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Introduction: On the Church and the World

Paul in his letter to the Romans caught the heart of the good news about God's continuous action in Christ on behalf of the world: The love of God in Christ Jesus our Lord is reality, and there is nothing that can separate us from that reality. This was the text to which members of the Bishop and District Superintendent Study Commission (1972 Book of Discipline, Par. 1281) were led in their organizational meeting. And the text has illumined successive stages of the work of the commission.

By the action of the General Conference of 1972 authorizing a commission "to study the offices of bishop and district superintendent," some 39 persons from across The United Methodist Church joined together in intensive study. As the commission worked, it became apparent that to study these offices is to study ministry, which is to study the church. These questions ran through all the meetings and all the studies: The church, including The United Methodist Church, exists in the world in the context of the latter half of the 20th century. In this period of time, what is God, who is eternally present and eternally breaking into history, calling his people to be, to do, and to become? And, in relationship to that call, what is required for ministry, particularly of persons who hold offices with responsibility for overseeing and for leadership in the church?

Or to put it another way, in the midst of an infinitely
complex world plagued with an energy crisis, a food crisis, an endless series of political crises, and a continuous threat of thermonuclear annihilation, can anyone honestly affirm that there is nothing in all creation, as it now exists, to separate persons from the love of God in Christ Jesus? The community of the faithful answer in a ringing affirmative, for it is in responding to God's call—to know his saving acts and to be equipped for his service in the world. The church exists for the sake of the salvation of the world and for the kingdom of God. And wherever it exists, it necessarily raises leaders in the faith whose particular ministry it is to be concerned with ordering the life of the fellowship and with leading the fellowship into the world.

In United Methodist polity and tradition, all persons within the fellowship share in ministry, while some persons are ordained by the church to the ministry of Word, sacrament, and order. Among those who are ordained, some are responsible for superintendency as

There is...nothing in all creation that can separate
us from the love of God in Christ Jesus our Lord.
—Romans 8:39, NEB
bishops and as district superintendents. All persons within the fellowship, whatever their particular role, are knit together in one functioning body to proclaim that the love of God in Jesus Christ is the central reality of this age, as well as of all ages past and of all ages yet to come.

The Bishop and District Superintendent Study Commission focused primarily on the task of superintending, which in The United Methodist Church resides in the office of the bishop and extends to the district superintendent, with each possessing distinct responsibilities. The main task of the commission was to wrestle with extensive data, with numerous documents, studies, and papers, in relationship to the call of God at this point in time. Then, the task was to determine, as best as inherent human fallibility would permit, what that call has to say to the tasks of leadership for the next generation in The United Methodist Church.

A word about the commission's struggle with an understanding of the term leadership as it is used throughout this report: Leadership is a cultural term which, for theological purposes, must be understood with more content than, for example, the way in which the term leadership is used in the secular world. Leadership in the church is related inextricably to the leadership of Christ, the Lord of the church, who, as well as being prophet and priest, is indeed king but a king with a crown of thorns, a king who is a servant ruler. The title leadership to the term servanthood: This tie is essential for understanding the report, the recommendations, and the legislation.

Thus, the commission's concept of leadership is that which is within the church, which has always existed within given human societies and political structures. The church has had to be both participant in and judge of those societies and structures. This is still true for The United Methodist Church. In the last quarter of the 20th century, however, the almost totally pervasive effect of the secular society means that the church has a particular task of searching for its authenticity as over against the ease of succumbing to civil religion, the idolatry of culture. This tension provides the perspective on three specific elements in the present context.

1. There is a profound crisis of leadership: While worldwide, this crisis is especially true in the United States, where the compounding effects of social unrest, with its positive and negative sides, has eroded leadership substantially. Events and experiences such as the assassination of a President and several key figures, the attack by the counterculture on value structures, the disruption of colleges and universities, the disastrous war in Vietnam, the collapse of an "imperial" presidency, and the paltering of world economy have made many persons hostile, openly skeptical, and suspicious of anyone in a position of authority or leadership.

2. Two specific effects result from this crisis. One is that people wish to participate in as many decisions as possible, while reserving the right to opt out when they please. The other is that people yearn profoundly for someone in whom to believe and to put trust. The crisis of leadership affects all aspects of society and all organizations, including the church. The implication for church leadership is clear: Church leaders are included in the total crisis of leadership in society. Where will the real leaders be found?

2. There is a continuing search for panaceas to solve a whole range of complex problems. For example, one of the most widely diffused panaceas is the "McNamara model" used in the Pentagon. This is brought into the vocabulary of virtually all organizational terms such as accountability, flow charts, management by objectives, performance-based criteria, program budgeting, cost-benefit analysis, and the like. While these are useful tools, especially for industrial management, they do not provide any panacea; their appropriateness must be judged by the church. There is need for the church to be clear about the framework and the theology through which such concepts will be filtered. In other words, the church must be equipped to deal with any concepts developed in the world and to make judgments about them lest the church simply be co-opted by the world and its latest panacea.

Again, the implication for church leadership is clear. Church leaders must not only be wise in the ways of the world but especially wise in the ways of the church, the insights of the faith, in order to judge the world.

3. This is an age of the instant everything. Mass media and mass transit combine to make everything instant. This means that demands on a person's time can increase at a compounding rate to create almost unmanageable situations. When everything is instant, it has the appearance of being urgent.

Once more, the implication for church leadership is clear: Church leaders, especially, need a clear rationale by which they can identify the important in the midst of all that is urgent. The good Samaritan was in urgent need to get on to Jericho; but, in the midst of that urgency, he did what was important.

Leadership and servanthood are, thus, tied together in this report which, in Part I, sets out the mandate of the commission, the theological perspectives from which the commission worked, the nature of roles and functions of bishops and district superintendents, and the ways in which persons are called into superintending. Part II summarizes the recommendations of the commission, while Part III states the proposed legislation.

If this study is at all helpful and useful to The United Methodist Church, commission members hope that it will be directed to the end that the ministries of superintending or of leading in The United Methodist Church may reflect more authentically God's purposes for the salvation of the world. In addition, it is hoped that ministries of superintending may be better understood by the whole church for their essential role in leading the faithful into the total crisis of leadership in society. Where will the real leaders be found?

If only a small part of that expectation is fulfilled through the work of this commission, then, indeed, more persons in the latter part of the 20th century will hear, will experience, and will know that there is nothing in all creation to separate humanity from the love of God in Jesus Christ, the Lord of the world.
Part A

Leadership and Ministry of the Church

Report of the Commission

Chapter I

Studying Episcopacy and District Superintendency: The Mandate of the Commission

1. The Mandate Received

a) The Need for the Study—The General Conference of 1972 authorized the creation of a commission to study the offices of bishop and district superintendent "with particular reference to the method of their selection, tenure, assignment, function, and such other matters as it shall deem appropriate" (Journal of the 1972 General Conference of The United Methodist Church, pp. 1474-1475). This action of the General Conference was in response to numerous petitions having to do with bishops and superintendents.1

One of the essential first tasks of the commission was to clarify its understanding of the mandate from the General Conference. At the organizational meeting of the commission, this question was addressed. There was consensus that the primary concerns reflected in the numerous petitions to the General Conference of 1972 had to do with the practical, operational side of the offices. Indeed, the wording of the legislation underscored that thrust. Members of the commission felt, however, that in order to study the offices, they would need to reach back into the history of Methodism at large, as well as to come to some better understanding of the theological basis for the offices. Thus, the commission interpreted its mandate to be greater than simply an analysis of the functional aspects of the offices. "Commission members unanimously agreed that the scope and purpose of this study commission should not be limited to the functional and mechanical aspects of the offices of episcopacy and district superintendency but to include broad and fundamental issues of episcopacy and district superintendency historically, theologically, biblically, philosophically, and ideally" (Commission Minutes, October 9, 1972).

With that interpretation of the mandate, the commission then committed itself to an extensive study process and to a fundamental theological analysis. It was clear from the outset that the commission took its mandate with utmost seriousness and with a deliberate consciousness that, with the numerous concerns expressed in the petitions, there needed to be substantial clarification about these offices for the life and health of United Methodism.

b) The Organization of the Commission—According to the legislation adopted by the General Conference of 1972, the commission consisted of 31 voting members plus two consultant-members without vote; one bishop, selected by the Council of Bishops; and one district superintendent, selected by the commission. Twenty-five members were elected from the five jurisdictions. Membership from each jurisdiction was as follows: two clergy (none were bishops or district superintendents at the time of their election) and three lay persons (one layman, one laywoman, and one ethnic minority person). Six at-large members were elected by the original 25 members (two laymen, two laywomen, one ethnic minority, one youth). Additional persons involved without vote were one clergymember, added by action of the commission, and staff persons from the Division of Ordained Ministry, Board of Higher Education and Ministry. At times, as well, the theological consultant and the sociological consultant met and participated in sessions of the commission, without vote.2

It is significant to note that the General Conference of 1972 deliberately weighted the commission to provide a majority of voting members as lay persons, 19 lay persons and 12 ordained persons. As the commission operated from its initial meeting, members were free to participate as persons mutually joined within the company of the faithful. Whether a person was lay or ordained was not significant in the deliberations and debates because all persons shared in the common offering of themselves and of their work in service to the larger church and to whatever purposes God might have. In short, the commission became a particular company of the faithful engaged in work that, if deemed fruitful, might enable The United Methodist Church to become more useful to God and his purposes for the world in the latter part of the 20th century.

As it examined its task, the commission found it necessary to elect an executive committee of six persons, including the chairperson, the vice-chairperson, the secretary, and two other voting members. In addition, the bishop-consultant served on the executive commit-
2. The Task Interpreted
   a) Hypotheses and Assumptions—In order to undertake the sort of study called for by the way in which the commission interpreted its mandate in October, 1972, a study design was developed. The study design rested on a series of hypotheses and assumptions that the commission formulated and adopted at its meeting in February, 1973.

Hypotheses:
1. There is widespread concern in The United Methodist Church about the functions of the offices of bishop and district superintendent.
2. The concern is likely to have different manifestations in different regions of the country and overseas.
3. These differences may stem from other factors, such as former Methodists in relation to former Evangelical United Brethren, clergy in relation to laity, pastors in relation to district superintendents and bishops.
4. Although expressed in functional terms, the concerns reflect lack of clarity in the theological understanding of the offices, the traditions behind them, and the course to be charted for the future.

Assumptions:
5. We understand the church to be an instrument through which God transforms, or seeks to transform, the world; the church, then, is obliged to try to understand the world as it is and as it appears to be evolving. It is our objective to identify trends and tendencies as the world moves into the future in order that the church may more effectively fulfill its mission.
6. The United Methodist Church functions with the offices of bishop and district superintendent. We approach our study with the understanding that these offices are to be continued unless our findings compel us to consider alternatives.
7. While these offices have served the church effectively, functional difficulties have arisen. These difficulties largely reflect a lack of clarity in the election/selection process and qualifications required for these offices. It is our objective to locate and define these difficulties and to suggest solutions.
8. We believe these difficulties reflect a lack of clarity in the theological basis and functional roles of bishops and district superintendents. Diagnosis must be made of these issues before remedial suggestions can be made.
9. Our theological approach encompasses concern for the common ministry shared by all of us in the mission of the church in the world. We believe that it is for the sake of our common ministry that we have particular ministries, of which superintendent is one. Today, superintendency takes two forms: the superintendency of the district superintendent and the "general superintendency" of the bishop.
10. We are aware of emerging confusions in relationship between cabinets and other areas and conference staff persons; i.e., bishop's administrative assistant, public relations officer, conference council director, staff, and so on. It is our objective to assist in clarifying and defining the role and function of the district superintendent in these relationships.
11. Further, we are aware of the increasing desire of lay persons and ministers to be more involved in the decision-making processes (i.e., operation of district council on ministries, style of annual conferences, appointment of ministers to churches).
12. The various functions of the district superintendent (pastoral, program, and appointive) present unique problems. We want to discover how compatible the functions are or if any one of them can best be handled by other means.

As the commission gathered data from the various studies, it became clear that the basic hypotheses were valid, especially the fourth. There is a lack of clarity in
the theological understanding of the offices, the traditions behind them, and the course for the future. As the commission worked, it became clearer that the key to the present and the future lay in developing understanding about the theology of the offices.

So far as the assumptions are concerned, these, too, were validated by the commission as it worked through its studies. It became apparent that many functional difficulties do, indeed, exist. It is the hope of the commission that its report and recommendations may provide help in solving some of the difficulties.

The hypotheses and assumptions did provide continuing reference points for testing data as it was collected and analyzed and for reviewing recommendations as these were developed. The hypotheses and assumptions were directional in all the studies. Most important, they did not provide any answers in themselves; but they did provide the context in which answers could be arrived at after the studies had been carried out.

b) Study Design—The study design, then, was inductive in its nature. The commission, operating in a consensus style, agreed that no decisions would be made until a wide range of material had been collected, analyzed, tested against the hypotheses and assumptions, and viewed from theological perspectives. The study plan was developed at the commission meeting in Dallas in February, 1973. The plan adopted was a study, inductive and experimental in design, that would deal with the episcopacy and district superintendency in a series of stages.

In the first stage, data gathering, two sets of data were collected. One was data from a survey of opinion across The United Methodist Church collected from all United States bishops, most Central Conference bishops, all district superintendents, all administrative assistants to bishops, all conference council on ministries directors, all presidents of conference and district United Methodist Women, together with a scientifically chosen random sample of the following: pastors, conference lay members, chairpersons of pastor-parish relations committees, chairpersons of local church council on ministries, and lay leaders. In addition, persons were invited to write to the commission with concerns or with information. Another kind of data collected by members of the commission was in cooperation with the consultants from in-depth interviews with each active United States bishop, some of the retired United States bishops, and most of the Central Conference bishops, active and retired; from interviews with some of the district superintendents; and from observation of cabinets in session. In addition, information was collected from a joint meeting of the commission with the Council of Bishops and from a meeting of several members of the commission with the general secretaries of the United Methodist general boards and agencies. These data and materials were all assembled into a written report for the commission.

In the second stage, evaluation and testing, members of the commission undertook an extensive study of episcopacy and superintendency in other branches of Methodism, in regional and ecumenical conversations of the World Council of Churches, in historic Anglicanism and Roman Catholicism, in the Eastern churches, in the early church, and in Scripture and its interpretation. The second stage provided an opportunity to evaluate the research studies in light of history and tradition and a variety of practices. Out of these studies and analyses, the commission identified the issues that required careful definition and study.

In the third stage, issue clarification, all members of the commission worked in various task groups to clarify the issues and to develop alternative ways of dealing with them. Concurrently with this stage, the theological consultant wrote three papers for use by commission members to assist in clarifying the theological issues related to leadership.

In the fourth stage, decision-making, members of the commission made decisions after reflecting on the research data, the studies, the theological papers, and the issues. In the decisions, commission members sought to be guided by their sense of the theological framework in which, for us, all human decisions should be made. It is important to note that the decisions did not rest on any one isolated element of data but rather arose out of deliberate and open discussion and debate, which through all of it ran the continuous question of what God is calling his people, and especially United Methodists, to be, to do, and to become in the latter part of the 20th century and the requirements for leadership in relation to that call.

In addition to the sequential nature of the study, which put decision-making at the end of the process, the study design as adopted in 1973 clarified the roles of the commission members and the consultants. This definition proved useful as the study proceeded and helped the commission answer questions of ownership as such questions arose.

3. The Procedures Followed

a) Meetings as Landmarks—The commission met in full session seven times. In addition, task groups on a variety of subjects and the executive committee met several times, as well. Members of the commission, then, invested considerable time in meetings and spent personal time in study, in reflection, and in preparation.

Each of the meetings represented a particular landmark in the progress of the study. A brief comment about each meeting may be in order. The organizing meeting in October of 1972 has already been discussed in section 1 above. The work of the second meeting in February of 1973 has been described in section 2 above. Thus, by the spring of 1973, the commission was organized, had defined its understanding of its mandate, had determined a style of operation, and had adopted a study plan which was ready to be implemented.

Fourteen months later, in April of 1974, the commission met in Los Angeles, concurrently with the Council of Bishops, to receive reports on the data collected to that
date and to test them and their interpretation with members of the Council of Bishops. At the meeting in October of 1974, reports were received from commission members on the studies undertaken by each person during the summer. The results of these reports formed the basis for identifying a range of issues, the central one being roles and functions. In January of 1975, the commission received a task force report on roles and functions which provided a breakthrough for the commission in its understanding of the theological basis for roles. Prior to the meeting of April, 1975, at which decisions were made, several task groups developed papers that dealt with each of the issues that had been identified as significant. The meeting of April, 1975, was an extraordinary session as persons with differing convictions wrestled with all of the materials to arrive at decisions through consensus. Finally, the meeting of October, 1975, adopted the report and a set of recommendations, together with the text of legislation.

b) The Study Process—The study design adopted at Dallas in February, 1973, was followed in the main. Since the commission was open to the unpredictability of group process, several variations were introduced because it was not possible to predict which issue might need to be addressed by a task group. The commission started with basic reading in books such as Dr. Gerald Moedé's on The Office of Bishop in Methodism: Its History and Development (New York: Abingdon Press, 1964) and the earlier studies of Dr. Murray Leiffer on district superintendents. A working bibliography was developed and was expanded as the commission pursued its work.7

It is important to say that members of this study commission became directly involved in virtually every phase of the study, including such elements as participation in the in-depth interviews with bishops and in indicating the sorts of questions and, indeed the phrasing of questions, to be included in the survey instrument.

c) Horizons—What can come of the work of this study commission? Members of the commission sense that, in the tradition of John Wesley, all work is tentative and incomplete, as all that is done may be but a stage in the process of going on to perfection. The commission hopes that it has produced a report that is suggestive rather than prescriptive, that is freeing rather than circumscribing for persons carrying leadership roles, and that is supportive rather than hindering in moving the church into critical engagement with the world. The commission realizes that it is not possible to prescribe or to legislate completely the manner in which persons will function in particular roles, especially leadership roles. What it is possible to do is to design legislation that may enable the desired sort of performance to occur. That is the thrust of the legislation proposed in Part C below, entitled, "Leadership and the Discipline of the Church: Legislation."

The commission expects, as well, that the networks of accountability described and recommended below will serve to strengthen, not weaken, leadership by providing more regular channels for setting goals, for reviewing achievements, and for thinking through performance.

The commission recognizes that The United Methodist Church has designed a set of expectations for leadership that really go beyond the ability of any human being to fulfill. The commission hopes that networks of accountability will help leaders and all others in the community of the faithful to know what leaders ought to do at particular times and in particular seasons. The commission further hopes that these networks of accountability will help in the interpretation of leadership throughout the community.

The commission hopes that the General Committee on Episcopacy, which is recommended below, may become an instrument through which the needs for leadership throughout the whole United Methodist Church may be continuously reviewed, defined, and responded to. Health and wholeness in the functioning church may be one way in which humans can glimpse something of the wholeness of all creation.

The commission hopes that the spirit of its study and recommendations may carry into the life of The United Methodist Church in a dynamic way, in an enabling way, and in an ennobling manner so that all in the community may have a clearer sense of and a greater openness to the God of history who leads his people, who breaks in on them, who defines his own seasons, and who, in his gracious time, will bring in his kingdom.

Chapter II
Understanding Episcopacy
And District Superintendency:
A Theological Perspective

There are a variety of ways to gain some theological perspective on the matter of episcopacy and district superintendency. One could go to the beginnings of the church in the apostolic age and attempt to trace, and perhaps thereby justify, some particular form or forms of supervision in the church. The attempt here is to look at United Methodist polity and tradition as a concrete illustration of one way in which leadership has evolved, then to move from that into a consideration of some of the elements that relate United Methodist supervision to the larger Protestant world, and finally to the whole ecumenical context, in the sense of the whole church and the whole inhabited world.

