

NEBRASKA-KANSAS EPISCOPAL AREA TASK FORCE

February 12-13, 2010

Nebraska Conference Center, Lincoln

Those present were Bishop Scott Jones, Bishop Ann Sherer-Simpson, Rev. Charlotte Abram, Rev. Wayne Alloway, Rev. Pat Ault-Duell, Rev. Gary Beach, Rev. Cheryl Jefferson Bell, Rev. Eduardo Bousson, Rev. Gary Brooks, Nancy Brown, Bob Cox, Sheran Cramer, Matthew E. Fowler, Corey Gobey, Oliver Green, Rev. Brian Kottas, Rev. David Livingston, Rev. Janet Maxwell, Rev. Debra McKnight, Rev. Jan Todd, Tom Watson, and Rev. Carol Roettmer Brewer, staff. Nebraska Communicator Kathryn Witte was also present for the meeting. Rev. Troy Bowers and Dixie Brewster were excused.

Friday, February 12

Gathering

The Task Force gathered for lunch and fellowship.

Bishop Ann Sherer-Simpson offered devotions on Isaiah 43:13 and following. She introduced Dr. Jesse Foster, Nebraska Annual Conference Director of Christian Leadership, who will facilitate our time together in consultation with our consultant Dr. Gil Rendle who could not come due to bad weather.

Conference Lay Leader Tom Watson welcomed the task force and said that this is a historic time as the three Annual Conferences gathered for dialogue.

Dr. Foster led the group in a team building time.

Bishop Jones led the group in affirming and signing its Covenant. Rev. Brewer has the original copy and will send copies with the minutes.

Tom Watson was affirmed as chair of the task force.

Bishop Jones reviewed our timeline as a task force. The next meeting is April 6 and 7 in Wichita.

Gil Rendle suggested that two meetings be set in the fall, two in the spring and two in the fall of 2011. One or two meetings in the spring of 2012 will be held. Bishop Jones reminded us that by July 2012 the technical questions need to be resolved. With 4 meetings per year, it was decided that there would be one meeting in each of the Conference Offices and a fourth in a central location. The Bishops will bring dates for subsequent meetings before we leave.

Dr. Foster led the group in more team building.

Dr. Gill Rendle

Dr. Gil Rendle spoke to the group by telephone. Other places in the United Methodist Church are having similar conversation. It is an opportunity to rethink church especially what needs to be different. Similar discussions are also happening in other denominations. There is also a similar pattern in our demographics. How will we go about our work differently? He asked us to take a big bite into the opportunity we have.

Dr. Rendle discussed Heifetz book Leadership Without Easy Answers. Technical work is known solutions to known problems; it is how we are trained for leadership. We could view this from a technical perspective only. Adaptive leadership is moving toward questions that will make us learn things in a new way. Leadership is to help people face into their questions. How can we walk into our questions? How do we stop controlling so there is room for the Spirit of God? It forces us to make room for new things to happen. Whenever a system doesn't know what to do, it does what it does know how to do. If we only do technical work, we will only get what we already have. We have to be clear about our reality. These are dashboard indicators. We only have two choices—deep change or slow death. We also need to foster “conflict” of two or more ideas to help creativity.

Dr. Rendle asked us not to run ahead by identifying a question and look for an answer. At times, we frame a question to go with the solution we have. Second he asked us not to be a representative of our Annual Conference but of the area and its big missional picture.

Bishop Jones asked how we communicate with our Annual Conferences. Dr. Rendle pointed to the agenda for Saturday when we will create 6 to 8 points to share with others. We need to “extrovert” our work from the very beginning. We also need to be transparent in our work.

Dr. Foster reminded us that “Nothing Comes from Nothing.” Everything comes from what we have done and gotten.

Demographics

The group examined the demographics: We look alike. Declining membership and declining worship attendance. Some “larger” churches have declined. Each Conference has a large group of small churches. We did increase 900+ churches by one in each Annual Conference.

Dr. Foster gave out graphs of the combined demographic figures. We have opportunity to do things differently. What have we been producing and what are the factors?

In small groups the task force discussed Cultural and Environmental Factors, Denominational Factors, Conference Factors, and Local Church Factors. Then the groups rotated to discuss the factors or add factors.

Dr. Foster then asked the group to sort the variables, causes and reasons on sticky notes into Control or Indirect Control. Those over which we have no Control will stay on the board.

The lists are ATTACHMENT A.

Dinner

After dinner, Dr. Foster played a Muppet video about change. Two options: keep singing/doing the “change solo” or leave.

