese of California created its own Task Force on Disability and Deaf Access at its 170th Diocesan Convention in 2019. That Task Force has developed both a Best Practices Guide for accommodating and including disabled and Deaf people at all levels of the Church, including voluntarily so at the parish level. The Best Practices Guide was completed during the COVID-19 pandemic so as to include recommendations relevant to pandemic life and post-pandemic life where video conference platforms are far more frequently used. The Task Force also created a disability sensitivity and awareness training that the Diocese has required all diocesan staff, both lay and clergy, with hiring responsibilities and the Commission on Ministry to take every three years. The Diocese mandated disability sensitivity training at its 173rd Diocesan Convention in 2022.

Even more, we commend the DioCal Task Force for beginning discussion and collaboration with the Church of England's Disability Advisor for the Diocese of Oxford^v, and efforts to begin collaborating across the Anglican Communion on the topic of accessibility and inclusion in our worship, ministry, governance activities, and all other activities of the Church. We recognize that the Anglican Church of Aotearoa, New Zealand and Polynesia also has two disability ministry educators who address the work of accessibility and, especially, inclusion of disabled people.^{vi} The Anglican Church also has a best practices guide for accommodating disabled people in its spaces and work.^{vii}

That at least two of our sibling churches in the Anglican Communion have created official posts dedicated to the work of disability accessibility and inclusion in the Church means we must, as a church that originated in the same country as the largest disability rights movement, also take up such roles and leadership Church-wide.

We call on the Diocese of California to share these resources with the greater Church, especially as we ask the 81st General Convention to pass legislation making the disability sensitivity and awareness training and Best Practices Guide available for all members of the Church. In doing so, The Episcopal Church will be that much closer to the work of the two above-named sibling churches in the Anglican Communion.

At the same time, we note the urgency to create an official body to take on the role of a disability advisory group that the Church's Task Force on Disability and Deaf Access recommended above, and also move towards establishing official roles of a disability officer within The Episcopal Church. This official body, whether created as a subcommittee of the Executive Council or as a body established by the 81st General Convention, should have the resources available to provide oversight, guidance, and to be a resource for the entire Church.

Future Work

As a committee, we have had many discussions about the present and future State of the Church. Often in our discussions, we would realize that what we wished we could accomplish during this pandemic-shortened “biennium” was impossible. With guidance from President Ayala Harris, we focused on what was both achievable and attainable in the shortened time frame. As noted in the subcommittee reports, we have posed many questions that we hope the church will ask itself in the future. It is our hope that perhaps those questions guide the work of future State of the Church committees. We hope that increased data collection and transparency about that data will provide a more accurate picture of the state of the church and that, one day, a dedicated staff officer for data will be in place. Perhaps someday in the future, there might be a denomination-wide survey, much like the United States census, to obtain data from individuals and parishes that is not gathered elsewhere. Additionally, while we are all aware that historically The Episcopal Church is largely white, we know that it is changing. Our committee membership reflected that shift. Most of our membership was under 40 years old. We represented many ethnic groups, including many who identify as members of multiple ethnic groups. We had representation that spanned the gender and sexual orientation spectrums. We had people who spoke different native languages. We had members who are neurodivergent and/or disabled in some way. We as a committee feel that it is important that in the future, there are efforts to reach those Episcopalians who are not heard from as often. We would like to see increased communication between caucuses and groups such as the Deputies of Color, LGBTQ caucus, GC under 40 caucus, and the whole church. We will not know the true state of the church until all voices are included.

End Notes

ⁱ https://www.cdc.gov/nchs/pressroom/nchs_press_releases/2022/20220622.htm

ⁱⁱ <https://www.frontiersin.org/articles/10.3389/fmed.2023.1168628/full>

ⁱⁱⁱ <https://www.who.int/europe/news/item/27-06-2023-statement---36-million-people-across-the-european-region-may-have-developed-long-covid-over-the-first-3-years-of-the-pandemic>

^{iv} <https://www.who.int/news-room/fact-sheets/detail/disability-and-health#:~:text=Key%20facts,1%20in%206%20of%20us.>

^v <https://www.oxford.anglican.org/environment-and-social-justice/deafness-disability/>

^{vi} https://www.anglicantaonga.org.nz/news/common_life/dismineds

^{vii} https://www.anglicantaonga.org.nz/news/common_life/making_churches_more_accessible

Proposed Resolutions

A050 Publishing and Sharing Resources for Disability Access and Inclusion

Resolved, That The Episcopal Church recognize that all people are children of God and that our Baptismal Covenant requires us to recognize the dignity of every human being; and be it further

Resolved, That disabled and Deaf people have been historically and systemically excluded from Church life and business throughout Church history; and be it further

Resolved, That the Church has committed itself to voluntary compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act through creation of a Task Force on Disability and Deaf Access in 2018; and be it further

Resolved, That the 81st General Convention direct the Episcopal Church Center to publicize, through the Episcopal Church website and by other appropriate means, to dioceses, congregations, and Christian Formation leaders, a Best Practices Guide for voluntary means of creating an accessible Church and a disability sensitivity and awareness training for all to use as resources in furtherance of an accessible Church.