1 United Methodist Emphases
a) The Rise of Supervision Among Us1—John Wesley was an 18th-century man, called to the ordained ministry in the Church of England, around whom a Methodist Society was formed in 1739. The society consisted of persons who were self-selected and who joined together because of similarity of intent, mind, and belief. From

---

7See Appendix 4, “List of Sources Consulted,” p. 44.
the outset, John Wesley was the key figure in the society. His leadership was called for and acknowledged by members of that society. He soon had governing power to assign preachers. By 1743, he had drafted the General Rules for the society. In 1744, the first conference of preachers was held. In conferring with one another, the first Methodist leaders sought out the will of God for their time. Wesley’s primary thrust was to see that the organizations were created and designed to be instruments through which God might work for the salvation of the world. As the organization grew, Wesley designated certain of the members as assistants who, in this country, were eventually known as presiding elders and district superintendents.

In this sequence of events can be noted the nuclear features of leadership in Methodist tradition. It rises from the constituency of persons who have banded together. Indeed, the experience of Methodist societies further emphasized the nature of leadership as rising from the constituency. By 1744, the conferential nature of the society was to provide a vehicle for institutionalizing this pattern of identifying leadership. Methodist societies, class meetings, and conferences all embodied the fellowship nature of the community that gathers in response to God’s call and then selects persons for leadership.

The pattern of supervision became tested when the societies spread informally to America in the 1760s. The distance of an ocean posed problems for maintaining adequate supervision. Wesley, in a pragmatic manner, then designated persons as assistants for America. In the generation up to 1784, Wesley’s instructions to the societies in America were consistent with his position that sacramental life for Methodists lay in the Church of England. But the end of the war of the American Revolution and the complexities of maintaining supervision from a distance pressed Wesley to act upon his understanding of his own role as episkopos, or overseer of the societies. Out of his studies which had been ongoing, he concluded that, as a presbytery, he had authority to ordain and, thus, in 1784, he ordained Richard Whatcoat and Thomas Vasey as deacons and elders and set Thomas Coke apart as general superintendent for the work in the new United States. It is clear that Wesley himself was a general superintendent of the societies and, after 1784, of a new church.

By the fall of 1784, Francis Asbury, whom Wesley had also designated as general superintendent along with Thomas Coke, indicated his willingness to serve as general superintendent for the work in the United States if members of the society elected him. At the Christmas Conference of 1784, Asbury and Coke were elected general superintendents; and 12 elders were elected and ordained. In relationship to the emergence of episcopacy, the instance of Asbury is critical. He was a general superintendent by Wesley’s appointment in 1784; but it was election by the conference in Baltimore that, for him, validated the office on the basis of which he assumed the title bishop, even against the expressed will of John Wesley. Further, it should be noted that the conference moved to be a legislative body rather than merely a consultative body.

This sequence of events contains the characteristics, then, of superintendency among Methodists. General superintendents, or bishops, are elected by a conference from among those who have been ordained as elders after they, too, have been elected by a conference. The ties that hold ordained persons and lay persons together as Methodists are now in the conference, the basic constitutive element. In the process of events, general superintendents, or bishops, as they became known by 1787, did not comprise a separate order but they did hold a particular office of supervision and of leadership in the church.

b) General Superintendency and Special Superintendency—From the outset, then, Methodism combined two superintendencies. The general superintendent, soon called bishop, carried responsibility for ordering in the life of the whole church. The special superintendent, first known as the presiding elder among preachers, carried responsibility for particular areas or regions. It could be argued that, prior to 1784, Francis Asbury was, in fact, a special superintendent for the societies in America. His election made him responsible for general supervision in America.

Initially, the commission attempted to treat bishops and district superintendents separately. It was found that such distinctions made little theological sense. In fact, the tasks of superintending join both offices and link them together in a functional relationship. The overseeing of the life and work of the church is the task of superintending carried out at a wider range and at a narrower range. District superintending becomes, thereby, an extension of general superintending. In the chapter below on roles and functions (see chapter 3), the interrelated nature of the offices is further analyzed.

c) Personal, Collegial, and Corporate Superintendency—In the historic developments that gave rise to the particular forms of superintendency among Methodists, there is yet another dimension to touch upon. Wesley designated both Coke and Asbury as general superintendents for the United States, and the Baltimore Conference, in fact, elected them both to that office. What is significant in this instance is that two men were designated and were elected. In other words, the task of superintending is not simply a one-person job; it is a task undertaken with peers. There is a one-person dimension to superintending in that one is assigned, as an itinerant, to a particular geographic region or responsibility. But the general superintendent, or bishop, functions on an ongoing basis in sharing the supervision with district superintendents who also carry direct responsibility for one region. But the particular structure means that no one who supervises does it in isolation. It is always done with reference to the authorization of a conference, to the group of ordained peers, and to other persons who, at the same time, share in the task of superintending—whether that be the cabinet of a conference, the College of Bishops in a jurisdiction, or the Council of Bishops for the whole church. At each level, then, the corporate dimension of superintending creates a dynamic situation where particular needs of specific places and persons are seen and responded to in relationship to the needs of the whole
world as seen through the larger corporate structures. No district, no conference, no local church exists to itself; it is tied in all ways dynamically to the whole church through the corporateness of supervision. Elements, then, of mutuality become essential for the successful functioning of such a system which is nonhierarchical in concept and in design.

2. Protestant Elements
   a) The Concern of Ministry—We turn now from the Methodist experience and relate it to wider Protestant elements. It is apparent that Wesley saw the church essentially in its New Testament formulation as basically a single congregation gathered together. At the Annual Conference of 1747, these questions and answers were recorded:

   Q. Does a church in the New Testament always mean a single congregation?
   A. We believe it does. We do not recollect any instance to the contrary.

   Q. Are there three orders of bishops, priests, and deacons plainly described in the New Testament?
   A. We think there are; and believe they generally obtained in the churches of the apostolic age.

   Q. Are you assured, that God designed the same plan should obtain in all churches, throughout all ages?
   A. We are not assured of this; because we do not know that it is asserted in Holy Writ.

   Q. If this plan were essential to a Christian church, what must become of all foreign reformed churches?
   A. It would follow, that they are no parts of the Church of Christ!—a consequence of shocking absurdity.  

It is clear that Methodists, then, from the early days were linked to the wider Protestant formulation that the church includes the people who gather in response to God's call to assist in transforming the whole world. The church, then, becomes a training ground in which persons are equipped to deal with the structures of the world on behalf of God and his purposes. Within this community, some are ordained by the church to the office of superintending. Elements, then, rises from the community and is not something imposed from above. United Methodists, through the representative processes of conferences, elect their bishops to the office of superintending.

   b) Christ, the Church, and the Kingdom—And so the office of superintending rises from the company of the faithful as one way in which the company may be equipped for service to the world and may, indeed, be led into the world. It is clear that anyone who participates in the ministry of Christ, whether as a lay person or as an ordained person, is thereby committed to God's future, for God is always breaking in on the present and making all things new. So, all structures and organizations must be understood as transitory and as subject to some ultimate judgment about the degree to which they have been responsive to the needs of the world. The church, then, is not simply a static structure designed to celebrate God's saving acts from ages past. Rather, it is a dynamic structure designed to be responsive to God and to anticipate the coming of his kingdom. This means that the church must be missional, that it must have leaders who constantly lead it into the world for the sake of the world's salvation.

   'The spirit of the Lord is upon me because he has anointed me;
   he has sent me to announce good news to the poor,
   to proclaim release for prisoners and recovery of sight for the blind;
   to let the broken victims go free,
   to proclaim the year of the Lord's favour.'

   —Luke 4:18-19, NEB

Liberation of the world, salvation of the world, anticipation of God's kingdom—these are the tasks of the missional church for which leaders are needed. Those who are elected or selected for the tasks of superintending are not, therefore, merely persons who keep records, who run meetings, and who spin wheels. Records, meetings, and wheels may all be essential pieces of administration and organizational machinery; but they are not ends in themselves. They are simply vehicles to help leaders lead the whole community into the world.

But some persons may ask whether the prophetic role is found only in the offices designated for superintending. The answer is that prophets are found wherever they are found; some may be in the offices of superintending. In any event, those who lead need to be sensitive to prophetic voices wherever they speak.

   c) The Problem of Authority—It is at this point that many of the faithful have problems with authority. Part of the problem arises out of the contemporary secular context where there is a strong bias against leadership and a strong suspicion of anyone who holds an office of leadership.

   But beyond this immediate cause, there is a more fundamental problem with authority. It is readily acknowledged that any organization or structure needs a mode of operation which is understood, that some officer must carry responsibility for seeing that the organization works. The difficulty arises because there has not been sufficient clarity about the different styles or modes in which authority and power may be exercised. Many persons think of authority only in hierarchical terms in which accountability is enforced only to one's superiors and not to the people with whom one works. The degenerate form of such authority is bureaucracy. And yet in the preceding sections about Methodist emphases and Protestant emphases, it is apparent that, in these traditions, authority inheres in the office of superintending as these offices are filled by election. The exercise of
that authority need not occur in a hierarchical model or in a superior-inferior relationship. In a curious way, many persons expect that individuals in a superintending position can only function out of a hierarchical framework. But all superintending, in order to be authentically related to Christ, must arise out of mutuality, interdependence, and a stance of servanthood.

4. Governing Concepts

The commission found that, after reflecting on theological perspectives, it identified and operated on the basis of four governing concepts. These were formulated and adopted at the commission meeting in January of 1975 as follows:

1. We are looking at the task of superintending, which in The United Methodist Church resides in the office of bishop and extends to the district superintendent, with each possessing distinct responsibilities.

2. We are looking at the task of superintending in view of one order, which involves two ordinations in the process. All who are ordained "to minister the doctrine of Christ, the sacraments, and the discipline of the church" have the same fundamental role; but their specific functions differ in relation to their particular appointment, whether that be as pastor to a congregation, as bishop to an area, as superintendent to a district conference, or as a minister under special appointment.

3. We are looking at the issue of leadership in The United Methodist Church. That church, with its size, scope, and structure, is an immensely complex organization. The United Methodist Church is, we believe, by the grace of God, within the one church of Jesus Christ.

4. We are looking ultimately at the church of Jesus Christ because we find that the study of the superintending task can never be done in isolation. It leads inevitably to a consideration of ministry as it is entrusted to the body of Christ and shared by all its members who are called to apostolic witness in the world.

Chapter III

Describing Episcopacy
And District Superintendency:
The Interplay of Roles and Functions

1. The Nature of Roles and Functions

a) Expectancy and Performance—The two terms, role and function, are closely related. Role refers to that which is given, which is written, which is stated in documents, which is definable. It refers to an office or a position. For such an office or position there will exist a set of expectations and, if the expectations are not fulfilled, there are sanctions. Function is closely related to role and derives from it but, at the same time, also from the person who fulfills the role. The performer makes the role; indeed the great performer may transform the role substantially. Function, therefore, has to do with persons and with performance.

To make this relationship more concrete, for example, the Discipline can contain paragraphs in which the roles of bishop or district superintendent are delineated. It is possible, therefore, for anyone to read the specific requirements of the roles. Yet once a person is elected bishop or selected as a district superintendent, that person, now an incumbent, has to make operational decisions about how he/she will function, will perform in that role. It is impossible to prescribe completely the manner in which persons must function in a particular specified role.

There is, therefore, a clear relationship between role and function. Expectation arises both from the person who fills a particular role, as well as from the persons
who assist in placing a person in a given role. Performance or functioning is always measured against both spoken and unspoken expectations.

Within the life of the church, roles and functions within the office of superintending must be understood in terms of theological perspectives. The basic ingredient in understanding the office of superintending, and the role and functions relating to it, arises out of the very nature of the church, the Christian community, the body of Christ, the household of faith, the group of fellow sinners and sufferers, the pilgrim people. This body includes all those called out from the whole world in order to be sent back into it for transforming the whole world. Baptism integrates such persons into the priesthood of all believers. Within the body of the baptized, some are further set apart by ordination to the ministry of Word, sacrament, and order.

Within the tradition of The United Methodist Church, ordination comes about in a particular manner, the thrust of which seems to underscore one ordination. Ordinarily, the site of ordination is the session of the annual conference. While the bishop ordains, the ordinand has been elected into the company of the ordained by peers, those presently ordained. Peers assist and participate in the ordination. The highest ordination in United Methodist tradition and polity has always been as an elder. No bishop or district superintendent has a higher, or different, ordination from that of an elder. Yet not all who are ordained are appointed to the same office within the church. There are three basic offices to which an ordained person may be appointed: the office of pastoring, the office of superintending, and the office of teaching or special ministries.

Thus, two basic ingredients in the office of superintending and in understanding the relationship of roles and functions are the nature of the church and the nature of ordination. Those who are in that office fulfill their ordination with particular emphasis on the tasks of order. For the superintending office is the office which is responsible for overseeing the spiritual and temporal affairs of The United Methodist Church.

b) Corrections and Improvements—The tension that may exist between expectancy and performance requires some mode of resolution. In the studies of the commission it became apparent that the expectations held by The United Methodist Church for persons who hold the roles and offices of superintending are so extensive and so high that few persons can even come close to providing a performance somewhere near those expectations. This false elevation of bishops and district superintendents onto a pedestal may well be the source of considerable accountability, which arises from the structure and from the definition of role. A third mode is creedal accountability, which arises out of Scripture and tradition and which contains norms. Only legal accountability can be described in legislative terms. However, that form, to be effective, requires linkage to the other two forms. Thus all modes of accountability operate for persons who are in the office of superintending.

In the legislation recommended below, the commission proposes networks of accountability that are especially designed to begin to deal with the concept of legal accountability; that is, the accountability within the structure. It is the hope of the commission that such networks may help leaders feel that others in the structure have some sense of the role of leadership at a particular time and place and then are able to assist the leader in defining some of the areas of importance for functioning. It is the hope of the commission, therefore, that the existence of some networks of accountability will in fact help to lessen some of the tension between role expectation and the realities of time and of the person who must function. Further, it is hoped that the networks may indeed point ways toward moral accountability and toward a better understanding of the inherent nature of creedal accountability.

2. The Elements of Roles and Functions

Clarity of roles and functions, especially as these arise out of ordination, is important to enable bishops and superintendents to be effective leaders. An analysis of the functioning of bishops and district superintendents arranged from the commission's research data and studies shows a considerable gap between what the situation actually is, or is thought to be, and what is desired as moving toward a more optimal condition.

As the commission struggled with the various functions that had been identified in the research studies, as well as functions that members suggested, there was a problem of how to make any sense out of the lengthy list. The commission worked to find some categories that would be helpful both in an operational and in a theological sense.

Three categories were used for analysis of the functioning of leaders: leaders performing by being, by saying, and by doing. These functions point to the roles around which the church has constructed expectations: Word, sacrament, and order.

a) Being Related to Sacrament—The category of "being" includes public roles such as celebrant, ordainer, spiritual leader, exemplar, and representative person—as well as actions or activities more personal, such as being a "holy person," a counselor, and a friend. In these ways, leaders fulfill the ministry of sacrament.

b) Saying Related to Word—The category of "saying" embraces first the bold proclamation of the Word. But it also includes speaking through appointment-making, presiding, and judging, as well as defending the faith, taking a stance, and designing strategy. Thus, leaders fulfill the ministry of Word.

c) Doing Related to Order—The category of "doing" includes actions such as administering, enabling, and evangelizing, with a goal of transforming the world.
These are carried on also while performing the duties of a superintendent, connectional officer, and corporate executive. Thus, leaders fulfill the ministry of order.

For the office of superintending, therefore, the ordination responsibilities come in this sequence: ordering is primary; Word and sacrament are the means by which and the purposes for which leadership is exercised. The sequence does not suggest that any aspect of ordination is unimportant, but it does suggest a sequence that flows from the primary responsibility of the office of superintending. The primary role of leadership is to lead, to maintain order in the fullest sense of that term by doing. Performance, or how a given person will fulfill the role that inheres in the office, will be related to that person's perception of the nature of leading. Performance should always interact with a theological understanding of what it means that one who is ordained in the one ordination is appointed to the office of superintending as over against and as distinct from the office of a local pastor or the office of persons engaged in extension ministries. All share in the ministry of the church of Christ, all share in fundamental roles that arise from ordination; but all must perform that ministry and that ordination also in relation to their particular office. So it is that those in the office of superintending carry particular responsibility for ordering in the life of The United Methodist Church.

3. The Superintending Role

The role of superintending has been a key one in the life of the church across the centuries. In United Methodist formulation it resides in the office of bishop and extends into the office of district superintendent as well. The commission studied all of the issues that were identified as being of importance with respect to these offices. A series of working papers was prepared by commission task groups to make it possible for the whole commission to understand the nature and definition of each issue, its relationship to roles and functions of the offices of superintending, and its reference to the theological perspectives. The commission then was able to proceed to draw some conclusions and finally to make decisions about the position it would take on each of the issues. In fact, many of the specific issues had to do with matters of the ways in which persons were chosen, were placed and assigned, and might be supported as they undertook those leadership responsibilities that they were empowered to exercise. The material which follows indicates the conclusions at which the commission arrived. In only one or two instances is material presented to indicate the detailed lines of discussion and review that the commission pursued.

1. Chosen to Lead

God is, indeed, a God of history who breaks in and makes all things new. God is, moreover, a God of seasons who in his own gracious time calls persons to particular tasks. There is a rhythm to the seasons of life and some persons are called early to assume the responsibilities of leadership, some are called later, and some are never called to this particular assignment. The point made earlier should be recalled: that leadership arises out of one order. That means all who are ordained have the same fundamental roles of ministry in terms of Word, sacrament, and order. Thus, some who are ordained are called in particular seasons to give their lives and energies to the responsibilities of superintending. Seasons change and so, indeed, do the responsibilities that persons are called to carry.

a. Gifts and Graces—What sort of qualities seem to be desirable for leaders in The United Methodist Church in this particular age? As best the commission can determine, the key qualities are a willingness to come to terms with the implications of ordering as described in chapter 3, section 3 above. Beyond this, there seems to be a call for leaders who can be companions, enablers, and exemplars. Such leaders should be able to articulate the issues clearly, to read consensus competently, to negotiate settlements honestly, to consult willingly, and to make difficult decisions candidly. In addition to such temporal concerns, there is a call for spiritual leadership, for models of living to cope with this age, and for ever new ways to incarnate the lordship of Jesus Christ.
b) Election, Selection—Leadership is crucial to any organization, especially during periods of rapid social change. Methods for selecting and electing leaders must be examined regularly in light of current needs.

In discussing the selection process for bishops and district superintendents in The United Methodist Church, the commission gave serious considerations to assumptions 7 and 11 of the study design (see chapter 1, section 2 above). It was felt that broader participation and selection would provide stronger affirmation of leadership, once selected. Also, a clear understanding of qualifications for the office should avoid selection purely on the basis of personal popularity or exposure.

Nomination of candidates for episcopacy by annual conferences and consultation prior to selecting district superintendents would provide for greater participation. The use of biographical-data forms for nominees for bishops would enable members of jurisdictional conferences to consider nominees in view of desired criteria for bishops. Continuation of selection of district superintendents by bishops through consultation, rather than conference election, would attempt to assure that consideration of qualifications for the office receives high priority in the selection process.

The recommendations of the commission, then, move to underscore the need for openness in the election process of bishops by having the annual conferences identify nominees and by preparing biographical-data forms so that delegates to jurisdictional conferences can have more adequate data in hand while they vote. It is hoped that this process may generate debate and discussion about needs for leadership each time an election occurs. It is hoped, further, that rooting the first stage in the annual conferences may help provide further interpretation of leadership needs and may, indeed, identify persons who have the gifts and graces needed in this age for leadership but who may not have had regional or national exposure.