Book Discussion

The group discussed The Great Emergence by Phyllis Tickle. Insights gained from the group included:

- The reformation requires a literate laity so our change needs a theological literate laity which means clergy need to be open to trusting people to have dialogues that honor complexities.

- Pivotal moments in history—things get bad enough so openness for change. It is worth trying again.
- In every great change the question is where is authority? In the Emergent Church it networks out of the dialogue. Authority rests in Scripture and community.
- The 500 year cycle; 1517 was the convenient date for the Reformation. Maybe we can identify a few of the major changes and be involved in them. It is more than a generational issue.
- Some people are hurt by change, and we hate to hurt them. Also we don't have to have everyone on board.
- The Emergent movement is still a local church based. We United Methodists are connected and knitted together; so what is our larger community?
- Splits have been renewing for both sides. Maybe God is creating two new things.
- The book doesn't address what is happening worldwide. A lot of emerging factors in the world are not dealt with in this book, i.e. growing church in Africa and its emerging theology. The question is what is intractable? What things make the system the system? What is our core (if everything else died what could we live off of)?
- Are we going to be diverse enough for a variety of world views? How do we walk together and not marginalize other views?
- [Dr. Foster: The more questions we have the better off we are.]
- No divine activity in this book. All is societal change. Tickle is saying that the church is a social construct. [We have to teach more.]
- How do we define the concepts of spirituality and morality as the Kansas-Nebraska people?
- What do we teach in our context? How have we adapted as Kansas and Nebraska and what do we have to share? We need to be a defined tribe—what do we believe, etc. and how does the tribe live globally? Who is your tribe is important? It is a feeling of affinity.
- It is the job of Bishops to set the boundaries. Authority is exercised with laity by making them feel comfortable or uncomfortable. How far do our boundaries extend so we exist as a tribe?
- What are the metrics of success? There is often decline as the progress begins.
- Tickle said that morals come later.

The discussion continued. We need to measure spiritual growth. It needs to affect how we reach people who are different from us. How do you propose to reach those people?

There is an element of experience that we have almost worked to keep from happening. We have to think of creative ways to move out of the way so good things can happen. We need to avoid thinking that we can create a perfect plan. We need to create a structure that allows creativity so others can be free to be and do. People wouldn't come to our churches because they were United Methodist.

Annual Conference needs to provide a compass, not a road map. A dysfunctional organization adds more and more rules. How do we live in the same community and have similar practices?

What does faithfulness to Christ in the United Methodist tradition look like? What defines us as a community?

We have a United Methodist structure that is like General Motors in the 1950's.

Key Learnings of Meeting

Dr. Foster asked people to share their Key Learnings during our time together. They are the following:

- What defines us as a Kansas-Nebraska tribe? What are our deep commitments as we move into the future? There have to be structures and boundaries?
- What do we want to hang onto? What do we want to give up?
- What data do we need to consider?
- Learned helplessness

- Global world perspectives
- Represent area, not Annual Conference or group
- Diversity and what holds us together

Statements learned since been here:

- We resemble the problem ourselves; get up on the balcony and look at ourselves. It will make the task more hopeful
- There are strengths that we can build on without being confined by the broken pieces
- Communication will be important to help others come along in the process
- We come from different places, have different interests and we are God's people.
- We need to foster positive conflict

Janet Maxwell offered the closing prayer.

Saturday, February 13

Adaptive and Technical Change

Dr. Foster welcomed the group. Bishop Jones led the group in prayer.

Bishop Jones reviewed the concepts of adaptive and technical changes. He said that we will make a preliminary list for our Task Force. A technical challenge has a known problem and known solution. The adaptive challenge is a needing change in a group of people in their beliefs, values and behavior. He cited President Lyndon Johnson's creation of a holding environment for civil rights so some leaders could request change.

Bishop Jones continued by asking: What are the right questions? He reminded us that the Task Force will begin to help the people of the Kansas and Nebraska Conferences to answer those questions.

In preparation for our morning's work, Dr. Foster discussed a study that reminds us that we need to find what we do well and further develop them.

The group made lists of Technical Questions and passed them along for others to add or read. [Carol has permission to put the lists in two columns: 2nd column is may be adaptive.] ATTACHMENT B

The Task Force divided into four groups to make a list of their Adaptive Questions. They were then asked to prioritize them by picking five questions. ATTACHMENT C

Dr. Foster did an exercise of trusting and depending on one another. Dr. Foster reminded us that we will be one Episcopal area, and we need to depend on one another.