EXPLANATION

The Church, over several decades, has promised to be accessible for disabled and Deaf people at all levels of the Church, and to commit to voluntary compliance with accessibility laws, notably the Americans with Disabilities Act (and, for diocese outside of the United States, the United Nations Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities).

In 2018, the 79th General Convention created a Task Force on Disability and Deaf Access to assess disability and Deaf accessibility throughout the Church. The Task Force's Blue Book Report made several suggestions for becoming an accessible Church, but did not publish or make available resources for the wider Church to use in taking this significant step forward.^[1]

The Diocese of California created its own Task Force on Disability and Deaf Access at its 170th Diocesan Convention in 2019. That Task Force has developed both a Best Practices Guide for the voluntary, low-cost, and easy means of access and inclusion for disabled and Deaf people at all levels of the Church, including at the parish level. The Best Practices Guide was completed during the COVID-19 pandemic so as to include recommendations relevant to pandemic life and post-pandemic life where video conference platforms are more frequently used. The Task Force also created a disability sensitivity and awareness training that the Diocese has required all diocesan staff, both lay and clergy, with hiring responsibilities and the Commission on Ministry to take every three years. The Diocese mandated this disability sensitivity training at its 173rd Diocesan Convention in 2022.

The DioCal Guide and Training were developed by two members of the Disability Community, each of whom has not only lived experience with disability but also professional experience working for and with nationally-renowned disability rights organizations such as Disability Rights Education and

Defense Fund, Inc. and the National Association of the Deaf. These resources were developed specifically for use within a faith community and especially in The Episcopal Church. These resources were also inspired by existing resources in the Church of England's own disability resources, including the Disability Officer for the Diocese of Oxford.^[i]

The current House of Deputies Committee on the State of the Church includes multiple members who identify as disabled and/or as neurodiverse. The Committee thus recognizes the importance of making these resources widely available to the Church at large, particularly once the DioCal resources have been appropriately vetted, and urges this Convention to pass this resolution so that concrete steps towards Church-wide accessibility, as each Church institution and parish or congregation is able, can be made available throughout The Episcopal Church.

[i] https://www.episcopalarchives.org/e-archives/gc_reports/reports/2022/bb_2022-R038.pdf

[ii] <https://www.oxford.anglican.org/environment-and-social-justice/deafness-disability/>

A051 Amend Canons I.2.4.a Data Collection for the Church (co-sponsored with House of Deputies Committee on the State of the Church)

Resolved, That the 81st General Convention amend Canon I.2.4.a to add item a.7 as follows:

<Amended text as it would appear if adopted and concurred. Scroll below the line of asterisks (***) to see the version showing all deleted and added text.>**

7. Make provision for the analysis of appropriate data about this Church's mission, its opportunities, and challenges. An annual report, published freely to the Church, will include such data as to allow for data-informed decisions by the Domestic and Foreign Missionary Society, the General Convention, the Executive Council, dioceses, congregations, and local leaders.

<Proposed amended resolution text showing exact changes being made:>

7. Make provision for the analysis of appropriate data about this Church's mission, its opportunities, and challenges. An annual report, published freely to the Church, will include such data as to allow for data-informed decisions by the Domestic and Foreign Missionary Society, the General Convention, the Executive Council, dioceses, congregations, and local leaders.

And be it further

Resolved, That all dioceses, congregations, and other church institutions are urged to cooperate with all research endeavors sponsored by the Domestic and Foreign Missionary Society by responding to requests for data; and be it further

Resolved, That the General Convention will provide a budget allocation of \$75,000 to carry out this work in the first triennium.

EXPLANATION

This resolution was co-sponsored by the House of Deputies Committee on the State of the Church and the Standing Commission on Structure, Governance, Constitution and Canons.

When is the best time to plant a tree?

Twenty years ago.

When is the second-best time to plant a tree?

Now.

The Episcopal Church is woefully behind our sister denominations in the collection, study, and use of data for decision making at every level of the Church, and in a perfect world, this resolution would be designed to create a high level staff position for such work. Given the realities of a new Presiding Bishop who will want to organize their own staff, this stop-gap measure is presented to a) require the next Presiding Bishop to offer a full data analysis and b) urge the Church-wide structure, dioceses, congregations, committees, commissions, agencies, and boards to make use of data in their decision making. Outsourcing this work in the first triennium will allow the Presiding Bishop, the House of Deputies Committee on the State of the Church, and the Standing Commission on Structure, Governance, Constitutions, and Canons to take an iterative approach in understanding what data is helpful, how it is best collected, and in what form the report should be produced.

Supplemental Materials

Approved New Parochial Report

Proposed New Parochial Report

Approved by State of the Church Aug. 2023

Direct questions to Evangeline Warren (Chair, Data Subcommittee)

1. We will first walk through the membership of your church. (numeric responses)

This question helps us measure the scope and reach of our churches, acknowledging that not every participant or person touched by the church is a member. In addition, our hope is that this question captures long distance (virtual) engagement as well. To calculate “viewership” for online or streamed services please use the combined totals across all streaming platforms (e.g., 5 Zoom viewers, 10 Facebook viewers, 25 YouTube viewers would be 40 total live viewers). Viewership should measure “unique” viewers (rather than using viewers as a proxy for household) and includes all viewers, no matter for how long they stayed.