In addition, the commission recommends a process of consultation by the bishop in the selection of district superintendents. There is strong sentiment in the commission that, since the district superintendent’s office is integrally related to the task of leadership or overseeing, bishops need to make this appointment and then be held accountable for the effectiveness of the appointment.

c) Term of Office—This question was a pivotal one for the commission. The basic decision regarding the term of office for bishops was between life tenure and a limited term of office, though several different limited terms were considered. Arguments for life tenure include a desire to maintain continuity in the office of bishop for ecumenical relationships and leadership to the world; to protect the bishop’s ability to speak out without fear of future appointments; to retain tenure as it has existed historically in United Methodism in the United States; to appeal to persons of quality as candidates for the office; to preserve the constitutional terms of union; and to maintain objectivity and integrity in the appointment-making process.

Arguments for a limited term include a desire for enforcing accountability by restricting tenure in the episcopacy; for creating more opportunities for episcopal leadership; for the election of younger persons; for less “aura” around the office; for an episcopal term comparable to current terms for general secretaries and other church leaders; and to respond to majority sentiment for term episcopacy among the laity as identified in the commission’s survey instrument.

Weighing the arguments for and against life and term episcopacy, the commission combined a number of reasons into the rationale for its decision in favor of life tenure.

In the first place, the commission seriously considered the office of bishop in the context of the demands of this age. Volatile times like ours call for strong and ongoing leadership. Bishops must be free to speak out without fear. In the context of increasing global interaction, bishops, individually and corporately, need sufficient time to initiate and see through comprehensive strategies of long-range impact for the whole church. In an ecumenical age, the painful and tedious work of healing the body of Christ calls for leaders with long experience. Also, the connectional system of The United Methodist Church is best served by placing strong authority into the hands of the elected officials rather than creating a vacuum into which others could step. In all of these considerations a clear distinction was made between office and person. The office should be strong and of a continuous nature with the possibility of being held until retirement. Persons should be enabled to hold the office according to the seasons in which their call leads them into and out of the vocational shift which the episcopal office entails.

Secondly, the data collected for and by the commission had to be used responsibly. The questionnaire was not designed to go to the whole church to ask for a popular mandate. Rather, it was addressed to a sample of church leadership, lay and clergy, to obtain an informed view for the further study process on the basis of which the commission would make decisions. Even if the questionnaire were to be refunctionalized from an instrument into a mandate, the mandate would be, by no means, clear. While slightly more than one half of the respondents seemed to favor term episcopacy, there was considerable divergence regarding the form that term might take.

Thirdly, it seemed to the commission that there was substantive value in maintaining the historical position of bishops in the United States, an experience of almost 200 years. While such experience is not sacrosanct, it should not be dismissed lightly. Moreover, the Council of Bishops, including active and retired bishops, does provide valuable wisdom and experience accumulated across the whole United Methodist Church over a considerable span of time.

Fourthly, it seemed to the commission that most of the reasons for term episcopacy dealt with the personal
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1See recommended legislation, Par. 505 (p. F-23) and Par. 515 (p. F-30).
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3See Appendix 6-C "Questionnaire Responses," p. F-49.
4This difference of opinion is indicated in the "Questionnaire Responses" tables, Item 33b (p. F-53), Item 48 (p. F-59).
misuse of power rather than with the office as such. Negatively speaking, it can be documented that the institution of term episcopacy does not safeguard the church from autocratic and even tyrannical bishops. Positively speaking, the commission felt that the needs of persons have been addressed by what is for all practical purposes a modified and voluntary term episcopacy. It is a modified term episcopacy because bishops live with fixed retirement dates and limited terms in any given area, particularly in the area from which they were elected. It is a voluntary term episcopacy because bishops receive increasing possibilities for gracious exit procedures, not only by resignation but particularly by early retirement for various reasons, personal and otherwise.

In summation, the primary concern of the commission was to provide for continuity and experience in the office without encouraging the development of an autocratic and arbitrary style of leadership. The recommendation, then, is to maintain life tenure for bishops but to provide for a clearer system of accountability and to describe a variety of exit options that may more adequately relate to the possible shift in seasons.

The function of district superintendents is closely related in many ways to that of bishops. The only new recommendation concerning the district superintendency is that any one person be limited to a maximum of two terms—two to exceed six years each.

d) Termination—Termination was an issue only for bishops since district superintendents traditionally are appointed to other responsibilities upon completion of their terms. The issue the commission faced was how to build flexibility for those who discover that they are no longer equipped for episcopal leadership or that they are called to some other office or responsibility and, therefore, wish to leave. The commission is recommending some revision in the current disciplinary provisions which it hopes will provide for more gracious procedures for leaving the office. In addition, the recommendation for networks of accountability described below is designed to help provide a context in which qualifications and needs of persons who are bishops may be regularly reviewed by conference committees, jurisdictional committees, and the proposed General Committee on Episcopacy.

2. Placed to Lead
a) Assignments—The primary concern here is centered on matching the skills and abilities of the officeholders with the area or district to be served. For bishops, a new method of assignment across jurisdictional lines is suggested, together with a new method of evaluating conference needs to complement the current jurisdictional assignment process. In effect, this recommendation would call for the General Committee on Episcopacy to look at the needs of the whole United Methodist Church and then assign bishops to jurisdictional committees on the basis of such needs. Jurisdictional committees would then make assignments to specific residential areas. For district superintendents, consultation with the district committee on district superintendency is suggested to facilitate better appointments.

b) Relationships—Bishops and district superintendents may be regarded as linkage persons in the structure of The United Methodist Church. It is in this linkage that the collegial style of leadership should be active and developed. While bishops are not members of any particular annual conference, they are primarily agents of one or more annual conferences. It is by virtue of this relationship that bishops have relationships to jurisdictional conferences and General Conference. A bishop in an annual conference shares with the district superintendents in the task of superintending. At the jurisdictional and general church levels, the bishops’ tasks are shared with their peers.

In addition, bishops and district superintendents become key persons in ecumenical relationships, both in the sense of leading the church into the whole world and also in the sense of relationships to other communities of faith that acknowledge the lordship of Jesus Christ. Ecumenism must spring from the teachings of the church. Reasons for division in the body of Christ, however well known, recognized, and analyzed, must always be countered by witness to the oneness of the body of Christ. Bishops are recognized as a symbol of unity in the church. As linkage persons in The United Methodist Church, bishops and district superintendents are responsible for supporting ecumenical activities—bishops on area, national, and international levels; district superintendents on district and conference levels. Bishops in The United Methodist Church are received and respected by bishops of other traditions, and this facilitates ecumenical conversations. Worship can be a springboard for action many times; the alertness of a bishop or district superintendent to all of the possibilities can pay large dividends.

These relationships among peers, within the structures of The United Methodist Church and with the world, mean that those who superintend are in a position to reflect from a wide perspective as they become involved with particulars of a given situation. The “whole world” and the “local world” always exist concurrently.

3. Supported to Lead
a) Bishops and Cabinets—The cabinet consists of a bishop and the district superintendents of an annual conference. In every conference the cabinet is the group directly responsible for appointment-making. In many conferences that nucleus is expanded by the inclusion of program directors and/or staff to consider larger elements of conference strategy. Thus, there is a distinction and a relationship between an appointment cabinet and a program cabinet. The cabinet, both appointment and program, becomes a framework in which those who carry primary responsibility in the ordering of the work of the church come together to conduct certain specified
business, to review the needs of all the churches and all the people in a given annual conference, then to take appropriate steps to enable mission into the world. The appointment cabinet carries specific responsibility for insuring that the appointment-making process is not restricted to district lines but is conducted in a style of mutuality, trust, and conference-wide strategy.

In the next section, the proposal for linking bishops and district superintendents into networks of accountability is designed to help remove the potential isolation that can occur in an instrument such as the cabinet without a clearly understood system for other persons to be aware of the issues.

b) Networks of Accountability—Our concern is the development of a system which will enable the bishops and district superintendents to lead in the common ministry shared by all persons in the mission of the church to and in the world.

The accountability system proposed is one in which bishops and district superintendents work mutually with other persons in the church to set goals for the bishops' and district superintendents' part in Christ's mission and ministry and to establish the support network which will help achieve these goals. Periodically, the same group will assemble to reassess these goals, as well as the support framework. In this context, the primary tools are planning, assessment (self-appraisal and mutual evaluation), and support.

Because of the increasing desire of all who are called into the priesthood of all believers to be more involved in decision-making processes at all levels of The United Methodist Church, the following network is proposed:

Committee on District Superintendency

This committee should be composed of lay persons and clergy selected as determined by the district conference or the annual conference and the district superintendent concerned, meeting annually or upon call by the district superintendent and/or the chairperson of the committee. The duties of the committee should be to support the district superintendent, to be available for counsel, to assist in determining the needs of the district, to keep the superintendent advised of conditions in the district, and to interpret the role and the particular functions of the superintendent to the people of the district.

Conference Committee on Episcopacy

This committee would be composed of lay persons and clergy selected by the annual conference and the bishop concerned. The committee would meet at least annually with the bishop to assess the work of the bishop and discuss the needs of the conference. When two or more conferences comprise a residential area, the conference committees on the episcopacy may decide to meet in joint session.

Jurisdictional Committee on Episcopacy

The committee should be composed of representatives of each annual conference. The committee should meet at least biennially to receive reports from the conference committees, to consult on the needs of the jurisdiction, and to review the work of the bishops. In addition, this group should be available for counsel and should carry responsibility for keeping bishops advised concerning conditions throughout the jurisdiction.

General Committee on Episcopacy

There should be a General Committee on the Episcopacy composed of the members of the jurisdictional committees on episcopacy. This should be a quadrennial committee, meeting at the site of the General Conference and upon the call, initially, of the president of the Council of Bishops and, subsequently, of the chairperson of the committee. The duties of the committee should be to hear reports of regional episcopal needs, to review leadership needs of the total church, and then to assign bishops to the jurisdictions as provided in the proposed amendment to the Constitution, Division 3, Par. 55, Article VI (see page F-39 of this report).

In addition, the General Committee on the Episcopacy should serve as the body that reviews the budget for support of the bishops and it should, therefore, be in regular liaison with the Council of Bishops and with the General Council on Finance and Administration.

All these structures in the network would be designed to deal with the matter of legal accountability. It should be recalled that the concept of accountability proposed by the commission includes, as well, moral and creedal accountability for which it is not possible to indicate legislation. But it may be that the institution of a network for legal accountability may enable the other concepts to be understood so that they may, in fact and in time, inform the whole network of accountability.

c) Corporate Leadership—There are three structures in which leadership may be examined in a corporate manner: the cabinet, the jurisdictional College of Bishops, and the Council of Bishops. Each of these corporate structures requires considerable thinking through in terms of how it may best operate to support leaders.

From the suggestions made in section 3a above that there should be coherence from bishop to cabinet, there should be developed a sense in which district superintendents are, in operation, not only responsible for specified tasks that are related to the particular district for which they carry responsibility but also are responsible for leadership for the whole conference system. This concept may argue, in time, for shifting the title from "district superintendent" to "conference superintendent." The analogy is obvious at the level of bishops: They are bishops of the whole church, responsible for the general superintendency of the whole church, and yet they carry specific presidential and residential responsibilities for particular conferences and areas. Somehow or other, the dynamic interrelationship of the parts and the whole
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needs to be more adequately understood and, then, put into operation. The figure that is used by Paul about the church as an organism (1 Corinthians 12:12-26) may be appropriate for consideration of the interlocking of specific and general responsibilities. To carry the argument one step further, the jurisdictional College of Bishops provides a framework in which, on a regional basis, bishops can gather to review the needs of the church in specific parts of the country. This structure has the potential for mutual support as well as for leading The United Methodist Church to address specific issues that are of a regional nature.

Then, the Council of Bishops, which presently includes all active and retired bishops, is a structure which provides for two kinds of corporate leadership. On the one hand, the Council of Bishops is the body which provides for the bishops, as a corporate group, to be connected to the boards and agencies of The United Methodist Church, to engage in the development of strategy for addressing church-wide issues and concerns, and to provide leadership and challenge for The United Methodist Church to respond corporately to the needs of the world. As such, it is an extremely important corporate body. As the Council of Bishops during the last quadrennium has reorganized itself, it is more self-consciously becoming equipped for carrying out these responsibilities. On the other hand, the Council of Bishops becomes the body in which peers may hold one another accountable for specific work in the residential/presidential areas.

4. Empowered to Lead

a) The Appointive Process—There is great diversity in the practice of appointment-making in The United Methodist Church; therefore, confusion exists regarding the essential nature of the process. Currently the term “consultation” is the focus of the problem, along with the properly related functions of the pastor, the bishop, the district superintendent, and the pastor-parish relations committee.

Historically, the appointive process was found in the former Evangelical United Brethren and Methodist churches. In The United Methodist Church, all ministers, including bishops and district superintendents, and, in turn, the whole church, are affected by the appointive process.

Centrality of Consultation: One of the most important functions of the office of the bishop is the appointment of ministers to pastoral charges and special ministries. In order to make acceptable appointments, it is essential that there be a common understanding of the meaning of consultation.

Consultation means conferring with the parties affected by the process of appointment-making. Consultation is not unilateral decision-making or notification.

It is clear that, presently, the final authority for the appointment of itinerant ministers rests with the bishop after the process of consultation. In order to make the consultative process viable, it is recommended that the district superintendent consult with each minister under appointment in his/her district at least once annually. It is also recommended that he/she meet with the pastor-parish relations committee of each charge from time to time to determine how it is carrying out its prescribed responsibilities. The district superintendent also should meet with the pastor, the committee, or him/herself.

The purpose of these consultations should be to increase the effectiveness of the clergy in enabling the congregation to be more faithful witnesses to the power and love of Christ in God’s world. This procedure aids in insuring the integrity of both the pastor and the pastor-parish relations committee.

The bishop will consult with the cabinet so that the widest and wisest perspective can be obtained in relating a particular minister’s skills and abilities to corresponding needs in a local charge.

The consultative process offers all concerned parties a voice in their own future. It also enables bishops and district superintendents to exercise more clearly their pastoral functions.

Criteria for Appointment-Making: The purpose of appointment-making is to provide such pastoral leadership to the ministry of local congregations that together they can move where the breath of God moves them rather than settle where the dusts of human schemes settle. The governing concerns of bishops and cabinets are, therefore, strategic appointments rather than appointments of convenience and accommodation. In order to arrive at such appointments, the consultation process needs to identify specific elements in the profiles of both congregations and pastors.

The congregational profile needs to determine—

1. the general situation in which the congregation finds itself with respect to the temporal situation. What is the size, actual and potential? What is their financial condition? For understanding the spiritual situation, what is the composition of the lay leadership? How is the local church perceived by the community and the conference?

2. the convictional stance of the congregation, theological and/or prejudicial. As to theology, has a defensible ethos been consciously formulated? What spirit seems to permeate the congregation? As to prejudices, is the congregation aware of any? Of what kind are they?

3. the ministry of the congregation among its people for the sake of the community. Among itself, what service programs are emphasized? How are new members won or old ones lost? The mission of the congregation to society, is it existing? What forms does it take?

The structure of the pastoral profile will renew and extend the gifts and graces affirmed at ordination by considering—

1. the pastor’s spiritual and personal sensibility. Does he/she live out of a personal faith and call to the ordained ministry, cultivating patterns of
holiness? Consequently, how are personal and family well-being and life-style integrated into the vocation?

2. the pastor’s academic and career background. Is there a conscious theological stance, growing through continuing education, and is it compatible with that of the congregation, either by healing rifts or by challenging complacency?

What is the particular professional experience and record of performance in relationship to the age of the pastor?

3. the pastor’s practical skills and abilities. What are the areas of strength in church administration, including leadership development, worship and liturgy, preaching and evangelism, teaching and nurturing, counseling and group work? Are existing abilities properly appraised, utilized, and trained?

These minimal criteria are considered vital for each appointment under consideration. It is recommended that these criteria be shared with all parties concerned.

Consultative Process Regarding a Change in Appointment: When a change of appointment is contemplated, the following elements should be part of the procedure.

1. The process may be initiated by the minister, pastor-parish relations committee, the district superintendent, or the bishop. When a move is imminent, consultation takes place among the pastor, the district superintendent, and the pastor-parish relations committee.

2. The bishop and the cabinet consider all requests in light of the criteria.

3. All appointments receive consideration by the bishop, the district superintendents concerned, and the appointment cabinet as a whole until a tentative decision is made.

4. Consultation with the pastor and pastor-parish relations committee may indicate supporting data for the tentative decision. If it is determined that this decision should not be carried out, the process shall be repeated until the bishop, basing his/her judgment on the information derived from the consultation and advice from the cabinet, makes final the appointment.

5. The announcement of that decision is made to all parties directly involved in the consultative process; i.e., the cabinet, the pastor, and the pastor-parish relations committee before a public announcement is made.

b) Opportunities and Duties—It is the hope of the commission that leaders will be equipped to lead in the manner suggested throughout this report. It is hoped that the legislation, as proposed, will succeed in freeing leaders from a long list of precise duties and will help them understand more of the nature of leadership that seems to be needed in this age.

To this end, a proposed section of legislation on “The Nature of Superintendency” is vital. The intent of that proposed legislation is to set forth, in as succinct language as possible, something of the task of superintendency, together with some guidelines. It is hoped that this section, together with a regrouping of some of the essential legal requirements as arranged under Section IV and Section VI of the proposed legislation, may provide a starting point in the discussion that will need to take place in order for the networks of accountability to come to life.

c) Questions of Style—It is possible for a leader to fulfill every requirement presently stated in the Discipline and yet be ineffective in leading! By the same token, it is possible for a person to provide very effective leadership with only minimal reference to certain of the requirements. This is the age-old problem, addressed in the letter of James, of the letter and the spirit. The commission would argue that for leaders to lead greater attention must be given to the spirit than to the letter.

It is therefore proposed to group the specific responsibilities of bishops under three headings: leadership—spiritual and temporal, presidential, and working with ministers. In a similar manner, five headings are proposed for specific responsibilities of district superintendents: supervision, personnel, pastoral, administration, and program. These groupings are intended to indicate the main categories of specific responsibilities.

But it is the hope of the commission that all these specifics will be informed by the continuing power of the Holy Spirit who leads us on to new opportunities and new challenges in the world. For whatever style is adopted by those who lead in the next generation, an openness to the leading of the spirit is a vital quality. The figure of the servant-ruler has also been lifted up not only in the title but also in the main lines of argumentation in this report. Indeed, in the understanding of the commission, leadership and servanthood are intimately joined together. It is that juxtaposition of words that gives the clue to the style of leadership. How must leaders lead? Leaders must be servants of all.

14See recommended legislation, Par. 512 (p. F-29).
15See recommended legislation, Par. 518 (p. F-31).
Part B

Leadership and the Welfare of the Church

Recommendations

Chapter V

General Recommendations

Of the Commission

As the commission has worked, it has tried to develop a report that would address the needs for leadership in The United Methodist Church. Many of the findings of the commission can be translated into legislation, and such material as can be proposed for legislation is set forth in chapter 6 below.

The commission recommends that the proposed legislation as set forth as new chapter 5 below be adopted and incorporated into the 1976 edition of the Book of Discipline with the following transitional provision: Mandatory retirement provisions for bishops as detailed in proposed legislation Section III, ¶ 507.1, shall be effective with the jurisdictional conferences of 1980.

Beyond that, however, the commission is acutely aware that much of what appears to be needed in the way of leadership does not lend itself to legislation. The spirit must inform leaders, as well as the letter which describes some of the specific tasks. In the following sections, therefore, are grouped, as recommendations and observations, certain matters the commission would wish to have considered.

1. Strengthening a Coherent Leadership
   a) There is need for clear liaison between the General Council on Ministries and the Council of Bishops. This need includes the definition of the role of the general boards and agencies and their relationship to the Council of Bishops. At a time when society demands leadership on significant issues, it is essential that The United Methodist Church find some method by which it can speak other than through proclamations from General Conference only at four-year intervals. It is the feeling of many church people that elected leaders, the Council of Bishops, accept this responsibility.