The questions that the groups posed were reviewed.

Needed Information and Data

Dr. Foster asked the group to think about the data that will prepare us to make decisions about these adaptive questions. The group listed the following as possibilities:

1. Mission and Vision Statements
2. How much money do we have and how do we get it

3. What jobs are priorities and what staff do we use to do those
4. What are we good at?
 - a. What ministries are growing
5. DNA of each annual conference
6. Geographical locations by attendance size
7. Where are the rural, urban and other types of churches located?
8. Conference area maps
9. Affinities of certain areas of states
10. Population centers and other census information
11. How other Annual Conferences structured of other Episcopal (Gil and DCM)
12. Conference institutions, camps
13. Clergy Benefits systems
14. How do you communicate? Technology use
15. New exciting ministries in each Annual Conference
16. Information from other Annual Conferences who are changing
17. Staffing, structures to develop a common vocabulary
18. Cost of maintenance of property
19. What the Annual Conferences owns, location and value
20. Structural change thinking from Schaller and Essam (could Gil Rendle; Wayne also volunteered)
21. Latino and Hispanic ministry is done
22. How is ministry done with all racial, ethnic groups? Where are we? Where we do and how we go differently?
23. Also VIM, economic classes,
24. 18 to 40 age groups. Where are the churches where the age group is growing?
25. Assessment of effectiveness of clergy—outstanding, average, “soft or needed area for improvement”
Potential of serving large church, etc.
26. Categories, age of clergy, retirees

The Task Force agreed that each Annual Conference will make a presentation of 15 to 20 minutes at the next meeting. The group of three will inform the Task Force about their Conference’s strengths and fruitful ministry areas. It will be a snapshot of their DNA. Each Conference will make the presentation of 15 to 20 minutes using video or power point. They will also offer the information requested in ATTACHMENT D.

Gathering information and reporting are: Gary Beach and Jan Todd of Kansas East, Debra McKnight and Charlotte Abram of Nebraska, and Gary Brooks and Pat Ault-Duell of Kansas West.

Wayne Alloway will prepare a paper on his research with Lyle Schaller, Bill Essam and others.

The question was raised about the function of our chair? Tom Watson will work with the Bishops and Gil Rendle on agenda. He will work with the Staff to verify that reports are ready. The chair will be the spokesperson for the group.

Evaluation and Next Meeting

Our next meetings: April 6 and 7 in Wichita noon to noon
 Oct. 1 and 2 in Manhattan, KS (central location)
 December 8 and 9 in Topeka

For the April meeting, the Task Force is also to read Caught in the Middle: America’s Heartland in the Age of Globalism by Richard Longworth.

Dr. Foster asked the Task Force about what they had learned? We have a lot to learn when people are expecting answers; learners for a time; richness of relationships across artificial boundaries, everyone wants transformation; we are a part of an experiment that is working for a change; we are a lot more alike than different; targeted deadlines and pace we are going to be productive; very hopeful that God can work through this group; begin to communicate with people the difference between adaptive and technical change; we are looking at 2030 and 2010.

Kathryn Witte, Nebraska Communicator, and Lisa Elliott Diehl, the Kansas Communicator, will work with the Bishops and Chair on the publicity plan.

Bishop Jones offered the closing worship on Ezekiel 37, the dry bones coming to life.

Recorded by Carol Roettmer Brewer

NEBRASKA-KANSAS EPISCOPAL AREA TASK FORCE

February 12-13, 2010
Nebraska Conference Center, Lincoln

ATTACHMENT A Cultural and Environmental Factors, Denominational Factors, Conference Factors, and Local Church Factors

Identify the variables, causes and reasons that we are aware of that keep us from producing what we produce.

CULTURAL AND ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS

CONTROL:

- a United Methodist Church in every town
- lack of excellence in the church; only the best

CULTURAL AND ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS

INDIRECT CONTROL:

- stereotyped church in media as judgmental, anti-gay and boring
- irrelevance of organized religion with shift away from one and authority is within self not outside of self
- no allegiance to denomination
- no allegiance to one particular religion
- "me" generations
- sexual misconduct
- UMCOR has long staying power; "Nothing but Nets"
- fewer people go to church

CULTURAL AND ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS

NO CONTROL:

- rising affluence
- ADA
- secularization
- digital communication (TV, cell phones, internet)
- distrust of authority
- spiritual not religious
- declining middle class
- families are geographically scattered
- mobile society
- "relative" economic stability
- demographics and change
- decline of family farms
- meat packing industry
- "colorization," diversification, new Hispanic neighbors
- economic: urban versus rural
- auto makes us de-localized
- many sources of information
- no religious preference is an option
- respect of clergy office has suffered
- entertainment a premium
- church not heart of community