Communicants in Good Standing must meet the following requirements as stipulated in Canon 1.17c. In the previous year, ones who have received Communion three times, and have been faithful in corporate worship, unless for good cause prevented, and have been faithful in working, praying, and giving for the spread of the Kingdom of God.

Active members (others) should include those who regularly participate in the life of the church, are members (according to your parish standard) but do not meet the Communicant in Good Standing threshold. This can include non-Episcopalians and non-Christians who are members of the parish.

Active participants (non-members) should include those who participate in the life of the church but do not meet the Communicant in Good Standing threshold OR the membership standard for your parish.

Average Sunday Attendance (on site)

Average live (unique) viewership of streamed or online Sunday service

Average 1 week (unique) viewership of streamed services

Average Weekday attendance (on site)

Average Weekday attendance (online)

Estimated beneficiaries of outreach ministries

Average number of non-member volunteers for outreach ministries

Total average impact of church (above, summed)

Total Communicants in Good Standing

Communicants in Good Standing Under 16

- Active members (other)
- Estimated Active Participants (non-members)

- Easter attendance (total across all offered services)
- Christmas attendance (total across all offered services)

2. We will now walk through the regular staffing of your church. (numeric responses)

This question helps us understand how many individuals undertake work on behalf of the church, recognizing in particular the contributions of lay staff (paid or unpaid). Unpaid lay staff may include, but is not limited to, nursery workers, Sunday school facilitators, parish administrators, lay preachers, etc.

- Full Time Clergy
 - Part Time Clergy
 - Non-Stipendiary Clergy

 - Full Time Lay Staff
 - Part Time Lay Staff
 - Unpaid or Non-Stipendiary Lay Staff

 - Total Priests
 - Total Deacons
- Total Clergy Staff

 Total Lay Staff
 Total Staff

3. Who leads your primary worship service? (select one)

- Full Time Priest
- Part Time Priest
- Short Term Supply
- Long Term Supply
- Lay Person
- Deacon

4. Does your congregation have a unique or unusual clergy situation? (select all that apply)

- Long Term Supply or Interim
- Call to Common Ministry
- Clergy from elsewhere in The Anglican Communion

5. How many of the following services did your church provide? (numeric responses)

This information should be easily accessed through your parish register. This helps us measure the vitality of our church through the provision of sacraments and other lifecycle services.

- Marriages
- Baptisms
- Confirmations
- Burials
- Eucharists
- Daily Office Services

6. Which of the following services/programs/initiatives does your church have? (select all that apply).

This question allows us to measure the vitality of the church through provision of services and initiatives that help engage the parish and larger community.

- Sunday Morning Eucharist
- Sunday Morning Prayer
- Other Weekend Eucharist
- Weekday Eucharist
- Weekday Morning/Noonday/Evening Prayer
- Streamed Service
- Interactive Virtual Service
- Paid Musicians
- Volunteer Musicians
- Adult Choir
- Children's Choir
- Sunday School
- Sunday Childcare
- Bible Study
- Outreach Ministries (e.g. food pantry, shelter)
- Ecumenical Collaboration
- Virtual Formation
- In Person Formation
- Campus Ministry
- Other: _____

**7. Does your church have any subsidiary or associated organizations?
(select all that apply).**

- Preschool or Nursery Program
- K-8 School
- 9-12 School
- Outreach Ministry
- Other: _____

**8. For which of the following languages do you offer services? (select
all that apply)**

This question allows us to better understand the distribution of languages of worship within the church. It also helps us highlight parishes which multilingual programs and services.

- English
- Spanish
- French
- Haitian Creole
- Mandarin
- Tagalog
- ASL
- Other: _____

Select this box if you offer a service that is simultaneously conducted in more than one language.

9. Approximately what percentage of your congregation is White, Caucasian, or of European descent?

<slider from 0-100>

10. What is the estimated average age of your congregation?

<slider from 0-100>

11. What is your normal operating income?

This question helps us understand the role of finances in shaping the work your church does.

[Numeric response]

12. Now let's walk through your financial assets. (numeric responses)

Similarly, this question helps us understand the structure of your financial assets.

[___] Endowment (restricted)

[___] Endowment (unrestricted)

[___] Total Endowment

[___] Non-endowed Assets (restricted)

[___] Non-endowed Assets(unrestricted)

[___] Total Non-endowed Assets

[___] Total Assets

13. How is your parish reducing your carbon footprint?

The inclusion of this question is mandated by Resolution 2022-D064. This question is optional.

[text response]

14. What is one program or initiative at your Church that you feel best exemplifies your congregation?

This short answer question helps us recognize the church at work every day. This question is optional.

[text response]

15. What is one program or initiative at your Church that represents your hope for the future of your congregation or the greater Episcopal Church?

This short answer questions helps us celebrate your accomplishments and goals. This question is optional.

[text response]

If you have questions or comments about this parochial report, please contact the House of Deputies State of the Church Committee.