   At the same time, a sharper definition of the relationship of the General Council on Ministries to the Council of Bishops needs to be made. Both carry responsibility for planning and strategy for the whole church. Therefore, we recommend that, to examine and to clarify these relationships, a task force be formed to include members from the Council of Bishops, the General Council on Ministries, and the General Committee on Episcopacy, membership not to exceed fifteen.

   b) There may be need for the Council of Bishops to develop some method by which it taps staff from boards and agencies to prepare materials for study and discussion by the council. The Council of Bishops should initiate study of this possibility.

   c) There is need to clarify the relationship among cabinet and program staff and annual conference boards and agencies. Because they share responsibilities for planning and strategy, they need to define their roles in light of the total annual conference programming and services. Therefore, we recommend that a task force of cabinet and program staff members be created with an equal number of members elected from the conference Council on Ministries at the fall organizational meetings of 1976 to study ways of defining roles, clarifying relationships, and identifying the means of carrying out their responsibilities for planning and strategy for the annual conference.

   d) There is need to see the resources of personnel in seminaries as one of the major areas where leaders could turn for study, for reflection, and for theological expertise.

   e) There is need to develop suggested manuals that cover matters such as styles of operation, strategies for specific problems, models for analysis of social issues, and suggestions for ways in which to handle the responsibilities of office. It may be wise to develop such manuals jointly between, for example, the General Committee on Episcopacy and the Council of Bishops. Much material for district superintendents already exists out of recent training sessions. Such manuals would need to be the direct responsibility of the Division of Ordained Ministry of the Board of Higher Education and Ministry.

   f) There is need for careful study of the ways in which differentials in the existing structure of the pension systems operate against the concept of coherent leadership. We recommend the creation of a study group to examine pension structures in the context of shared ministry. The study group should be convened by the General Board of Pensions and include participants from the Council of Bishops, the General Committee on Episcopacy, the General Council on Ministries, and the General Council on Finance and Administration.

2. Setting Bishops Free
   a) There is need for bishops to be vigorous in blocking out sufficient time for reflection and study.
b) There is need for a study of the alignment of conferences to reflect societal, economic, and demographic conditions in the light of the present demands for presidential/residential leadership as well as the responsibilities for general superintending. Therefore, we recommend a study be undertaken by the Council of Bishops and the General Committee on Episcopacy to consider the need for enlarging the number of active bishops to be elected in 1980.

c) There is need to analyze expectations that exist for leaders beyond the residential/residential areas. Leaders are elected to travel widely throughout the connection as leaders of the whole church. Spouses feel keenly the "role" expectation and have not yet found a place in their own right and often feel left out. We recommend a joint study by the General Council on Finance and Administration and the General Committee on Episcopacy into the level of financial and staff support available for bishops, including travel allowances with consideration for the role of spouses.

d) There is need for effective transitional arrangements for outgoing and incoming bishops in particular areas, especially for newly elected bishops. In legislation, we recommend that August 31 become the date on which bishops assume responsibility in new areas. We further recommend to the General Council on Finance and Administration that salary, benefits, pension, and the like begin at the time a bishop is elected and consecrated at the jurisdictional conference.

3. Equipping District Superintendents

a) There is need for effective orientation and training for district superintendents. Much material for this training for district superintendents already exists out of recent training sessions. The commission commends the present program and urges its expansion and, therefore, recommends its continuation.

b) There is need in each annual conference for a careful study of the level of financial and staff support for district superintendents, including such matters as secretarial assistance, salary, housing, pension, time and support for continuing education, and adequacy of office space and office equipment. We recommend that committees on district superintendency in each annual conference initiate such a study. General direction to the study could be given by the Division of Ordained Ministry of the General Board of Higher Education and Ministry.

c) There is need for continued theological reflection on the functions of the district superintendents as related to the total office of superintending. We recommend that the Division of Ordained Ministry of the General Board of Higher Education and Ministry and the General Committee on Episcopacy study these relationships. It will be well to include theological expertise from the seminaries.

d) There is need to study reasons for appointing some district superintendents to some regions. For instance, reasons may vary in a strategic program region or in an urban or in a rural region. We recommend that a study be undertaken by the Division of Ordained Ministry with the Council of Bishops and the General Council on Ministries to examine a possible extension of the term of district superintendents for strategic reasons in exceptional cases.

4. Affecting the Ministry of the Church

a) There is need for greater flexibility in the timing of pastoral appointments. Appointments to charges should be made at any time deemed advisable by the bishop and cabinet; this means we should move away from the rigid concept of annual appointments. There should be an understanding that when a pastor's tenure in an appointment extends beyond a period of ten years, an intense evaluation of that appointment should be made. Therefore, we recommend that the Council of Bishops consider means of implementing this concept as soon as possible.

b) There is need for a proper exit system for all ordained ministers. In our connectional church, ministers may continue even in ineffective ministries as they carry leadership responsibilities. Therefore, we recommend an in-depth cooperative evaluation of pastors at frequent intervals. Materials are to be developed by the Division of Ordained Ministry of the General Board of Higher Education and Ministry. Such evaluations should be carried out by the committee on district superintendency and by pastor-parish relations committees. Many conferences and areas have such evaluation schemes in progress. Analysis of the extent to which the Division of Ordained Ministry needs to create a task force in this regard.

c) There is need to provide time for all in ministry to engage in continuing education, especially continuing theological education. Bishops and district superintendents need to lead in continuing education by being participants themselves. Conference Boards of Ministry need to develop strategies so that local congregations will understand this concept and be persuaded to provide adequate financial support to carry it out.
Leadership and the Discipline of the Church

Chapter VI

Legislative Recommendations
Of the Commission

The commission has reviewed the 1972 edition of the Book of Discipline in relation to the thrust of its report and recommendations. It is recommending legislation that will bring all materials dealing with superintending into a coordinated chapter. Further, it is recommending legislation to create the networks of accountability by adding such specifications to the organizational material on districts and conferences. Finally, it is recommending constitutional changes to facilitate the work of the General Committee on Episcopacy, particularly the total-church concept for the assignment of bishops.

1. New Chapter 5 in Part IV of the Discipline: “Superintendency—General and District”

In order to give a brief picture of the structure of proposed chapter 5, the following outline is presented:

PART IV
ORGANIZATION AND ADMINISTRATION

Chapter Five
SUPERINTENDENCY—GENERAL AND DISTRICT

Section I. Nature of Superintendency
¶ 501 Task
¶ 502 Guidelines for
Superintending in This Age
  1. Mode
  2. Pace
  3. Skill

Section II. Office of Bishop
¶ 503-504 and District Superintendent

Section III. Election, Assignment
and Termination of Bishops
¶ 505 Election
  1. Nomination
  2. Process
¶ 506 Assignment Process
  1. General Committee on
     Episcopacy
  2. Jurisdictional Committee

on Episcopacy
3. Central Conferences
4. Special Assignments

Termination of Office
1. Mandatory Retirement
2. Voluntary Retirement
3. Involuntary Retirement
4. Resignation

Status of Retired Bishops

Leaves
  1. Sabbatical Leave
  2. Sick Leave

Bishops in Central Conferences
Bishops in Missionary Conferences

Section IV. Specific Responsibilities of Bishops
¶ 512 Leadership—Spiritual and Temporal
¶ 513 Presidential Duties
¶ 514 Working With Ministers
[Appointment-Making]

Section V. Selection, Assignment, and Term of District Superintendents
¶ 515 Selection and Assignment
¶ 516 Installation of the
District Superintendent
¶ 517 Limitation on Years of Service

Section VI. Specific Responsibilities
¶ 518 of District Superintendents
¶ 519 Supervision
¶ 520 Personnel
¶ 521 Pastoral
¶ 522 Administration
¶ 523 Program

Section VII. Corporate Expressions
¶ 524 of Superintendency
¶ 525 Council of Bishops
¶ 526 Cabinet

Section VIII. Appointment-Making
¶ 527 Function
¶ 528 Definition of Consultation
¶ 529 Process
¶ 530 Criteria
¶ 531 Frequency
2. Text of Recommended Legislation

a) Chapter 5.

Chapter Five
SUPERINTENDENCY—GENERAL AND DISTRICT

Section I. Nature of Superintendency.

§ 501. Task.—The task of superintending in The United Methodist Church resides in the office of bishop and extends to the district superintendent, with each possessing distinct responsibilities. From apostolic times, certain ordained persons have been entrusted with the particular tasks of superintending. Those who superintend carry primary responsibility for ordering the life of the Church. It is their task to enable the gathered Church to worship and to evangelize faithfully.

It is also their task to facilitate the initiation of structures and strategies for the equipping of Christian people for service in the Church and in the world in the name of Jesus Christ and to help extend the service in mission. It is their task, as well, to see that all matters, temporal and spiritual, are administered in a manner which acknowledges the ways and the insights of the world critically and with understanding while remaining cognizant of and faithful to the mandate of the Church. The formal leadership in The United Methodist Church, located in these superintending offices, is an integral part of the system of an itinerant ministry.

§ 502. Guidelines for Superintending in This Age.—The demands of this age on the leadership of bishops and district superintendents in The United Methodist Church can be seen in mode, pace, and skill:

1. Mode.—This is an age which calls for leaders who can function in relationships of mutuality, in enabling stances, and in trust-building approaches. The Spirit is given to the community and to the members to the extent that they participate in the life of the community. Therefore, leaders need to be able to read consensus and integrate it into a living tradition, to be open to the prophetic word, to be skilled in team-building, and to be effective in negotiation. The style of leadership should rise out of nurtured and cultivated spiritual disciplines and patterns of holiness.

2. Pace.—This is an age which has the technological capacity to expand demands on the time of a leader at a rapid rate and to make it possible for a leader to be engaged in a continuous round of activities. Beyond formal systems of accountability, leaders need to open themselves to forms of accountability that they cultivate for themselves through a support group. Such a group can listen, can help, and can clarify, as well as participate with the leader, as he/she thinks through time demands and constraints through the sorting out of priorities and through the ways to distinguish matters that are important from those that are urgent. Good stewardship of time is especially critical for the leader who, by office, becomes a model for others. Appropriate time must be taken for reflection, study, developing friendships, and self-renewal.

3. Skill.—In this age when all organizations have become complex, leaders need to recognize the complexity of The United Methodist Church. Some skills needed by leaders are spiritual discipline, theological reflection, building the unique community of the church and of the larger community, as well. Reading the signs of
the times, analyzing, designing strategy, assessing needs, organizing a wide range of resources, and evaluating programs and personnel are yet other skills crucial for leaders.

Section II. Offices of Bishop and District Superintendent.

¶ 503. The offices of bishop and district superintendent exist in The United Methodist Church as particular ministries for which persons are elected or selected from the group of elders who are ordained to be ministers of Word, sacrament, and order and thereby participate in the ministry of Christ, in sharing a royal priesthood (1 Peter 2:9). The superintending role has apostolic roots especially in the lives of Peter and Paul. Jesus said to Simon Peter, “Feed my sheep” (John 21:15-17). Paul, taking leave of the Ephesian elders, commended the care of the flock to them (Acts 20:28). Peter directed the elders to, “Tend the flock of God that is your charge, ... [by] being examples to the flock” (1 Peter 5:2-3). The first letter to Timothy describes the personal characteristics of a bishop (1 Timothy 3:1-7).

¶ 504. Bishops and superintendents share in the full ministry as ordained elders, yet their particular offices make them first among equals. The Body of Christ is one; yet many members with differing functions are all joined together in the one body. Leaders or administrators are included in the listing of those whom “God has appointed in the church” (1 Corinthians 12:28).

Section III. Election, Assignment, and Termination of Bishops.

¶ 505. Election.—1. Nomination.—An Annual Conference, in the session immediately prior to the next regular session of the Jurisdictional Conference, may name one or more nominees for episcopal election. Balloting at Jurisdictional Conferences shall not be limited to nominees of Annual Conferences nor shall any Jurisdictional Conference delegate be bound to vote for any specific nominee. Each Jurisdictional Conference shall develop appropriate procedures for furnishing information about nominees from Annual Conferences. This shall be done at least two weeks prior to the first day of the Jurisdictional Conference. Similar procedures shall be developed for persons nominated by ballot who receive ten votes, or 5 percent of the valid votes cast, and shall be made available to the delegates at the site of the conference.

2. Process.—a) Jurisdictional Conference delegates, in electing bishops, shall give due consideration to the inclusiveness of The United Methodist Church with respect to sex, race, and national origin. In addition, consideration should be given to the nature of superintendency as described in ¶¶ 501-502 (Section I).

b) The Jurisdictional and Central Conferences are authorized to fix the percentage votes necessary to elect a bishop. It is recommended that at least 60 percent of those present and voting be necessary to elect.

c) Consecration of bishops may take place at the session of the conference at which election occurs or at a place and time designated by the conference. The consecration service may include bishops from other Jurisdictional and Central Conferences and representatives from other Christian communions.
1. General Committee on Episcopacy.—The General Committee on Episcopacy shall meet to hear reports of the Jurisdictional Committees on Episcopacy with respect to Jurisdictional episcopal requirements, review leadership needs of the whole church, determine the number of active bishops eligible for reappointment, and assign to each jurisdiction from the total Council of Bishops a group of bishops equal in number to those active bishops eligible for reappointment in each jurisdiction, consistent with the Constitution, Division Three, Article V and Article VI. Assignment of bishops to jurisdictions by the General Committee on Episcopacy shall be made only following appropriate consultation with each bishop and approval of the General Conference. In making assignment of said bishops to the jurisdictions, insofar as possible, due consideration shall be given to the retirement age of the bishops.

2. Jurisdictional Committee on Episcopacy.—The Jurisdictional Committee on Episcopacy then shall recommend, after consultation with the College of Bishops, the boundaries of the episcopal areas and the assignment of the bishops to their respective residences for final action by the Jurisdictional Conference; provided, however, that it shall not reach any conclusion concerning residential assignments until all elections of bishops for that session are completed and all bishops have been consulted; and provided further that a bishop shall not be recommended for assignment to the same residence for more than eight consecutive years. For strategic reasons only, a Jurisdictional Committee on Episcopacy on a two-thirds vote may recommend one additional four-year term in the same area.

The effective date of assignment for all bishops is September 1, following the Jurisdictional Conference.

The Jurisdictional Committee on Episcopacy shall not recommend assignment of, nor shall the Jurisdictional Conference assign, a newly elected bishop to a residence within the bounds of the Annual Conference of which that bishop was a member at the time of election; nor shall the Jurisdictional Committee on Episcopacy recommend, nor the Jurisdictional Conference assign, the newly elected bishop to administer an area within which his membership was most recently held unless by a two-thirds vote the Jurisdictional Committee shall recommend that this restriction be ignored and by majority vote the Jurisdictional Conference shall concur.

3. Central Conferences.—In the case of an emergency in a Central Conference through the death, expiration of a term of service, or any disability of a bishop, the Council of Bishops may assign one of its members to provide the necessary episcopal supervision for the conference.

4. Special Assignments.—The Council of Bishops may, with consent of the bishop and the concurrence of the General Committee on Episcopacy, assign one of its members for one year to some specific church-wide responsibility deemed of sufficient importance to the welfare of the total church. In this event a bishop shall be released from the presidential responsibilities within the episcopal area for that term. Another bishop or bishops, active or retired, and not necessarily from the same jurisdiction, shall be named by the Council of Bishops on recommendation of the College of Bishops of the jurisdiction involved to assume presidential responsibilities during the interim. This assignment may be renewed for a second year by a two-thirds vote of the Council of Bishops and majority vote of the General Committee on Episcopacy and the consent of the bishop and
the College of Bishops involved. The bishop so assigned shall continue to receive regular salary and support.

¶ 507. Termination of Office.—An elder who is serving as a bishop up to the time of retirement shall have the status of a retired bishop, including all bishops of Central Conferences.

1. Mandatory Retirement.—A bishop shall be retired on August 31 next, following the regular session of the Jurisdictional Conference if the bishop has reached his/her sixty-sixth birthday prior to the first day of the month in which the Jurisdictional Conference is held. This shall be effective with the Jurisdictional Conferences of 1980.

2. Voluntary Retirement.—a) A bishop who has completed twenty years or more of service under full-time appointment as an elder, including at least one quadrennium as a bishop, may request the Jurisdictional Conference to place him/her in the retired relation with the privilege of receiving his/her pension as determined by the General Council on Finance and Administration in consultation with the General Committee on Episcopacy. Payment of the pension will begin the first month after his/her sixty-fifth birthday.

Any Bishop who seeks a voluntary retired status shall notify the president of the Council of Bishops and the secretary of the General Committee on Episcopacy at least two months prior to the General Conference.

b) A bishop may seek voluntary retirement for health reasons and shall be so retired by the General Committee on Episcopacy upon recommendation by the involved College of Bishops and upon presentation of satisfactory medical evidence. The bishop shall receive his/her pension as provided by the General Council on Finance and Administration in consultation with the General Committee on Episcopacy. Payment of the pension will begin when the bishop's request for such retirement is approved by the General Committee.

3. Involuntary Retirement.—a) A bishop may be placed in the retired relation regardless of age by a two-thirds vote of the General Committee on Episcopacy if, after providing the affected bishop due process, such relation is found by said committee to be in the best interests of the bishop and/or the Church. Appeal from this action may be made as provided in ¶ .

b) A bishop, for health reasons, may be retired between sessions of the Jurisdictional Conference by a two-thirds vote of the General Committee on Episcopacy upon the recommendation of one third of the membership of the involved College of Bishops. The affected bishop, upon request, shall be entitled to a review of his/her health condition by a professional diagnostic team prior to action by the involved College of Bishops. Notification of action to retire shall be given by the chairperson and secretary of the General Committee on Episcopacy to the secretary of the Council of Bishops and the treasurer of the Episcopal Fund. Upon such retirement, the bishop shall receive a pension as determined by the General Council on Finance and Administration.

4. Resignation.—A bishop may voluntarily resign from the episcopacy at any time. The consecration papers of a bishop in good standing so resigning shall be properly inscribed by the secretary of the Council of Bishops and returned. He/she shall be furnished with a certificate of resignation which shall entitle him/her to membership as a traveling elder in the Annual Conference (or its successor) in which membership was last held. Notification of this action shall be given by the secretary of the Council of Bishops to the chairperson and
secretary of the General Committee on Episcopacy. When the resigned bishop or surviving spouse and dependent children become conference claimants, the Episcopal Fund shall pay a pension as determined by the General Council on Finance and Administration in consultation with the General Committee on Episcopacy.

§ 508. Status of Retired Bishops.—1. A bishop retired under § 507 above may be appointed by the Council of Bishops upon recommendation of the involved College of Bishops to presidential responsibility for temporary service in an area in the case of death, resignation, or disability of the resident bishop, or because of judicial procedure (§ 1539). This appointment shall not continue beyond the next Jurisdictional Conference.

2. Bishops who have been released from the obligation to travel through the connection at large in accordance with any of the foregoing provisions shall not preside thereafter over any Annual Conference, Provisional Annual Conference, or Mission, or make appointments, or preside at the Jurisdictional or Central Conference, but may take the chair temporarily in any conference if requested to do so by the bishop presiding. They may participate in the Council of Bishops and its committees but without vote. However, in the case where a retired bishop is appointed by the Council of Bishops to a vacant episcopal area or parts of an area under the provisions of § 508.1, that bishop may function as a bishop in the effective relationship.

3. A retired bishop may be considered a member of an Annual Conference, without vote, for purposes of appointment to a local charge within the said conference.

4. Each Central Conference shall determine the rules for retirement of its bishops, provided that the age of retirement shall not exceed that fixed for bishops in the jurisdictions. In the event that retirement allowances are paid from the Episcopal Fund, these rules shall be subject to the approval of the General Conference.