- Hispanic immigration
- Pat Robertson
- redefined families
- population shift
- compete with activities and clubs
- influence of on-line communities
- women in work force

DENOMINATIONAL FACTORS

CONTROL:

- committees
- theological education
- Book of Discipline strict requirements
- world-wide nature affects mission
- clergy benefits driven
- more second and third career pastors
- increased number of Local Pastors
- inclusiveness (if you look like us)
- relational trumps mission
- invitation to discipleship/ doors of church open
- practice doesn't match our commercial image
- strong missional presence
- beginning to establish a media identity
- high apportionments (top down)
- concept of UMC is good! Open hearts, minds, and doors
- aging membership (get young ones)
- limited passion
- not emphasized youth or campus ministry
- culture that does not reward thinking outside the box
- lack of emphasis on call
- will work with others
- lowered membership expectations
- anger and disrespect

DENOMINATIONAL FACTORS

IN-DIRECT CONTROL:

- focus on inputs not fruitfulness
- multiple General Boards and Foci
- controversy over Social Principles
- organizational process of General Conference
- a system of governance that mirrors our culture
- connectional system
- conflict of interest [with] benefits
- tiered leadership
- weakened episcopacy
- itinerant system
- broken structure
- guaranteed appointments
- broken Discipline structure

DENOMINATIONAL FACTORS

NO CONTROL:

- systemic homeostasis
- our “National Debt” is people
- but we’re in multiple cultures around the world
- self-perpetuating

CONFERENCE FACTORS

DIRECT CONTROL:

People of the Episcopal Area have direct control over:

- organizational structure
- more program and people resources/leadership were directed towards the Conference programming rather than the other way around
- too many people on Conference committees produce limited decisions
- vesting leadership in some of the same people over and over again
- financial decline; stewardship issues
- conference has created a culture of dependence
- how to create laity connection as a conference
- what does it mean to be the church over a large geographical area
- what is the mission and purpose of Annual Conference
- does the Annual Conference behave like a local church because that is what it knows—rather than looking at the big picture
- potential disconnect between Board of Ordained Ministry and Cabinet
- separation of powers adopted from culture
- paying more attention to “context” of local churches
- lack of creative plans for small membership church ministries
- lack of clear purpose—governance by committee
- positive emphasis (attempt) and focus on younger adults
- best leaders tapped for Conference leadership positions
- increased support of camp and experiences of children/youth
- everyone at the table
- improved leadership training, i.e. Incubator and Abide
- leadership vision or lack of
- aging Conference leadership
- looking to one or two people to be the “leaders” of the Conference
- focus on its own existence
- lack of specialized staff
- districts with strong change agent D.S.’s
- area-wide appointments provide more opportunities and possible sense of unity
- emphasis on process over results
- area-wide Kansas and Nebraska sharing people and physical resources
- fewer committees, more responsibility
- lack of accountability/effectiveness structure for elders—ongoing support after Board of Ordained Ministry process
- more churches than we need: non-welcoming, non-growing, and non-hospitable
- death by committee
- reason have committees for participation/input

CONFERENCE

INDIRECT CONTROL:

- lack of clergy with skill sets needed
- merger mentality rather than creating something new—new conversation
- Board of Ordained Ministry process too long and too rigid
- how to be more productive
- local churches see the Conference as something external rather than something that they are part of
- risk-taking leaders
- inability to make changes in direction quickly if something is not working
- “silos” or “turf” are guarded
- theological disconnect between clergy and laity
- new mega church produces emphasis on leadership training
- difference in Episcopal office funding versus Conference funding

CONFERENCE

NO CONTROL OVER

- two conferences and one Bishop produce a connectional Cabinet
- “liberal” clergy and conservative” state produces quiet politics
- who or what drives the vision
- pockets are vision-driven
- maintenance-mode
- intellectual introverted pastors produces distance and lack of community

LOCAL CHURCH FACTORS

DIRECT CONTROL:

- intergenerational opportunity
- different understanding of itself than community does
- the place to make disciples of Jesus Christ for transformation of the world
- local church culture
- insider/outsider mentality
- pastor movement
- lack of relevancy
- leadership, leadership, leadership of laity and clergy
- develop leaders
- ineffective pastors kill churches
- menu of the season requests (demands) from the Conference to do the new thing—old things then Abandoned
- inwardness, self-centered; “It’s all about us.”
- increased need or commitment for ministry with the poor
- worship, praise, relative
- increased competition and/or apathy for connection
- love of/for children
- isolation (local church versus district, conference, general)
- don’t communicate effectively with surrounding culture
- what is the church? differing opinions
- Biblical theological illiteracy
- not familiar with U.M.C. (i.e. structure, connection)
- need to celebrate growth (spiritual)
- apportionments too high

LOCAL CHURCH

INDIRECT CONTROL:

- unprotected time
- incredible generosity when need is clear (Haiti, Katrina)
- professionalization of clergy impacts lay leadership
- lack of creative community (creative expression), "the arts"
- cost of facilities
- no/little relationship between churches in an area/district
- the place where people live out their faith community—commitment
- more comfortable with slow death than deep change
- cost of leadership
- lack of vision
- denial that numbers do matter
- consumer mentality
- church is Sunday morning
- distance of connection with church and General Conference focus areas
- middle-class church
- strong fellowship
- club rather than mission station
- not open to change
- lack of delegation from pastor to laity
- lack of view of global missional church
- problem solvers versus adapters

LOCAL CHURCH

NO CONTROL:

- institutional loyalty is not what we can count on anymore
- church members are not residents of town or neighborhood where church is located
- family churches
- many other demands
- some generous, caring laity
- many influential community members, persons
- 90% of young adults in top 20 churches
- individual lack of commitment to Methodism (connectional church)
- swallowed religion as a private thing versus public-political life; compartmentalized life

NEBRASKA-KANSAS EPISCOPAL AREA TASK FORCE

February 12-13, 2010
Nebraska Conference Center, Lincoln

ATTACHMENT B Technical Questions List

How will we educate everyone in the use of technology to bring our worlds closer together so we don't worry about where "the" office is located?

How can the tech systems in the 3 conferences be made more compatible and accessible to all 3 conferences?

How about a paid driver for the Bishop?

How or will the 3 conferences consolidate their ministries or operate separately?

How many staffpersons will be needed in the new Area?

What do we do with 2 Episcopal residences and 3 office buildings?

What is the schedule for three annual conference sessions?

Will there be three annual conferences?

What disciplinary functions/guidelines compel what each annual conference must do?

Do we need one central Episcopal office?

What will we do to help churches and pastors to understand/acknowledge that the bishop is resident throughout the Annual Conferences?

How can we help the bishop be present in the wide area – really nice RV as residence or office?

How will the role of the DCMs change, if at all, with a mobile Bishop?

Will the 3 conference merge into 1 or 2?

How would we broaden the conversation among our people to create the answer to that question?

Will some staff from all three conference areas be employed in the new Episcopal area office?

Or should we have more than 3 conferences?

What should be the name of the Episcopal area?

What would be our sense of "identify" without a name?

What will be our acknowledged strengths as an area?

Will clergy be appointed in both states or only in conference of origin?

When will the cabinets begin to work together on the appointive process and how will this process be conducted?

What will be the staffing requirements for each annual conference – overlap, uniqueness, outsourcing?

Cross-conference appointments??

Will there be three independent appointive cabinets?

How many “directors” do we need? (i.e., Congregational Transformation, DCM, Youth/Children, Leadership, etc.)

Will there be 3 annual conferences? Two? One?

Can we have one gathering and 3 conferences like KS East/West did a few years back?

How will the conference staffs cooperate or work tougher to further the mission of disciple making?

Do we need to re-configure conference staffs to have more effective use of our resources or a greater impact or do we need to maintain three staffs with duplicate positions?

Will the change require reconfiguration of districts?

What will be the role of the District Superintendents?

Who takes care of charge conferences?

Do districts need to be geographically based?

Can lay person be trained and engaged to assume some leadership positions?

Where will the Episcopal residence be located?

Where will he/she stay when away?

Will we keep 3 conference offices?

Will we remain 3 conferences or something more/less?

Could administrative relationships be urban/rural?

Can we create ministry specializations around our various settings (i.e., rural specialists, urban specialists, etc.) – and recruit people accordingly?

How many conference treasurers should we have?

What type of conference staffing will we need?

What conference staff do we need to cut if any?

What is it that we are trying to accomplish that needs staffing?

What do we do with the funds we have for process?

What is the place for video conferencing in the new area?

What blend of high-tech and high-touch shall we create?

How do we measure success in this process?

Will we still have districts confined to the geography of state boundaries?

Do districts have to be defined by geography or physical boundaries?