§ 509. Leaves.—1. Sabbatical Leave.—A bishop who has served for at least two quadrenniums may be granted a sabbatical leave of not more than one year for a justifiable reason other than health if the request is made and if the involved College of Bishops, the Committee on Episcopacy of that jurisdiction, and the Council of Bishops or its executive committee approve. In this event the bishop shall, for the period for which the leave is granted, be released from the presidential responsibilities within the episcopal area; and another bishop or bishops, active or retired and not necessarily from the same jurisdiction, shall be designated by the Council of Bishops, on recommendation of the College of Bishops of the jurisdiction involved, to assume the presidential duties during the interim. The bishop shall continue to receive housing allowance and one-half salary for the period of the leave.

2. Sick Leave.—A bishop who by reason of impaired health is temporarily unable to perform full work may be released by the General Committee on Episcopacy from the obligation to travel through the connection at large. He/she may choose a place of residence, and the Council of Bishops shall be at liberty to assign him/her to such work as he/she may be able to perform. He/she shall receive support as provided by the Episcopal Fund.

§ 510. Bishops in Central Conferences.—The Central Conferences shall elect bishops, in the number determined by the General Conference, whose episcopal supervision shall be within the territory included in the Central Conference by which they have been elected, subject to such other conditions as the General Conference shall
prescribe; provided, however, that a bishop elected by one Central Conference may exercise episcopal supervision in another Central Conference when so requested by such other Central Conference.

1. Bishops elected by a Central Conference shall be constituted by election in a Central Conference and consecrated by the laying on of hands of three bishops or at least one bishop and two elders.

2. Bishops elected by a Central Conference shall have, within the bounds of the Central Conference by which they are elected or within which they are administering, authority similar to that exercised by bishops elected by or administering in a Jurisdictional Conference.

3. Bishops elected by a Central Conference shall have the same status, rights, and duties within their territory as a bishop elected by or functioning in a Jurisdictional Conference. A bishop elected by a Central Conference shall have membership in the Council of Bishops and shall have the privilege of full participation with vote. Attendance at the annual meetings of the Council of Bishops by bishops elected by Central Conferences shall be left to the option of the bishops in each Central Conference, in consultation with the Council of Bishops and the General Council on Finance and Administration.

4. In a Central Conference where term episcopacy prevails, bishops whose term of office expires prior to the time of compulsory retirement because of age and who are not reelected by the Central Conference shall be returned to membership as traveling elders in the Annual Conference (or its successor) of which they ceased to be a member when elected bishop. Their term of office shall expire at the close of the Central Conference at which their successor is elected, and they shall therefore be entitled to participate as a bishop in the consecration of the successor. The credentials of office as bishop shall be submitted to the secretary of the Central Conference, who shall make thereon the notation that the bishop has honorably completed the term of service for which elected and has ceased to be a bishop of The United Methodist Church.

§ 511. Bishops in Missionary Conferences.—1. Missionary bishops are those bishops who have been elected for a specified foreign mission field with full episcopal powers but with episcopal jurisdiction limited to the foreign mission field for which they were elected.

2. Missionary bishops shall be included in all other provisions for the episcopacy, including relation to Jurisdictional Conferences, amenability, and provisions for support and retirement.

3. Notwithstanding the above definitions, in an emergency the Council of Bishops may assign a missionary bishop for specified service in any foreign field in consultation with the authorities, where such exist, of the Central Conference or the Provisional Central Conference concerned.

Section IV. Specific Responsibilities of Bishops.

§ 512. Leadership—Spiritual and Temporal.—1. To oversee the spiritual and temporal affairs of The United Methodist Church, which confesses Jesus Christ as Lord and Savior, and particularly to lead the Church into the world.

2. To travel through the connection at large as the Council of Bishops (§ 525) to implement strategy for the concerns of the Church.

3. To provide liaison in ecumenical activities and relationships.

4. To organize such Missions as shall have been authorized by the General Conference.

5. To discharge such other duties as the Discipline may direct.
¶ 513. Presidential Duties.—1. To preside in the General, Jurisdictional, Central, and Annual Conferences.
2. To form the districts after consultation with the district superintendents and after the number of the same has been determined by vote of the Annual Conference.
3. To choose and appoint the district superintendents annually. But no minister shall be appointed a district superintendent for more than six years in any consecutive nine years, and no minister shall so serve more than twice.
4. To consecrate bishops, to ordain elders and deacons, to consecrate deaconesses, and to see that the names of the persons ordained and consecrated be entered on the journals of the conference and that proper credentials be furnished to these persons.

¶ 514. Working with Ministers (see also ¶ 527-531 and ¶ 665.4 and following in the 1972 Discipline).—1. To make and fix the appointments in the Annual Conferences, Provisional Annual Conferences, and Missions as the Discipline may direct.
2. To divide, or to unite, a circuit(s), station(s), or mission(s) as judged necessary for missional strategy, and then to make appropriate appointments.
3. To read the appointments of deaconesses.
4. To fix the Charge Conference membership of all ordained ministers appointed to ministries other than the local church in keeping with ¶ 453 [currently ¶ 352].
5. To transfer, upon the request of the receiving bishop, ministerial member(s) of one Annual Conference to another, provided said member(s) agrees to said transfer; and to send immediately to the secretaries of both conferences involved, to the conference Boards of Ordained Ministry, and to the clearing house of the General Board of Pensions written notices of the transfer of members and of their standing in the Course of Study if they are undergraduates.

- Section V. Selection, Assignment, and Term of District Superintendents.

¶ 515. Selection and Assignment.—Inasmuch as the district superintendency is an extension of the general superintendency, the bishop shall appoint elders to serve as district superintendents. Prior to each appointment, the bishop shall consult with the Cabinet and the Committee on District Superintendency of the district to which the new superintendent will be assigned. Such consultation shall be for the purpose of determining leadership needs of the Annual Conference and the district (¶¶ 501-502). Due consideration should be given to the inclusiveness of The United Methodist Church with respect to sex, race, and national origin.

¶ 516. Installation of the District Superintendent.—Elders who have been duly selected as district superintendents shall be installed at the session of the Annual Conference or at a District Conference which marks the beginning of their terms in office. The presiding bishop shall conduct the installation service assisted by other elders and leaders in the Annual Conference.

¶ 517. Limitations on Years of Service.—An elder may not be appointed a district superintendent for more than six years in any consecutive nine years. No elder shall serve as district superintendent more than twice. In addition, consideration shall be given to the nature of superintendency as described in ¶¶ 501-502.
Section VI. Specific Responsibilities of District Superintendents.

§ 518. The district superintendent shall oversee the total ministry of the pastors and the churches in the communities of the district: (1) by giving pastoral support and supervision to the clergy of the district; (2) by encouraging their personal, spiritual, and professional growth; (3) by enabling programs throughout the district that may assist local churches to build and extend their ministry and mission with their people and to the community; (4) and by assisting the bishop in the administration of the Annual Conference. In the fulfillment of this ministry, the superintendent shall consult regularly with the Committee on District Superintendency. While carrying out all duties and responsibilities as may be indicated in various paragraphs of the Discipline, the district superintendent shall be especially conscious of responsibility in the following areas of concern.

§ 519. Supervision.—1. To work with pastors, Pastor-Parish Relations committees, and Charge Conferences in formulating statements of purpose for congregations in fulfilling their mission and in clarifying the pastors’ priorities in accomplishing these purposes.

2. To establish a clearly understood process of supervision for clergy of the district, including observation of all aspects of ministry, direct evaluation, and feedback to the clergy involved.

3. To meet with Pastor-Parish Relations committees when conditions require, in accordance with § 529.

4. To make specific provision for the supervision of probationary members and lay pastors appointed within the district and for building clusters for supervision with the assistance of counseling elders in the district.

§ 520. Personnel.—1. To work with pastors, Pastor-Parish Relations committees, and congregations in interpreting the meaning of ministry and in identifying and enlisting candidates of the highest quality for ordained ministry, with special concern for the inclusiveness of the Church with respect to sex, race, and national origin.

2. To consult and plan with the district committee and conference Board of Ordained Ministry in order to make a thorough analysis of the needs of the district for clergy, implementing this planning with a positive and conscious effort to fill these needs.

3. To be the executive for the district Committee on Ordained Ministry, enabling a meaningful and appropriate examination of candidates into ordained ministry; to issue and renew license to preach when authorized; to keep careful records of all such candidates (§§ 319-320); to maintain regular communication with each candidate in order to advise and encourage them in spiritual and academic preparation for their ministry.

4. To develop adequate salary support for all clergy, including provision for housing, utilities, travel, and continuing education.

5. To require annually of each clergy person a report of his/her program of continuing education and to encourage congregations to give time and financial support for such programs.

6. To work with the bishop and Cabinet in the process of appointment and assignment for ministers who hold Charge Conference relationship in the district and the Annual Conference.

§ 521. Pastoral.—1. To give pastoral support and care to the clergy and their families by traveling through the district, preaching the Word, visiting and maintaining the order of the Discipline.
2. To counsel with clergy concerning their pastoral responsibilities and other matters affecting their ministry and personal life.

3. To encourage the building of peer groups among the clergy for mutual support and discipline; to build systems of mutual support for clergy families.

\( \text{¶ 522. Administration.} \) — 1. To schedule and preside, or authorize an elder to preside, in each annual Charge Conference or Church Conference within the district. [See ¶ 146-147 in the 1972 Discipline.]

2. To cooperate with the district Board of Church Location and Building and local church Boards of Trustees or building committees in arranging acquisitions, sales, transfers, and mortgages of property; and to ensure that all charters, deeds, and other legal documents conform to the Discipline and to the laws, usages, and forms of the county, state, territory, or country within which such property is situated.

3. To promote financial support in local churches for district, conference, and denominational causes.

4. To see that the provisions of the Discipline are observed and to interpret and decide all questions of church law and discipline raised by the churches in the district, subject to an appeal to the president of the Annual Conference.

5. To maintain in the district office and transfer to one's successor a complete set of records pertaining to:
   a) All abandoned church properties and cemeteries within the bounds of the district;
   b) All church properties being permissively used by other religious organizations, with the names of the local trustees thereof;
   c) All known endowments, annuities, trust funds, investments, and unpaid legacies belonging to any pastoral charge or organization connected therewith in the district;
   d) Membership of persons from churches which have been closed.

6. To transfer members of a discontinued church to another United Methodist church of their choice or to such other churches as members may elect.

\( \text{¶ 523. Program.} \) — 1. To administer the programs of the Church within the bounds of the district in cooperation with pastors and congregations, working with and through the District Council on Ministries while serving as its chief executive officer.

2. To serve as a member of the Annual Conference Council on Ministries and to work cooperatively with the conference council and its staff in all program concerns of the Church.

3. To appraise the needs and mission opportunities of the churches within the district and be available to them for counsel.

4. To establish long-range planning with an ecumenically responsive perspective and to initiate new forms of ministry.

5. To participate with the Cabinet in submitting to the Annual Conference a report reflecting the state of the conference, with recommendations for greater effectiveness.

Section VII. Corporate Expressions of Superintendency.

\( \text{¶ 524. The offices of bishop and district superintendent are interlinked with each other in ways described elsewhere (see ¶ 503). The interdependence of the offices calls for a collegial style of leadership. However, both the office of bishop and that of district superintendent are embedded in their own corporate contexts.} \)
¶ 525. Council of Bishops.—1. Bishops, although elected by jurisdictions, are elected general superintendents of the whole Church. As all ordained ministers are first elected into membership of an Annual Conference and subsequently appointed to pastoral charges, so bishops become through their election members first of the Council of Bishops before they are subsequently assigned to areas of service.

2. The Council of Bishops is thus the corporate expression of episcopal leadership in the Church and through the Church into the world. The Church expects the Council of Bishops to speak to the Church and for the Church to the world.

3. The Council of Bishops is, thus, also the body in which the individual bishops are held accountable for their work, both as general superintendents and as presidents and residents in episcopal areas.

4. In order to exercise meaningful corporate leadership, the Council of Bishops is to meet at stated intervals. The Council of Bishops is charged with the oversight of the spiritual and temporal affairs of the whole Church, to be executed in regularized consultation and cooperation with other councils and service agencies of the Church.

¶ 526. Cabinet.—1. District superintendents, although appointed to districts, are also to be given conference-wide responsibilities. As all ordained ministers are first elected into membership of an Annual Conference and subsequently appointed to pastoral charges, so district superintendents become through their selection members first of a Cabinet before they are subsequently appointed to service in districts.

2. The Cabinet under the leadership of the bishop is thus the corporate expression of superintending leadership in and through the Annual Conference. It is expected to speak to the conference and for the conference to the spiritual and temporal issues that exist within the region encompassed by the conference.

3. The Cabinet is, thus, also the body in which the individual district superintendents are held accountable for their work, both for conference and district responsibilities.

4. In order to exercise meaningful corporate leadership, the Cabinet is to meet at stated intervals. The Cabinet is charged with the oversight of the spiritual and temporal affairs of a conference, to be executed in regularized consultation and cooperation with other councils and service agencies of the conference.

Section VIII. Appointment-Making.

¶ 527. Function.—Pastors, ordained and unordained, shall be appointed by a bishop who is empowered to make and fix all appointments in the episcopal area within which the Annual Conference is a part. Appointments are to be made with due regard to the gifts and graces of pastors, to the needs, characteristics, and opportunities of congregations, and to program and missional strategy of conferences. Through appointment-making, the connectional nature of the United Methodist system is made visible.

¶ 528. Definition of Consultation.—Consultation means conferring with the parties affected by the process of appointment-making. Consultation is not unilateral decision-making or notification. Consultation is both a continuing process and a more intense involvement during the period of change in appointment.
§ 529. Process.—1. The process may be initiated by a pastor, a Pastor-Parish Relations committee, a district superintendent, or a bishop.

2. When a change is imminent, consultation shall take place involving the pastor, district superintendent, and the Pastor-Parish Relations committee, as well as the bishop.

3. The bishop and the Cabinet shall consider all requests in light of criteria developed for each charge and each pastor.

4. All appointments shall receive consideration by the bishop and the district superintendent(s) and the Cabinet as a whole until a tentative decision is made.

5. Consultation with the pastor and the Pastor-Parish Relations committee may indicate supporting data for the tentative decision. If it is determined that this decision should not be carried out, the process is to be repeated until the bishop, basing his judgment on the information and advice derived from consultation, makes the appointment.

6. The announcement of that decision shall be made to all parties directly involved in the consultative process; that is, the Appointment Cabinet, the pastor, and the Pastor-Parish Relations committee, before a public announcement is made.

§ 530. Criteria.—Appointments shall take into account the unique needs of a charge in a particular setting and also the gifts and graces of a particular pastor. To assist bishops, Cabinets, pastors, and congregations to achieve an effective match of charges and pastors, criteria must be developed and analyzed in each instance and then shared with pastors and congregations.

1. Congregations.—a) The general situation in which a congregation finds itself in a particular setting: size, financial condition, quality of lay leadership, history.

b) The convictional stance of the congregation: theology, prejudices, if any; spiritual life.

c) The ministry of the congregation among its people for the sake of the community: service programs, basis for adding new members, reasons for losing members, mission to community and world, forms of witness.

2. Pastors.—a) Spiritual and personal sensibility: personal faith, call and commitment to ordained ministry, work through the institutional Church, integration of vocation with personal and family well-being, life-style.

b) Academic and career background: nature of theological stance, experience in continuing education, professional experience, record of performance, age.

c) Skills and abilities: in church administration, leadership development, worship and liturgy, preaching and evangelism, teaching and nurturing, counseling and group work, ability in self-evaluation.

§ 531. Frequency.—While the bishop shall report all pastoral appointments as they exist to each regular session of an Annual Conference, appointments to charges may be made at any time deemed advisable by the bishop and Cabinet.
b) *Other Legislation.*

(1) General Committee on Episcopacy (for Part IV of the *Book of Discipline*, the chapter on “The Conferences,” Section I).

1. **General Committee on Episcopacy.**—1. In order to facilitate the general superintendency throughout the United Methodist connection, there shall be a General Committee on Episcopacy. It shall be composed of all the members of the Jurisdictional Committees on Episcopacy [see Other Legislation (2) below]. It shall be convened at least two days before the opening of the General Conference by the president of the Council of Bishops. It shall meet also in mid-quadrennium and in the fall of the year preceding the General Conference. The term of the General Committee on Episcopacy expires on January 1 in the year preceding the General Conference.

It shall have an executive committee of twenty persons consisting of two clergy persons and two lay persons from each of the Jurisdictional Committees on Episcopacy, named by the jurisdictional committees. It shall elect from the executive committee a chairperson, a vice-chairperson, and a secretary. The executive committee may meet in the interim between meetings of the General Committee.

2. The General Committee on Episcopacy shall:
   a) Be available to the Council of Bishops for consultation on matters of mutual concern.
   b) Prepare the budget of the Episcopal Fund, together with appropriate recommendations, to be sent to the General Council on Finance and Administration.
   c) Determine the number of effective bishops eligible for reappointment.
   d) Receive and act upon requests for possible voluntary and involuntary retirement of bishops from Jurisdictional Committees on Episcopacy.
   e) Receive and act upon recommendations from the Jurisdictional Committees on Episcopacy in regard to evaluation of bishops and area needs for episcopal leadership.
   f) Recommend assignments of bishops to jurisdictions, as detailed in § 506.1.
   g) Prepare a quadrennial report and recommendations no later than January 1 prior to the General Conference. Such report of the committee’s activities and recommendations to be submitted to the secretary of the General Conference and transmitted by the secretary to the successor committee and membership of General Conference.

3. The executive committee shall be responsible for carrying out work assigned by the General Committee, for conducting interim liaison with the Council of Bishops and with other general church boards and agencies, and for arranging agenda and plans for committee meetings.

4. The General Council on Finance and Administration shall make provision in its budget for the expenses of this committee.
(2) Jurisdictional Committee on Episcopacy (for Part IV of the Book of Discipline, the chapter on "The Conferences," Section II).

Jurisdictional Committee on Episcopacy.—I. There shall be a Jurisdictional Committee on Episcopacy consisting of one clergy person and one lay person elected by separate orders in each Annual Conference from the General Conference delegation, except for those Annual Conferences which elect only one delegate by orders to General Conference. In that case, elections to the Jurisdictional Committee on Episcopacy shall be from the total Jurisdictional Conference delegation.

Each newly elected Jurisdictional Committee on Episcopacy shall be convened by the president of the College of Bishops by January 15, prior to the regular quadrennial meeting of the General Conference.

It shall elect from among its members a chairperson, a vice-chairperson, and a secretary. It shall be a standing committee whose term shall expire January 1 prior to the regular quadrennial meeting of the General Conference.

2. The Jurisdictional Conference shall provide funding for the expenses of the Jurisdictional Committee on Episcopacy.

3. The Jurisdictional Committee on Episcopacy shall:
   a) Review the work of the bishops, pass on their character and official administration, and report to the Jurisdictional Conference its findings for such action as the conference may deem appropriate within its constitutional warrant of power.
   b) Recommend boundaries of the episcopal areas and the assignments of the bishops according to § 506.2.
   c) Receive reports from the Conference Committees on Episcopacy [see Other Legislation (3) below] with respect to the needs for episcopal leadership and how best they can be fulfilled and forward its recommendations to the General Committee on Episcopacy.
   d) This committee is explicitly authorized to make recommendations to the General Committee on Episcopacy with regard to involuntary retirement of bishops within that jurisdiction.
   e) Prepare a report of its decisions, activities, and recommendations to be transmitted to its successor through the office of the secretary of the Jurisdictional Conference. The report shall be made available to delegates of the Jurisdictional Conference prior to the Jurisdictional Conference.
(3) Conference Committee on Episcopacy (for Part IV of the Book of Discipline, the chapter on "The Conferences," Section IX).