How many districts are ideal for each conference?

Will budgets be combined and who will manage them?

How will we group churches for supervision and leadership deployment?

Will we be open to cross conference charges and church mergers in this Episcopal area?

Will churches need to be grouped by geography or affinity?

What kind of staff do we need for the area?

Where will the Episcopal office(s) be located?

Will there be District Offices as we have them now and where will they be located?

How will one Bishop handle 3 Annual Conferences?

Should Kansas and Nebraska be 1, 2, or 3 Annual Conferences?

Will there be open appointments (i.e., clergy in the NE-KS area can be appointed anywhere in the area)?

How many Districts will be in the Episcopal Area?

Will the appointive cabinet meet as an area cabinet?

Will the conferences function independently though in one Episcopal area?

Where shall Bishop live?

What staff is duplication conference to conference?

Will "terminology" need to be changed or defined to help us "understand each other" between conferences (i.e., Connectional Min./CG&D, etc.)?

How is the organizational structure determined?

Three point charge – the annual conferences?

Union or merger?

NEBRASKA-KANSAS EPISCOPAL AREA TASK FORCE

February 12-13, 2010

Nebraska Conference Center, Lincoln

ATTACHMENT C Adaptive Change Questions Prioritized

Group A:

1. What is the relationship between institutional care and disciple making?
 - what part of institutional care needs to be sacrificed/let go to focus on disciple making?
 - what needs to go in our Area Rummage Sale?
 - what are the roles of Elders, Deacons, Local Pastors, and Certified Lay Ministers?
 - how do we have more capable leaders for our mission—new training for new mission
2. How do we discover a shared mission and mission field for the area?
 - what is our name and what does it communicate, i.e. Hallelujah Area
3. How do we explore the options for “church”?
 - what is church
 - new look for buildings—or no buildings
4. What is the process of bringing together the mission of three Annual Conferences into a vision for one area?

Other:

How do we learn best practices from other multiple conferences transitioning into new area?
How do we live into the mission and function of three Annual Conferences into one Episcopal area?
How do we recognize current identities and discover new identities as unique Annual Conferences?
How do we communicate excitement to local churches about a new Area?
What does it do for us, why does it matter? Who cares?

Group B:

1. What structure makes the best use of time, resources (people and \$) to support and create local churches in making disciples of Jesus Christ and to extend the Body’s capacity to transform the world?
2. With this new opportunity, how can we rethink and recreate and create something new (outside the box)!
3. How will we measure “success” and not lie to ourselves?
4. How do we acknowledge the role of power, authority, and status in people’s response to potential adaptive change?
5. How can we understand/celebrate the history/stories that formed us in the past and how do they inform who we are and how do we write the next chapters?

Other:

How are we going to acknowledge/honor/unpack the theological differences in the area?
How can we function as a compass instead of a road map/GPS?
What can we get rid of (i.e. structure) and what must we hang on to?
How do we identify and share the best practices of each Conference?
What is the role of a Conference or District and how many of each should there be?
And what is the new entity?

Group C:

1. How do we define ministry areas in ways other than geographical boundaries?
2. How do we start new faith communities?
3. How do we equip leaders for our new environment?
4. How do we determine which structures we let go to create something new?

5. What will the role of the laity be in doing the work of senior leadership?
6. How do we make conferencing holy?

Group D:

1. What's the purpose of the Annual Conference? What is the role of the District Superintendent?
2. What kind of Annual Conference structure truly empowers and frees the local church to thrive? How do we become permission giving in this process?
3. Which ministries are best done by local church and which are best done by the Annual Conference/General Church?
4. Do we remain three Conferences and 17 Districts?

Other:

How do we encourage innovation?

NEBRASKA-KANSAS EPISCOPAL AREA TASK FORCE

February 12-13, 2010
Nebraska Conference Center, Lincoln

ATTACHMENT D Ideas for Data/Information Needed

★ Mission/Vision statements

Job description of Annual Conference from Board of Discipleship

★ How much money does each conference have and how do we get it and spend it

★ Staffing charts/job descriptions

How many districts and size of them

★ DNA of each conference –strengths to offer growth ministries

Maps showing where churches are (coded by size)

Where are growing churches

★ Institutions we own

How do we communicate

What software systems do we use (are they compatible)

★ What ministry is showing most growth

? Structure charts

? Properties we own

Diversity/lack thereof as compared to % of total population

Honest assessment of effectiveness of clergy

? Age level of clergy

★ Benefits system

★ Needed for April Meeting
? May have already completed