Conference Committee on Episcopacy.—1. There shall be a Conference Committee on Episcopacy elected by the Annual Conference and consisting of three laywomen, three laymen, three clergy persons, and three additional at-large members to make possible the representation of ethnic minorities, youth, and young adults, and three additional persons appointed by the bishop, provided that at least five of the fifteen persons are clergy. The bishop of the area may appoint three additional persons of his/her own choosing.

Two or more conferences under the presidency of a single bishop may decide to have one committee on episcopacy, in which case each Annual Conference shall be represented as stated in the preceding paragraph and shall each elect its own representatives.

The lay and clergy members of the Jurisdictional Committee on Episcopacy shall be ex-officio members with vote.

2. The committee shall meet at least annually. It shall be convened by the bishop and shall elect a chairperson, a vice-chairperson, and a secretary. The bishop and/or chairperson are authorized to call additional meetings when desired.

3. The functions of the Conference Committee on Episcopacy shall be:

   a) To support the bishop of the area in the oversight of the spiritual and temporal affairs of the Church, with special reference to the area where the bishop has presidential responsibility.
   b) To be available to the bishop for counsel.
   c) To assist in the determination of the episcopal needs of the area and to make recommendations to appropriate bodies.
   d) To keep the bishop advised concerning conditions within the area as they affect relationships between the bishop and the people of the conference boards and agencies.
   e) To interpret to the people of the area and to conference boards and agencies the nature and function of the episcopal office.
   f) To engage in annual consultation and appraisal of the work of the bishop in the episcopal area.
   g) To report needs for episcopal leadership to the Jurisdictional Committee on Episcopacy through the duly elected conference members of that committee.

4. The conference Council on Finance and Administration shall make provision in its budget for the expenses of this committee.
(4) Committee on District Superintendency (for Part IV of the Book of Discipline, the chapter on "The Conferences," Section X).

Committee on District Superintendency.—There shall be a Committee on District Superintendency.

1. Membership.—This committee shall be composed of three laywomen, three laymen, three clergy, and three at-large members selected to make possible the representation of ethnic minorities, youth, and young adults, and three additional persons appointed by the district superintendent, provided that at least five of the fifteen persons are clergy.

2. Selection.—The members shall be selected in such manner as may be determined by the District Conference or, where there is no District Conference, by the Annual Conference. In addition, the district superintendent shall appoint no less than three members to this committee and such additional members to correspond to the ratio of membership if said membership is enlarged by the District Conference or Annual Conference where there is no District Conference. The district committee shall be authorized to co-opt members as advisory members who have expertise in areas of special need. The bishop of the area, or his/her authorized representative, shall be an ex-officio member of said committee.

3. Meeting.—The district committee shall meet at least annually and upon call of the district superintendent and/or the chairperson of the committee.

4. Function.—The functions of the Committee on District Superintendency shall be:

a) To support the district superintendent of the district in the oversight of the spiritual and temporal affairs of the Church, with special reference to the district where the superintendent has responsibilities.

b) To be available for counsel.

c) To assist in the determination of the leadership needs of the district and how they can be fulfilled best (see § 515).

d) To keep the district superintendent advised concerning conditions within the district as they affect relations between the district superintendent, the people, and the district boards and agencies.

e) To interpret to the people of the district and to the district boards and agencies the nature and function of the district superintendency.

5. Consultation.—The district committee and the district superintendent shall engage in an annual consultation and appraisal of the work of the district superintendent in the district and shall serve in an advisory relationship with the bishop of the area.
c) **Constitutional Changes.**

(1) Amend ¶ 54, Division Three, Article V of the Constitution so that in lieu thereof the entire paragraph shall read as follows:

**¶ 54. Article V.**—The bishops shall have residential and presiden­tial supervision in the Jurisdictional Conferences in which they are elected or to which they are **assigned by action of the General Conference upon recommendation of the General Committee on Episcopacy.**

Bishops may be assigned by the Council of Bishops for temporary presidential or other service in another jurisdiction than the one from which they were elected or to which they have been **assigned,** provided request is made by a majority of the bishops in the jurisdiction of the proposed service.

In the case of an emergency in any jurisdiction or Central Conference through the death or disability of a bishop or other cause, the Council of Bishops may assign a bishop from another jurisdiction or Central Conference to the work of the said jurisdiction or Central Conference with the consent of a majority of the bishops of that jurisdiction or Central Conference.

(2) Amend ¶ 55, Division Three, Article VI of the Constitution so that in lieu thereof the entire paragraph shall read as follows:

**¶ 55. Article VI.**—The bishops, both active and retired, of The Evangelical United Brethren Church and of The Methodist Church at the time union is consummated, shall be bishops of The United Methodist Church.

The bishops of The Methodist Church elected by the jurisdictions, the active bishops of The Evangelical United Brethren Church at the time of union, and bishops elected by the jurisdictions of The United Methodist Church shall have life tenure. Each bishop elected by a Central Conference of The Methodist Church shall have such tenure as the Central Conference electing him shall have determined.

There shall be a General Committee on Episcopacy consisting of the members of the Committees on Episcopacy of the several jurisdictions. The General Committee on Episcopacy, after consultation with the active bishops of the jurisdictions, shall recommend the assignments of bishops to each jurisdiction according to the number of bishops in each jurisdiction who are eligible for residential assignment within that jurisdiction for the ensuing quadrennium, for final action by the General Conference. In making assignments to the jurisdictions, bishops may be transferred across jurisdic­tional lines. It shall perform such other functions as the General Conference from time to time shall direct.

There shall be a Committee on Episcopacy in each of the jurisdictions consisting of one ministerial and one lay delegate elected by the Annual Conferences of that jurisdiction. The committee shall review the work of the bishops, pass on their character and official administration, and report to the Jurisdictional Conference its findings for such action as the conference may deem appropriate within its constitutional warrant of power. The committee shall recommend the assignments of the bishops to their respective residences for final action by the Jurisdictional Conference.

*See Judicial Council Decisions 4, 303.*
Appendix 1

Membership of the Bishop and District Superintendent Study Commission of The United Methodist Church (1972-76)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jurisdiction</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North Central Jurisdiction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern Indiana</td>
<td>Leroy C. Hedgpipp</td>
<td>2427 E. Second St. Bloomington, Ind. 47401</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern Illinois</td>
<td>Merlyn W. Northfelt</td>
<td>Garrett-Evangelical Theological Seminary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2121 Sheridan Rd. Evanston, Ill. 60201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Ohio</td>
<td>Robert J. Tolbert</td>
<td>251 E. Mill Akron, Ohio 44308</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td>Paul V. Shearer</td>
<td>225 W. Main Washington, Iowa 52353</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Ohio</td>
<td>Mrs. Harold Baker</td>
<td>2410 Glenwood Ave. Toledo, Ohio 43620</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Ohio</td>
<td>Mrs. Wendell Forrest</td>
<td>1072 Chalker St. Akron, Ohio 44312</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southeastern Jurisdiction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern Illinois</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oklahoma</td>
<td>J. Chess Lovern</td>
<td>1301 S. Boston Ave. Tulsa, Okla. 74101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>Willie B. Randolph</td>
<td>5667 Belmark St. Houston, Texas 77033</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Texas</td>
<td>Leo L. Baker</td>
<td>5928 Glendora Dallas, Texas 75220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rio Grande</td>
<td>J. P. Zepada</td>
<td>1407 Clifton Ave. Fort Worth, Texas 76183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri East</td>
<td>Mrs. Edward A. Brandhorst</td>
<td>569 W. Glendale Rd. Webster Groves, Mo. 63119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Texas</td>
<td>Lindy Waters</td>
<td>P.O. Box 4506 Dallas, Texas 75208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>Harold H. Fink</td>
<td>903 Forest Ave. Richmond, Va. 23229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Georgia</td>
<td>Charles W. Boleyn</td>
<td>2198 Kodiah Dr. N.W. Atlanta, Ga. 30345</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>Richard V. Moore</td>
<td>Bethune Cookman College Dayton Beach, Fla. 32615</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>C. R. Hager</td>
<td>University of Kentucky Lexington, Ky. 40506</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Georgia</td>
<td>Mrs. Carlton Carruth</td>
<td>2903 Kemble Ave. Brunswick, Ga. 31520</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Alabama</td>
<td>Dr. Louise Branscomb</td>
<td>1225 Greenboro Ave. Birmingham, Ala. 35208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi</td>
<td>Ms. Cathy Wells</td>
<td>1716 Eisenhower Dr. Vicksburg, Miss. 39180</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Italic denotes minister.
Study Plan Adopted in Dallas, February 17, 1973
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STUDY PLAN

I. TASK

   The task of the study commission on the episcopacy and district superintendency originates from a mandate received at the General Conference of 1972. The commission sought to fulfill its task along the guidelines of a series of theses.

   A. Mandate

      On April 27, 1972, the Committee on Clergy petitioned the General Conference to establish a study commission. When the General Conference concurred, it thereby gave the study commission its mandate as previously formulated in the Committee on Clergy.

      The mandate calls "for the study of the offices of Bishop and District Superintendent with particular reference to the method of their selection, tenure, assignment, function, and such other matters as it shall deem appropriate" (1972 Daily Christian Advocate, page 603).

   B. Theses

      In its organizing meeting of October 9, 1972, the study commission interpreted its mandate in light of the various petitions to the General Conference which had led to the establishment of the study commission. Most of these petitions, so the commission members agreed, were of a functional character. In order to deal with them adequately, the commission members decided to dig deeper and consider the theological context and implications. "The commission
members unanimously agreed that the scope and purpose of this study commission should not be limited to the functional and mechanical aspects of offices of episcopacy and district superintendency, but to include broad and fundamental issues of episcopacy and district superintendency historically, theologically, biblically, philosophically, and ideally (Commission Minutes, page 4).

Pursuing this chosen direction, we propose a series of theses. A number of these are working hypotheses which we hope to test in the process of our study. Others contain resulting assumptions underlying the approach of our study for which we shall render account as we proceed.

Hypotheses:
1. There is widespread concern in the United Methodist Church about the functions of bishop and district superintendent.
2. The concern is likely to have different motivations in different regions of the country and abroad.
3. The differences in the concern could also stem from other factors, as former Methodists in relation to former Evangelical United Brethren, clergy in relation to laity, pastors in relation to district superintendents and bishops.
4. Although expressed in functional terms, the concern must be expected to reflect a lack of clarity in the theological understanding of the offices, the theology of their present expression, of the tradition behind them, and of the course to be charted for the future.

Assumptions:
5. We understand the church to be an instrument through which God transforms, or seeks to transform, the world; the church, then, is obliged to try to understand the world as it is and as it appears to be evolving. It is our objective to identify trends and tendencies as the world moves into the future in order that the church may more effectively fulfill its mission.
6. The United Methodist Church functions with the help of the offices of bishop and district superintendent. We approach our study with the understanding that these offices are to be continued unless our findings compel us to consider alternatives.
7. While these offices have served, and continue to serve, the church effectively, over the years difficulties have arisen, mainly on the level of the proper functioning of the said offices. These difficulties also reflect a lack of clarity in the election and selection process concerning qualifications required in these offices for leadership in our time. It is our objective to locate and define the difficulties and to suggest solutions.
8. We suspect that the difficulties at hand reflect a lack of clarity in the theological conceptions and functional roles of episcopacy and district superintendency. Diagnosis must be made of these issues before remedial suggestions can be made.
9. Our theological approach entails an overall concern for the common ministry shared by all of us in the mission of our church in the world, as expressed in other documents of United Methodism. We believe that it is for the sake of our common ministry that we have particular ministries, of which superintendency is one of several. Today superintendency takes two forms among us, the superintendency of the district superintendent and the "general superintendency" of the bishop.
10. We are aware of emerging confusion in relationship and role between cabinets and other area and conference staff persons, i.e. bishop's administrative assistant, public relations director, conference council director and staff, etc. It is our objective to assist in clarifying and defining the role and function of the district superintendent in these relationships.
11. Further, we are aware of the increasing desire of lay persons and ministers to be more involved in the decision-making processes (i.e. district council on ministries, style of annual conferences, appointment of ministers to churches).
12. The varied functions of the district superintendent (pastoral, program and appointive) present problems. We want to discover how compatible the functions are, or if any one of them can best be handled by other means.

II. DESIGN

We propose a study, inductive and experimental in design, which will deal historically, theologically, biblically, philosophically, and ideally with the episcopacy and district superintendency as follows:

A. Background

In preparation for judgments to be arrived at, the members of the study commission will need to examine the conceptions of episcopacy and district superintendency in the Methodist and Evangelical United Brethren traditions in particular and in the Christian tradition in general. Members will become familiar with a limited number of agreed-upon pertinent studies. In addition, each member will serve on a small study group responsible for the input on particular aspects of the Methodist and Evangelical United Brethren traditions and the Christian tradition at large.

For these purposes, the consultants are to prepare a working bibliography for the study commission which in due course is to be expanded into a possible publication for The United Methodist Church at large.

B. Current Role

We will begin by gathering information on the current practice and understanding of the major offices of bishops and district superintendents in the context of the common ministry of The United Methodist Church.

The data most immediately available are recent studies of similar scope. These constitute our starting point.

The current thinking in the church at large regarding episcopacy and district superintendency is our external source of information. We propose to tap it in two ways. First, an opinion poll in the form of a representative random sampling shall be conducted, at the instruction of the commission, with the help of consultants. Second, comments are to be invited by articles in the church media and through personal contacts of the members of the study commission. All information gathered, not only the results from the random sampling but also memos by the study commission members or resulting correspondence, is to be made available to the consultants.

Another kind of material is the inside information which will be gathered from bishops and district superintendents. This material is to be collected through the use of consultants. In the case of the bishops, the data shall be collected by consultants and, when feasible, selected commission members shall interview all bishops.

Because of the importance of the cabinet meeting, particularly in the function of appointment-making, it is recommended that a representative observation of these be included if at all possible.

In the case of the district superintendents, representative opinions are further to be secured through the instrument of a questionnaire, approved by the commission, to be prepared and evaluated with the help of the consultants.

As a result, a first report is to be
produced integrating the findings of random samplings, memos, correspondence, interviews, observations, and questionnaires.

C. Evaluation
Taking the first report, members of the commission, together with the consultants, will conduct a critical comparison of the present situation under consideration with the Methodist and Evangelical United Brethren traditions and the Christian tradition at large.

As a follow-up to the first report, a process will take place where opportunity will be provided for reaction and clarification of the findings by persons who participate in providing data:
1. We propose a joint meeting of the Council of Bishops and the commission, with a design to include small groups consisting of bishops and commission members.
2. We propose, on a jurisdictional basis, a meeting or meetings of commission members and a sampling of district superintendents in the jurisdiction, with a design to include small groups consisting of district superintendents and commission members.
3. The executive committee and consultants are asked to provide a way of evaluating collected data from either local churches or annual conferences.

D. Options
Finally, there is to be a discussion of the range of options and their viability for further developments of the episcopacy and district superintendency in United Methodism.

In light of the theological ramifications of the second report, the options need to be listed for consideration by the members of the study commission together with the consultants.

The result should be collected into a third report that focuses on the future. On its basis, the recommendations will have to be formulated as to which options should be pursued. Also, the study commission will then determine how it takes its options into the life stream of The United Methodist Church for decision-making.

All this will be part of the last report.

III. PERSONNEL
The personnel is made up in the first place by the members of the study commission themselves, secondly, by consultants; and thirdly, by additional technical help as required.

A. Commission
The study commission owns the study as a whole, including the three or four reports produced in conjunction with the consultants, as well as the bibliography in all its stages. It will give proper credit to the contribution of the consultants.

To summarize the job of the members of the study commission:
1. Study recent reports of similar scope or their summaries.
2. Solicit and collect information among the constituents in the form of public and private opinions about the episcopacy and district superintendency.
3. Transmit the information, memos, and letters.
4. Advise the consultants on the development of random samplings, interview and questionnaire instruments.
5. Draft possible third report.
6. Study commonly agreed-upon basic works.
7. Participate in a study group on a special aspect of the tradition.
8. Provide input for critical comparison of findings and judgment of tradition.
9. Evaluate the second report.
10. Participate in consideration of options.
11. Evaluate possible third report.
12. Co-formulate options to be pursued.
14. Evaluate last report.

B. Consultants
There shall be two consultants: one in the area of historical theology; the other in the area of sociology of religion.

The consultants own the data collected, but not the emerging reports or the bibliography in its various stages.

To summarize the job expected from the consultants:
1. Develop instruments of random samplings, interviews, and questionnaires at the instruction of the study commission.
2. Collect data from random samplings, interviews, and questionnaires.
3. Collect data from memos and correspondence.
5. Prepare working bibliography.
7. Draft possible third report (integrating options into data and judgments).
8. Possibly produce final report at the instruction of the study commission.
9. Produce final bibliography for publication.

C. Technical Help
Additional personnel, such as technical help, has to be negotiated in the process of the study as need arises.

IV. CALENDAR

Spring, 1973
1. Executive committee select and enlist consultants and finalize budget for presentation to Division of Ordained Ministry.
2. Develop and mail questionnaires to district superintendents, clergy and laity.

Fall, 1973
1. Full commission meeting (tentative).
2. Begin interviews with each bishop in his own setting; involve commission members in interviews if at all feasible.

January-March, 1974
1. Complete interviews with each bishop.
2. Observe limited number of cabinet sessions.
3. Collate, digest, and interpret data from questionnaires and interviews with bishops.

April, 1974
1. Full commission meeting to receive first report from consultants.
2. Meeting with Council of Bishops for half day to test validity of interpretation of data collected by consultants regarding the episcopacy.
3. Jurisdictional meetings of selected members of the commission with district superintendents to test validity of interpretation of data.

November, 1974
1. Full commission meeting to receive and evaluate second report from consultants. Begin considering general directions and options.

Note: An executive committee meeting might be needed between April and November meetings.

Appendix 3

List of Full Commission Meetings

October 9, 1972—Chicago, Ill.
February 16-17, 1973—Dallas, Texas
April 15-18, 1974—Los Angeles, Calif.
October 31-November 3, 1974—Atlanta, Ga.
April 18-21, 1975—Evanston, Ill.
October 9-11, 1975—Evanston, Ill.
List of Sources Consulted
(Alphabetically arranged in subgroups)

1. Bibliographies


2. The United Methodist Church


The Study of the General Superintendency of the Methodist Church. 3 parts. 1963.


3. Other Methodisms


Doctrines and Discipline of the Free Methodist Church of North America (excerpts) 1969.

4. Methodisms in Regional Ecumenical Conversations, including COCU and WCC


Digest of the Proceedings of the Fifth Meeting of the Consultation on Church Union (Dallas) (excerpts). Fanwood: COCU, 1966.


Plan of Church Union in North India and Pakistan (excerpts), Negotiating Committee, 1965.


5. Methodisms in Confessional Ecumenical Conversations


Hanson, Anthony. “Episcopacy in Anglicanism and Beyond.” Anglican Theological Review, Suppl. No. 2 (September 1973).


The Report from the Committee on Christian Unity and the Church Universal of the Anglican Church of Canada (excerpts). Committee on Union, 1965.
6. Non-Methodist Ecumenical Conversations


7. Historic Anglicanism and Roman Catholicism


8. The Eastern Churches and the Early Church


10. The Council of Bishops


Appendix 5

List of Working Documents
Prepared for Use
by the Commission

1. Prepared for joint session of commission
   with the Council of Bishops, April, 1974:
   
   Sharing a Royal Priesthood
   “The Reluctant Monarchs” by Egon W. Gerdes
   “Is the King Dead?” by Ellis L. Larsen

2. Prepared for commission meeting, October, 1974:
   
   Watching Ourselves and the Flock
   “Is the Office of District Superintendent Necessary?”
   by Ellis L. Larsen
   “From Superintendency to Supervision” by Egon W. Gerdes

3. Three theological papers (1974) by Egon W. Gerdes:
   
   “Ministry and Ordination” (30 pages)
   “If I Were a Bishop” (47 pages)
   “The Church and Our Church” (24 pages)

4. Prepared for commission meeting, January, 1975:
   
   “Functions and Roles: Bishops and Superintendents”
   by G. Bashore; C. Boleyn; L. Brandhorst; R. Tolbert;
   A. Wyckoff; R. Shinn, chairperson (E. W. Gerdes and
   E. L. Larsen, consultants)

   Draft Statement on “Mandate and Process”
   by L. Baker

5. Papers prepared for commission meeting, April, 1975:
   
   “Appointive Process”
   by G. Bashore; A. Carruth; L. Brandhorst; M. Mathews; E. Hood; R. Tolbert; H. Fink, chairperson (E.
   L. Larsen, consultant)

   “Election/Selection, Training, and Tenure”
   by C. Boleyn; L. Branscomb; C. D. Haywood; B.
   Johnson; F. Kirchner; C. Lavern; L. Hodapp, chairperson

   “Relationships”
   by C. Aguilar; P. Forrest; W. James; J. K. Sasaki; C.
   Wells; L. Baker, chairperson (E. L. Larsen, consultant)

   “Accountability”
   by C. R. Häger; M. Isaacs; R. Pittenger; W. Randolph;
   P. Shearer; A. Wyckoff, chairperson (E. W. Gerdes and
   E. L. Larsen, consultants)
The total report was presented in two parts. The first, *Sharing a Royal Priesthood* (April, 1974), deals with the bishops; the second, *Watching Oneself and the Flock* (October, 1974), concentrates on the district superintendents. In both parts, the theological consultant based his contributions on interviews with the bishops and on participation in cabinet meetings, with resulting conversations with district superintendents.

The reflections on episcopacy consider bishops provocatively as "The Reluctant Monarchs." Their episcopacy, however, exists for the sake of the ministry of the church. Bishops are the prominent part of what is classically called church government and what we today call church leadership. Their rulership traditionally has been understood monarchically, a style in which modern bishops function, indeed, only reluctantly, if at all. Monarchic episcopacy is tempered, balanced, corrected—both Christologically and ecclesiologically.

Christologically speaking, a few bishops consciously model their office after Christ's kingship, which, however, is a kingship with a crown of thorns. Some relate better to Christ's prophetic office, leading through teaching. Most, however, wish to extend Christ's priestly office, understanding themselves as pastors of pastors, fulfilling a post-pastoral role.

Ecclesiologically speaking, the office of bishop is placed into networks. As pastor of pastors, the bishop is co-pastor of colleagues. In appointment-making, he is colleague to his cabinet. Beyond the collegial aspect, there are other relations to cultivate—in particular, to councils, boards, and agencies. Then, there is corporate episcopacy, to a lesser degree in the College of Bishops, but above all in the Council of Bishops, whose role is increasingly rediscovered by greater expectations from both the bishops and the church.

Into their office the bishops attempt to fit as persons—and they are human, too! Their main struggles occur over shattered personal life rhythms and defeated spiritual life patterns. The wider context of the office thus filled is given with the area which becomes the base from where to exercise general superintendency. While this is a specific understanding of episcopacy, bishops also participate in the general tradition of episcopacy, which they share with bishops of other traditions. Together, all bishops are symbols of the unity of the church.

The operational theology of bishops is more process oriented, with accountability as chief concern, than issue focussed. Church issues like declining church membership and remedial evangelism were more prominent than societal issues such as the polarization of society. The formal theology of bishops, which would not suffer from greater sophistication, is by no means uniform, though Reinhold Niebuhr and Boston Personalism have had a wide impact on them. The most problematic concern was a proper theology of the Holy Spirit. Many bishops are caught in the (mis)understanding of the Holy Spirit as a direct divine influence on individuals without regard to the community of the faithful. For the norm of their theology, bishops usually refer to a combination from Wesley's quadrilateral. When asked about the directions to be charted, most bishops offered strong convictions for life tenure.

Considerations of the district superintendency are offered in the question, "From Superintendency to Supervision?" The change in terms is to imply a transition of style from solitary to consultative for both—corporate supervision by the cabinet and personal supervision by individual district superintendents.

The main task of cabinets is appointment-making. It usually works in the form of series of appointments, from the highest paying churches and highest paid pastors down. Appointment-making is thus caught in a ladder system rather than freed up in a grid system. The results range from strategic appointments to those of accommodation. More proper networks of accountability are called for in the midst of the problems of unappointables, involuntary location, and stigmatic exit procedures. Theologically, the appointive system remains tied to the faith in the God of history whose moving through time and space is to be followed.

The partners in the appointment system are churches and pastors who have to be matched. Constant reflection goes, therefore, into the questions: What makes a good local church? What makes a good parish pastor?

The agents of the appointive system are cabinets and bishops. They cooperate as colleagues with distinct duties. Cabinets increasingly deliberate over appointments with conference-wide strategy. Bishops, more or less leading cabinets in their sessions, ultimately fix the appointments. Consultation with both pastors and churches is being integrated into widely divergent practices.

District superintendents affirm for their office a dignity of its own, though it is, through appointment, related to the bishop's office. Like bishops, district superintendents find themselves called upon to lead, particularly their pastors, for which they desire greater skills in terms of a well-interpreted professionalism. Like bishops, they are embedded in not always clearly defined relationships to other conference councils, boards, and agencies. Much clarification will still have to come. Even more than bishops, district superintendents act in concert—collegially with the bishop, corporately as conference superintendents.

In filling their office, to which they are after all appointed and not elected, district superintendents are highly sensitive on the point of bringing in, asserting, and keeping alive their own personhood. The locus of the district superinten-
tendent is in the district; the focus of their work, however, includes the conference as a whole. In this tension they live out the twofold tradition of the former Methodist and the former Evangelical United Brethren churches. Also, district superintendents work with an operational theology, which is above all concerned with accountability, their own and that of the pastors in their charge, and about support as the other side of accountability. It thus takes no wonder that the theological interests surrounding the superintending task are those of the ministry of the church and of the church as such.

Because of these existential contexts, the theological doctrines of greatest relevance among district superintendents deal with mutuality, authority, and again with the Holy Spirit among God's people, with leadership emerging from within. Directions district superintendents look for embrace both ongoing professionalization and transforming accountability from a hierarchical, vertical one to a horizontal sustention among the members of the body of Christ.

Both parts of the report, on episcopacy and district superintendency, support the quest for leadership which the church is raising and which will be with us for some time to come.

A Summary of the Sociological Consultant’s Report to the Bishop and District Superintendent Study Commission

By Ellis L. Larsen
Sociological Consultant

The original report by this consultant was entitled “Is the King Dead?” When that title was shared with the bishops and the commission members, several expressed anxiety and fear that it would be misunderstood. And it was! The title, of course, refers to a part of the theological description of Christ’s ministry—a ministry in which all clergy are called to participate; namely, the kingly, prophetic, and priestly roles (or, if one prefers, the roles of order, Word, and sacrament).

Now the church calls its bishops and district superintendents to exercise oversight and supervision for the sake of Christ’s mission to the world and for the well-being of the church. Problems arise, however, when such leadership is perceived to be autocratic and arbitrary, which the word king implies in the American cultural milieu. Are bishops and superintendents generally autocratic, or was the anxiety an expression of guilt by association, a cultural reaction to a word’s connotations? This consultant believes the latter is much more descriptive of the actual picture than the former. But what do United Methodists believe?

Answers to this and many other questions were sought through the examination of many theological and historical documents, interviews and observations of bishops and cabinets, and through a questionnaire distributed to some 9,600 church leaders (all United States bishops, most Central Conference bishops, all superintendents, administrative assistants, presidents of conference and district United Methodist Women’s groups, conference councils on ministries directors, together with scientifically chosen random samples of pastors, pastor-parish chairpersons, lay leaders, and councils on ministries chairpersons).

Eighty percent of the bishops and superintendents responded to the questionnaire, as did 60 percent of the pastors and 41 percent of the laity. The reader is encouraged to examine the tables, which are herein included (see appendix 6-C, following pages), for the specific responses to items by percentages. The following constitutes a summary of the questionnaire findings.

Our church overwhelmingly wishes to continue the offices of bishop and superintendent. However, not all are in favor of life episcopacy, nor do we see this office as a “third order.” Rather, the office is seen as a functional role which an individual is commissioned to fulfill for a season (and this holds true for the superintendent’s office).

This does not mean that a great number are calling for “term episcopacy” in the form of elections being held every four years. Rather, people are calling for some reasonable limit to presidential and residential responsibilities and for an easing of removal from such responsibilities. Many seem in favor of lowering the retirement age, of easing the possibilities (or the ability to do so) is open to question. Officeholders themselves described the major portion of their time being taken up in office activities of promotion and record keeping and correspondence. Investigations show that the church generally provides inadequate secondary support of such offices; i.e., very little is budgeted for secretarial help, staff work, and the like.

In conclusion, church leaders seem generally appreciative of the bishops and superintendents in our church. People want them to lead forthrightly but always in a fashion that is genuinely open to the influence of those who are being led. People especially want that leadership in a spiritual oversight and strategic fashion of appointment-making rather than in an accommodative one.

But, once again, people want some say in matters which affect them; they want to make suggestions for the district superintendency; they want information about prospective bishops widely disseminated; and they want a more widespread influence in the election of bishops. In addition, people want to be genuinely consulted when a change in appointments is up for consideration. And so our church wishes the kingly, the prophetic, and the priestly roles of Christ’s ministry to be fulfilled by today’s bishops and superintendents.
### 6-C Questionnaire Responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. The doctrines and teachings of the church need to grow and develop in order to keep up with the needs of the times.</td>
<td>92.3</td>
<td>91.2</td>
<td>83.2</td>
<td>82.7</td>
<td>85.7</td>
<td>58.3</td>
<td>90.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Bishops should fulfill national church responsibilities even though this might mean some neglect of their episcopal areas.</td>
<td>71.8</td>
<td>53.3</td>
<td>48.0</td>
<td>49.7</td>
<td>53.4</td>
<td>53.9</td>
<td>56.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Too many &quot;out-of-district&quot; demands are made upon the superintendent's time.</td>
<td>-25.6</td>
<td>52.2</td>
<td>66.7</td>
<td>65.0</td>
<td>65.8</td>
<td>67.0</td>
<td>55.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. No matter how wonderful the ideas you are trying to get across may be, you cannot succeed in the Annual Conference unless you have the Bishop and the Superintendents on your side.</td>
<td>47.4</td>
<td>47.7</td>
<td>59.6</td>
<td>73.8</td>
<td>56.2</td>
<td>72.3</td>
<td>63.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. The office of district superintendent should be continued in The United Methodist Church.</td>
<td>97.4</td>
<td>98.2</td>
<td>84.2</td>
<td>87.5</td>
<td>89.3</td>
<td>94.3</td>
<td>91.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. The office of bishop should be continued in The United Methodist Church.</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>98.4</td>
<td>91.7</td>
<td>89.1</td>
<td>95.2</td>
<td>91.8</td>
<td>94.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Bishops grow more autocratic the longer they are in office.</td>
<td>36.8</td>
<td>53.1</td>
<td>61.8</td>
<td>61.7</td>
<td>57.7</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>56.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Pastoral responsibility should not be separated from the appointive responsibility of district superintendents.</td>
<td>91.9</td>
<td>85.4</td>
<td>77.9</td>
<td>78.5</td>
<td>76.3</td>
<td>77.5</td>
<td>69.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. In making appointments, bishops ought to exercise the authority given to them and be less concerned with satisfying all sides.</td>
<td>43.2</td>
<td>35.9</td>
<td>34.6</td>
<td>38.6</td>
<td>33.1</td>
<td>34.9</td>
<td>34.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. If a person leaves the office of bishop to accept another office (e.g. pastor of a church), I would still consider him to be a bishop.</td>
<td>41.0</td>
<td>23.5</td>
<td>29.0</td>
<td>29.6</td>
<td>31.0</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>31.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. In the final analysis, the strongest basis for planning for the future is to trust to past experience and base the decision making on the historical facts.</td>
<td>44.4</td>
<td>34.8</td>
<td>44.7</td>
<td>53.2</td>
<td>48.9</td>
<td>52.8</td>
<td>36.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. I am optimistic about the future life and role of The United Methodist Church.</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>96.1</td>
<td>86.4</td>
<td>81.8</td>
<td>83.8</td>
<td>83.4</td>
<td>92.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. My understanding of the central doctrines and teachings of the Christian faith has changed considerably over the years.</td>
<td>64.1</td>
<td>72.4</td>
<td>63.0</td>
<td>61.4</td>
<td>63.1</td>
<td>55.2</td>
<td>74.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Bishops generally get adequate feedback on their performance.</td>
<td>71.8</td>
<td>26.5</td>
<td>25.8</td>
<td>40.1</td>
<td>45.7</td>
<td>43.5</td>
<td>40.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. District superintendents generally get adequate feedback on their performance.</td>
<td>84.2</td>
<td>42.7</td>
<td>33.9</td>
<td>51.7</td>
<td>55.5</td>
<td>53.5</td>
<td>50.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. In serving the needs of people, the church is less effective today than it was a generation ago.</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>23.6</td>
<td>40.9</td>
<td>61.9</td>
<td>56.1</td>
<td>62.9</td>
<td>39.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. By continuing its traditional approach in general, the church will better accomplish its mission than by experimenting with new methods.</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>21.6</td>
<td>32.1</td>
<td>39.4</td>
<td>41.2</td>
<td>46.2</td>
<td>24.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Big churches should receive more special treatment in the appointing of ministers than small churches.</td>
<td>31.6</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>21.4</td>
<td>20.7</td>
<td>21.9</td>
<td>27.9</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Bishops ought to be prophetic voices on behalf of The United Methodist Church.</td>
<td>94.7</td>
<td>88.3</td>
<td>84.1</td>
<td>68.9</td>
<td>72.2</td>
<td>68.2</td>
<td>68.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. It seems to me that all our concepts of God and his activity are to some degree historically and culturally conditioned, and therefore, we must always be open to new ways of approaching him.</td>
<td>92.1</td>
<td>92.9</td>
<td>88.0</td>
<td>78.8</td>
<td>81.1</td>
<td>62.1</td>
<td>86.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Any organizational structure becomes a deadening weight in time and needs to be revitalized.</td>
<td>79.5</td>
<td>89.0</td>
<td>87.4</td>
<td>88.2</td>
<td>88.1</td>
<td>61.4</td>
<td>88.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Bishops are away from their offices so much it is hard for Conference members to feel that bishops know them and their problems.</td>
<td>43.2</td>
<td>59.0</td>
<td>69.4</td>
<td>71.3</td>
<td>61.1</td>
<td>72.4</td>
<td>58.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. The current situation in the church calls for change. We must respond at once.</td>
<td>57.9</td>
<td>62.0</td>
<td>72.4</td>
<td>66.6</td>
<td>69.9</td>
<td>54.3</td>
<td>70.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. I regard recent experimentation with the worship liturgy as a departure from the true tradition of the church.</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>17.3</td>
<td>26.2</td>
<td>44.2</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>38.2</td>
<td>21.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. The program staff of the Annual Conference has relieved the superintendents of much responsibility for program promotion.</td>
<td>36.8</td>
<td>34.4</td>
<td>60.2</td>
<td>72.9</td>
<td>73.1</td>
<td>72.2</td>
<td>64.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bishops</td>
<td>Dist.Supts.</td>
<td>Pastors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. The Bishop or the Superintendents</td>
<td>92.1</td>
<td>90.1</td>
<td>58.3</td>
<td>65.3</td>
<td>67.8</td>
<td>64.6</td>
<td>73.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>generally know enough about the</td>
<td>churches and the pastors in our Conference to make wise appointments.</td>
<td>30.8</td>
<td>35.7</td>
<td>31.3</td>
<td>32.4</td>
<td>35.6</td>
<td>32.1</td>
<td>35.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. In general, churches expect too much</td>
<td>of their superintendents.</td>
<td>31.6</td>
<td>49.1</td>
<td>31.7</td>
<td>29.4</td>
<td>34.4</td>
<td>23.3</td>
<td>32.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. In general, the church expects too</td>
<td>much of its bishops.</td>
<td>26.4</td>
<td>49.1</td>
<td>31.3</td>
<td>29.1</td>
<td>35.7</td>
<td>34.4</td>
<td>30.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. The following are suggested as cri-</td>
<td>teria for evaluating the various func-</td>
<td>26.4</td>
<td>49.1</td>
<td>31.3</td>
<td>29.1</td>
<td>35.7</td>
<td>34.4</td>
<td>30.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tional responsibilities of the offices</td>
<td>of bishop and district superintendent.</td>
<td>26.4</td>
<td>49.1</td>
<td>31.3</td>
<td>29.1</td>
<td>35.7</td>
<td>34.4</td>
<td>30.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Please indicate how important each of</td>
<td>the following are in determining the responsibilities of these offices.</td>
<td>26.4</td>
<td>49.1</td>
<td>31.3</td>
<td>29.1</td>
<td>35.7</td>
<td>34.4</td>
<td>30.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Theological validity</td>
<td>3.61</td>
<td>3.24</td>
<td>3.31</td>
<td>3.32</td>
<td>3.32</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>3.49</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Service to the local church</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>3.49</td>
<td>3.39</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>3.48</td>
<td>3.39</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Service to the denomination</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>3.39</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Cost factors (time and money)</td>
<td>2.82</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>2.89</td>
<td>2.91</td>
<td>2.90</td>
<td>2.93</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Orientation toward the secular world</td>
<td>2.97</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>2.96</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>2.97</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>3.09</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) Ecumenical contributions</td>
<td>2.92</td>
<td>2.62</td>
<td>2.85</td>
<td>2.90</td>
<td>2.87</td>
<td>2.86</td>
<td>3.03</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g) Personal goals of the office-holders</td>
<td>2.84</td>
<td>2.65</td>
<td>2.72</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>2.58</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>2.86</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. As you view the situation, how free do the following feel to share honest feedback and criticism with the Bishop?</td>
<td>Do not know</td>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td>Very little</td>
<td>Some</td>
<td>Fully free</td>
<td>Do not know</td>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td>Very little</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Administrative Assistant to the Bishop</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>2.99</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>1.58</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Cabinet</td>
<td>3.62</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>3.09</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>3.24</td>
<td>2.46</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Program Director</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>2.93</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>3.09</td>
<td>3.01</td>
<td>2.22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Program staff</td>
<td>3.09</td>
<td>2.72</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>2.81</td>
<td>2.89</td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td>2.15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Ministers in general</td>
<td>2.94</td>
<td>2.49</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>2.52</td>
<td>2.62</td>
<td>2.59</td>
<td>2.31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) Lay persons in general</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>2.41</td>
<td>2.36</td>
<td>2.41</td>
<td>2.38</td>
<td>2.26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
31. How much influence, in general, do you think each of the following have with regard to decisions in the Annual Conference (other than appointive matters)?

- a) The clergy of the Conference? 1 2 3 4
- b) The lay members? 1 2 3 4
- c) The Bishop? 1 2 3 4
- d) The Conference Council Director? 1 2 3 4
- e) The Superintendents? 1 2 3 4
- f) The Conference Council? 1 2 3 4
- g) The Administrative Assistant to the Bishop? 1 2 3 4
- h) The public news-media? 1 2 3 4
- i) The supposed feelings of church members in general? 1 2 3 4
- j) The supposed feelings of citizens outside the church? 1 2 3 4
- k) You yourself? 1 2 3 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>b) The lay members</td>
<td>3.26</td>
<td>3.16</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>2.58</td>
<td>2.76</td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td>2.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) The Bishop</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>3.73</td>
<td>3.85</td>
<td>3.72</td>
<td>3.78</td>
<td>3.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) The Superintendents</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>3.49</td>
<td>3.46</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>3.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g) The Administrative Assistant to the Bishop</td>
<td>2.72</td>
<td>2.37</td>
<td>2.58</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>2.96</td>
<td>2.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h) The public news-media</td>
<td>2.26</td>
<td>2.11</td>
<td>2.18</td>
<td>2.32</td>
<td>2.21</td>
<td>2.19</td>
<td>2.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i) The supposed feelings of church members in general</td>
<td>2.82</td>
<td>2.68</td>
<td>2.39</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>2.34</td>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>2.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j) The supposed feelings of citizens outside the church</td>
<td>1.95</td>
<td>1.91</td>
<td>1.91</td>
<td>1.86</td>
<td>1.82</td>
<td>1.70</td>
<td>1.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k) You yourself</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>2.41</td>
<td>1.85</td>
<td>2.24</td>
<td>1.96</td>
<td>2.14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

32. What, in your opinion, are the five most important personal characteristics on the list below which generally led to persons being elected to the office of bishop? Please read the entire list of 10 and then indicate in Column A the 5 most important, with "1" equalling most important to "5" being the least important of the five chosen. In Column B use the same system to rank the five most important items which, in your opinion, caused district superintendents to be selected.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) A broad spread of experiences</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Depth of spiritual life.</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Ecumenical outlook.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Ethnic/racial background.</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Good record of work in most recent position</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) Intellectual achievement.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g) Reputation for being a good administrator</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h) Reputation for being a good reconciler.</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i) Reputation for being a good pastor</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j) Reputation for being a good preacher.</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k) Reputation of concern for change.</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Column A</th>
<th>Column B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 4 3 4 2 4 2 3 2 3</td>
<td>2 3 2 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 5 5 6 4 5 1 1 1 1</td>
<td>1 2 1 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 11 11 9 11 8 9 7 10 7</td>
<td>7 9 8 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 9.5 9 10 11 10 11 11 11 10</td>
<td>11 11 11 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 3 1 1 3 2 4 4 4 4</td>
<td>4 4 6 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 8 7 9 5 8 5 7.5 5 7</td>
<td>5 7 4 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 1 2 2 1 1 3 2 3 2</td>
<td>3 1 3 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 6 8 5 8 6 7 6 6 6</td>
<td>8 6 5 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 2 5 3 7 3 6 5 8 5</td>
<td>6 5 10 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 9.5 4 7 6 7 9 7.5 10 8</td>
<td>9 8 7 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 7 10 8 10 9 10 9 10 9</td>
<td>9 7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**ALTERNATIVE FUTURES...**

The following are possible developments which might characterize The United Methodist Church in the year 1990. Please rate each event on the basis of the following criteria:

**A. DESIRABILITY:** In your opinion, how desirable would it be if a particular event actually did happen by 1990 or before? Rate on a scale from "5" (equaling very desirable) to "0" (neutral) to "-5" (very undesirable), or any number in between which represents your estimate of desirability.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. The United Methodist Church joins with other denominations to form a new church.</td>
<td>-38.5</td>
<td>43.5</td>
<td>37.7</td>
<td>32.7</td>
<td>34.8</td>
<td>34.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Bishops are limited to a term of office rather than life tenure.</td>
<td>-79.5</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>22.1</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>20.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Episcopal areas are made smaller.</td>
<td>-38.5</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>41.0</td>
<td>22.8</td>
<td>20.1</td>
<td>47.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Formal Annual Conference participation in the selection of Superintendents is established.</td>
<td>-74.4</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td>59.2</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>63.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Confirmation services are added to the existing responsibilities of bishops.</td>
<td>-66.7</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>28.2</td>
<td>59.5</td>
<td>21.0</td>
<td>25.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. The &quot;worker-priest&quot; concept of ministry becomes a major alternative while maintaining Conference membership (i.e., clergy earning their living by secular employment).</td>
<td>-53.8</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>38.5</td>
<td>45.3</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>43.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. A quota system is formally adopted in the election of bishops, in order to secure adequate and equal representation of all minority groups.</td>
<td>-87.2</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>65.1</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. All clergy members of a conference are no longer guaranteed an appointment.</td>
<td>-51.3</td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td>30.8</td>
<td>57.2</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>33.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Questionnaire Item

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>33. Alternative Futures Continued...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. The election and consecration of bishops takes place at General Conference rather than at Jurisdictional Conferences.</td>
<td>48.7</td>
<td>54.9</td>
<td>43.4</td>
<td>19.9</td>
<td>29.2</td>
<td>22.9</td>
<td>32.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>20.7</td>
<td>42.7</td>
<td>35.0</td>
<td>37.3</td>
<td>31.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>43.6</td>
<td>33.9</td>
<td>35.9</td>
<td>37.4</td>
<td>35.7</td>
<td>39.8</td>
<td>36.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j. A few additional bishops are elected to serve the general church in special capacities other than presiding over conferences.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>51.3</td>
<td>51.7</td>
<td>42.8</td>
<td>28.0</td>
<td>27.6</td>
<td>27.4</td>
<td>17.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>25.1</td>
<td>24.3</td>
<td>28.4</td>
<td>18.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>43.6</td>
<td>38.7</td>
<td>43.6</td>
<td>46.9</td>
<td>48.1</td>
<td>44.3</td>
<td>63.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k. A formal, advance campaign process is openly adopted as the method of electing bishops.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>82.1</td>
<td>49.9</td>
<td>44.5</td>
<td>38.6</td>
<td>40.1</td>
<td>43.3</td>
<td>48.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>34.2</td>
<td>32.6</td>
<td>31.8</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>39.2</td>
<td>40.1</td>
<td>27.2</td>
<td>27.3</td>
<td>24.9</td>
<td>26.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l. A computerized data system for personnel records is utilized as part of the appointive process facilitating transfer between districts, conferences and areas.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>23.1</td>
<td>23.0</td>
<td>23.3</td>
<td>20.6</td>
<td>19.6</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td>18.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>26.0</td>
<td>26.5</td>
<td>26.9</td>
<td>22.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>66.7</td>
<td>66.3</td>
<td>62.4</td>
<td>53.5</td>
<td>53.9</td>
<td>58.7</td>
<td>59.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m. Instead of an annual appointment, clergy are appointed whenever the specific need arises.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>38.5</td>
<td>27.8</td>
<td>29.3</td>
<td>28.5</td>
<td>29.1</td>
<td>24.9</td>
<td>31.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>13.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>53.8</td>
<td>65.4</td>
<td>61.1</td>
<td>55.1</td>
<td>54.8</td>
<td>61.2</td>
<td>54.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n. Formal nomination for the office of bishop takes place at the Annual Conference level rather than at the Jurisdictional level.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>69.2</td>
<td>36.9</td>
<td>23.2</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>24.6</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>24.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>34.4</td>
<td>28.8</td>
<td>30.8</td>
<td>24.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>23.1</td>
<td>49.9</td>
<td>63.3</td>
<td>49.1</td>
<td>46.6</td>
<td>49.8</td>
<td>51.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o. Printed biographical sketches, highlighting qualifications for office, are made available on each nomination for bishop prior to the Conference at which elections are held.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>20.7</td>
<td>18.1</td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td>14.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>64.1</td>
<td>80.0</td>
<td>87.3</td>
<td>76.4</td>
<td>75.6</td>
<td>76.6</td>
<td>84.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p. An annual &quot;review of the work of bishops&quot; is made by the Jurisdictional Committee on Episcopacy, (i.e., acting as a support and consultation group to the bishops, aiding the bishops in making their ministry most effective.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>25.7</td>
<td>22.5</td>
<td>26.4</td>
<td>18.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>69.2</td>
<td>82.9</td>
<td>82.7</td>
<td>70.6</td>
<td>72.1</td>
<td>69.7</td>
<td>79.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Questionnaire Item

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>34. I see the church today functioning as (choose one) --</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A group of disciples or followers of Jesus attempting to fulfill his mission in the world.</td>
<td>73.7</td>
<td>70.8</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>56.3</td>
<td>57.0</td>
<td>56.2</td>
<td>67.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A voluntary group of people operating a religious institution.</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>19.3</td>
<td>26.1</td>
<td>30.6</td>
<td>31.9</td>
<td>19.6</td>
<td>20.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A divinely created institution under the control of God.</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A group of people who continue outmoded practices and beliefs.</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. If you had the authority to change the offices of bishop and district superintendent, on what would you base your judgement? Please divide 100 percentage points between the following to indicate the weight you would give to each.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expectations for the future.</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>33.4</td>
<td>27.6</td>
<td>26.6</td>
<td>26.8</td>
<td>27.3</td>
<td>29.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Past experience</td>
<td>18.1</td>
<td>22.6</td>
<td>21.6</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>20.4</td>
<td>21.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reason or logic</td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td>21.2</td>
<td>19.6</td>
<td>20.1</td>
<td>20.1</td>
<td>22.3</td>
<td>19.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scripture</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>19.1</td>
<td>22.3</td>
<td>19.2</td>
<td>19.3</td>
<td>19.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tradition of the church</td>
<td>17.3</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>10.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36. Some church leaders are saying that the office of the district superintendent has been undergoing much significant change. Please check the one statement below which seems to you most nearly correct.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Little change in the past decade.</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>8.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Becoming increasingly a management and supervisory role.</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>41.9</td>
<td>30.1</td>
<td>43.2</td>
<td>40.5</td>
<td>44.4</td>
<td>32.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Becoming more of a promotional and structure-supporting role.</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>27.0</td>
<td>43.8</td>
<td>30.2</td>
<td>32.6</td>
<td>25.9</td>
<td>44.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Becoming more of a counseling, pastor to pastors role.</td>
<td>61.1</td>
<td>28.1</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>16.3</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>14.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37. Some church leaders are also saying that the office of bishop has been undergoing much significant change. Check the one statement below which seems most correct.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Little change in the past decade.</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td>22.9</td>
<td>22.6</td>
<td>18.6</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Becoming increasingly a management and supervisory role.</td>
<td>27.0</td>
<td>51.1</td>
<td>36.8</td>
<td>36.5</td>
<td>40.6</td>
<td>38.1</td>
<td>31.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Becoming more of a promotional and structure-supporting role.</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>23.4</td>
<td>33.6</td>
<td>35.9</td>
<td>34.2</td>
<td>34.8</td>
<td>42.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Becoming more of a counseling, pastor to pastors role.</td>
<td>48.6</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>8.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38. If you perceive significant changes in the offices listed above, do you perceive such changes as helpful in promoting the mission of the church?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>86.8</td>
<td>66.0</td>
<td>32.0</td>
<td>27.2</td>
<td>38.5</td>
<td>34.9</td>
<td>43.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>37.9</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>22.4</td>
<td>21.7</td>
<td>13.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncertain</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>23.9</td>
<td>35.1</td>
<td>47.7</td>
<td>39.1</td>
<td>43.4</td>
<td>42.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Questionnaire Item 39. Here are 16 of the bishop's most frequently mentioned responsibilities. Please read the entire list and then indicate the 8 which you see as the most important tasks of the bishop on behalf of our church. Please rank them in order from 1 to 8: "1" standing for the most important responsibility. Number only 8 items.

Preparation and presiding at conferences...
Setting appointments of the ministers and selecting superintendents...
Deciding questions of law...
Promoting evangelistic activities and providing such inspirational leadership...
Ordaining Elders and Deacons and consecrating Bishops and Deaconesses...
Preaching in each of the districts under his supervision...
Representing the denomination in ecumenical concerns...
Representing the church in societal affairs (community, state, and national, etc.)...
Interpreting and promoting national and Conference programs and policies...
Serving on the Council and College of Bishops...
Serving as a pastor to pastors and their families (personal counseling, baptizing children, etc.)
Presiding at or participating in confirmation services...
Office work connected with the job (overseeing publicity, preparation of reports, etc.)...
Presiding over, working with the Conference Cabinet (superintendents)...
Serving/Presiding as a board member of denominational boards and agencies...
Other (please specify) ____________________________

(If you are a bishop would you also please rank the 8 most time consuming of your responsibilities, using the margin next to the item. Rank as above from "1" to "8".)
40. Here are 18 of the Superintendent's most frequently mentioned responsibilities. Please read the entire list and then rank 8 which you see as most important in forwarding the mission of the church, ranking them in order from 1 to 8 ("1" standing for the most important, etc.). Number only 8 items.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Preaching in the churches of the district</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attending (not preaching) some service at each church, and meeting the lay people informally</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conducting a Charge Conference for each pastoral charge</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keeping track of local church property matters in the district</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training pastors to be enablers and resource persons for their laity in defining mission, setting goals, and evaluating achievement</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpreting and promoting national, Conference, and district programs of the various boards and agencies</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Studying the territory of the district for purposes of long-range, district-wide planning</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development of and work with the District Council or its equivalent</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working with the &quot;problem&quot; churches to analyze weaknesses and develop constructive suggestions</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office work connected with the job, getting out publicity, preparation of reports, etc.</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Becoming a friend to each parsonage family, available as personal counselor to ministers and their wives</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assisting district leaders of lay groups in planning programs for lay people</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encouraging pastors to participate in continuing education programs; promoting ministerial recruitment</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serving on the cabinet (superintendents)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Questionnaire Item

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Serving on Annual Conference boards and agencies</th>
<th>Bishops</th>
<th>Dist. Supts.</th>
<th>Pastors</th>
<th>Leadership</th>
<th>Members</th>
<th>PPR Chp.</th>
<th>UMW Pres.</th>
<th>Spent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cooperating in ecumenical endeavors</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervising and supporting non-pastoral ministries</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participating in general community welfare activities and organizations</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>16.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (please specify)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(If you are a superintendent would you also please rank the 8 most time consuming of your responsibilities, using the margin next to the item. Rank as above, i.e., "1 to 8".)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BY PRIORITY RANK BASED UPON MEAN SCORE</th>
<th>Actual</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>L.C. Lay</td>
<td>Conf. Lay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41. District superintendents are now limited to a six year term in office. Should the church continue this same tenure period?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If you answered no, please indicate your alternative proposal:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years</th>
<th>Bishops</th>
<th>Dist. Supts.</th>
<th>Pastors</th>
<th>Leadership</th>
<th>Members</th>
<th>PPR Chp.</th>
<th>UMW Pres.</th>
<th>Spent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4 Years</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>49.6</td>
<td>62.4</td>
<td>56.4</td>
<td>57.7</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8-10 Years</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>56.8</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12-Year Limit</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>22.4</td>
<td>25.5</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quad. Appt.</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Questionnaire Item

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>42. Bishops are now limited to twelve years of service in one episcopal area. Should the church continue this same tenure period?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes:</td>
<td>91.7</td>
<td>80.9</td>
<td>73.9</td>
<td>73.3</td>
<td>75.6</td>
<td>70.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No:</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>19.1</td>
<td>26.1</td>
<td>26.7</td>
<td>24.4</td>
<td>29.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If you answered no, please indicate your alternative proposal:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Years:</td>
<td>75.0</td>
<td>81.0</td>
<td>70.3</td>
<td>70.0</td>
<td>65.9</td>
<td>57.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Years:</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open:</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td>22.5</td>
<td>19.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other:</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>23.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>43. Bishops are now elected to that office for life. Should the church continue this same practice?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes:</td>
<td>94.4</td>
<td>59.1</td>
<td>47.0</td>
<td>38.7</td>
<td>46.2</td>
<td>41.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No:</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>40.9</td>
<td>53.0</td>
<td>61.3</td>
<td>53.8</td>
<td>58.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If you answered no, please indicate your alternative proposal:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Years total:</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>16.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Years total:</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>44.0</td>
<td>34.7</td>
<td>28.7</td>
<td>26.1</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Years total:</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quadrennial:</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>19.6</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reelect after 8 years:</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reelect after 12 years:</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retire at 65:</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other:</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>18.4</td>
<td>33.0</td>
<td>35.2</td>
<td>48.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>44. If bishops were to serve on a term basis (e.g., X number of years with a possibility of reelection), do you foresee any difficulty in appointing an ex-bishop?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes:</td>
<td>76.5</td>
<td>47.9</td>
<td>35.4</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>29.5</td>
<td>25.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No:</td>
<td>23.5</td>
<td>52.1</td>
<td>64.6</td>
<td>83.5</td>
<td>70.5</td>
<td>74.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If you answered yes, how would you solve such a problem?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appt. as all other appts.:</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>41.3</td>
<td>34.3</td>
<td>30.6</td>
<td>22.9</td>
<td>44.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appt. to other episcopal area:</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Assignment:</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>22.4</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retire:</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other:</td>
<td>80.0</td>
<td>32.7</td>
<td>33.2</td>
<td>38.9</td>
<td>52.3</td>
<td>48.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Background Information...

The following information is very important. It will enable us to determine differences of opinion between various sectors of the country, for example. If differences appear then further investigation would be undertaken. Your response will remain anonymous. Please check the appropriate category or write in the answer as called for.

#### 45. Your sex:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td>37.0</td>
<td>20.6</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>97.7</td>
<td>82.1</td>
<td>63.0</td>
<td>79.4</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 46. Age:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under 25</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>.7</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-34</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-44</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>28.2</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td>15.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-54</td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td>43.9</td>
<td>25.5</td>
<td>30.3</td>
<td>24.9</td>
<td>37.6</td>
<td>39.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-64</td>
<td>64.1</td>
<td>38.0</td>
<td>19.6</td>
<td>25.3</td>
<td>26.2</td>
<td>20.6</td>
<td>30.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 &amp; up</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>23.2</td>
<td>11.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 47. Race:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>84.2</td>
<td>94.5</td>
<td>96.4</td>
<td>95.6</td>
<td>95.2</td>
<td>96.9</td>
<td>96.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 48. What is the approximate population of the community in which you live?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>under 250 (includes farm &amp; open country)</td>
<td>.0</td>
<td>.0</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>250-999</td>
<td>.0</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1000-2,499</td>
<td>.0</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>9.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,500-9,999</td>
<td>.0</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>20.2</td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td>21.6</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>19.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000-49,999</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>43.0</td>
<td>22.6</td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td>22.1</td>
<td>23.1</td>
<td>24.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50,000-99,999</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100,000-249,999</td>
<td>28.2</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>250,000-999,999</td>
<td>35.9</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>9.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 million or more</td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Questionnaire Item

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>53. What is the approximate membership of your local church?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-49</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>.8</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-99</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td>11.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100-199</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>17.7</td>
<td>16.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200-299</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>19.7</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td>17.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>300-499</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>25.7</td>
<td>20.2</td>
<td>20.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500-999</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>20.2</td>
<td>16.3</td>
<td>16.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,000-1,999</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>10.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,000-2,999</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3,000 and up</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>.8</td>
<td>.7</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 50. What is your Jurisdiction? |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North Central</td>
<td>27.3</td>
<td>21.8</td>
<td>26.7</td>
<td>26.3</td>
<td>28.4</td>
<td>26.4</td>
<td>28.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northeastern</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>18.6</td>
<td>22.4</td>
<td>24.5</td>
<td>27.9</td>
<td>17.3</td>
<td>19.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Central</td>
<td>27.3</td>
<td>23.1</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>18.6</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>21.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southeastern</td>
<td>27.2</td>
<td>29.4</td>
<td>26.6</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>23.8</td>
<td>24.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>17.3</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 51. Before the union in 1968, were you |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Evang.United Brethren?</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>10.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methodist?</td>
<td>92.1</td>
<td>92.3</td>
<td>87.9</td>
<td>87.2</td>
<td>88.6</td>
<td>90.8</td>
<td>87.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other?</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Number of usable responses**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>439</td>
<td>1390</td>
<td>657</td>
<td>725</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>341</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>