

# Calendar and Mode of Nomination of Our Next Executive Bishop

---

Draft Procedure, 2010-2014

## Brief Summary

- 2010 February: Hear the report of the committee, members take counsel about the key doctrinal issues behind the process, discuss the needed qualities of Executive Bishop, select a nominating committee.
- 2011 June Clergy Meetings: Hear the report of the Nominating Committee, report to the Assembly what the process will be. Nominating process begins.
- 2011 December: Nominations close, Nominating Committee prepares documents stating the candidates' experience and qualifications.
- 2012 February: Determine a nominee.
- 2012 Spring and Summer: Electronic/paper voting from world-wide membership leading to ordination into the 3rd degree.
- 2013 July 1: Begin serving as Assistant Bishop.
- 2014 July 1: Begin serving as Executive Bishop.

## Detailed Proposal

- I. February, 2010: At the Council of the Clergy Meetings
- A. Hear a report of the Bishop's Selection Process Committee
1. Recommendations
  2. Procedural questions for consideration (allows for some presentation of information generated on which we did not come to consensus)
  3. Key doctrinal questions to help us proceed in a unified way.
- B. Bishop's Selection Process Committee is looking to the following outcomes:
1. Agreed upon process by which we, individually and collectively receive counsel from the Church
  2. Agree to the desired composition of, and charge of, a Nominating Committee:

## Calendar and Mode of Nomination of Our Next Executive Bishop

---

- i. Composition:
    - a. Small enough to be functional/large enough to be representative
    - b. Should consist of those who do not consider themselves candidates for the position of Executive Bishop
  - ii. Charge:
    - a. Is it merely “facilitative” in nature?
    - b. Does it have the responsibility to ensure a full slate of appropriate nominees?
- C. Approval of Selection Process (as proposed or modified)
- D. Election of a Nominating Committee
- II. March 2010 through June 2011: Between Clergy Meetings (Assembly planned in June, 2011):
- A. NOTE: Things need not ramp up until January, 2011. That still leaves 5 months to do the following:
  - B. Each full member of the Council charged with receiving input from the laity in his local area of focus:
    1. Freedom as to how that could happen
    2. Requirement to report to the Secretary of the Council that it did happen and how it happened, by June 1, 2011.
    3. Nominating Committee:
      - i. Interview former Executive Bishops
      - ii. Update list of Clergy, showing age and summary of careers
      - iii. Prepare packet of information for all full Council members in time for dissemination at 2011 Clergy Meetings.
      - iv. Prepare session for Clergy meetings as outlined below
- III. June, 2011: Council of the Clergy Meetings (shortened session because of the Assembly)
- A. Nominating Committee Presentation:
    1. Review Selection Process, particularly process relating to nominations

## Calendar and Mode of Nomination of Our Next Executive Bishop

---

2. Review information collected to date and disseminate information packets
3. Lead Clergy through process of determining criteria for potential nominees:
  - i. Experience parameters
  - ii. Age parameters
  - iii. Degree parameters (i.e. from 2<sup>nd</sup> or 3<sup>rd</sup> degree only?)
  - iv. Explore the needs of the Church as a Council
  - v. Explore/share the input we received from the laity in our respective areas.

B. Before we begin the nomination process, we need to decide if we will accept nominations from the floor of the meeting.

1. Pro: protects full freedom of the Council to determine its leadership
2. Con: does not allow for level playing field in terms of information provided on each candidate

IV.2011 at Assembly:

A. Present Selection Process to the gathering

B. Meet in Joint Council session to hear input from the GC Board (and the ANC Board?)

1. Discuss the uses of the Episcopal Office and the qualities desirable in an Executive Bishop

V. Between June 2011 and February 2012:

A. Nominations open immediately following the Assembly, and remain open through December 1, 2011

1. From last time:

- i. Any full member of the Council of the Clergy was invited to submit a single written nomination addressed to the Administrative Committee, with a brief reason for the nomination being given.
- ii. While the identity of the person making the nomination was held in strict confidence by the nominating committee, the nominations were to be signed for the sake of reference.

## Calendar and Mode of Nomination of Our Next Executive Bishop

---

- iii. All signed nominations meeting the agreed upon criteria, to receive a written acknowledgement from the Nominating Committee.
  - iv. A minister becomes a candidate for the selection process after the Nominating Committee receives two written nominations from members of the Council of the Clergy and after the nominee gives his consent to be a candidate.
- B. As Nominations Proceed:
1. The Nominating Committee prepares a report to the Council about the slate of nominees to be sent out no later than January 15, 2012. Report to include:
    - i. Curriculum vitae for each candidate showing their career assignments, positions held, education, and a list of papers written and published.
    - ii. Blended overview of reasons given for nomination
  2. Once slate is received, Council members are urged to contact the supervising priest of any candidate concerning whom he has questions
    - i. The purpose of this step is to allow concerns to be addressed, and knowledge to be gained, so that each Council member can come to the Council Meetings at which we vote, more prepared to constructively engage in the process.
    - ii. Note: this addresses the observation that concerns, if not given an appropriate voice, tend to go underground in less-than-constructive ways.
    - iii. In advance of the February, 2012 Council of the Clergy Meetings, the Secretary of the Council asks three men to serve as Tellers of the Election.

VI. February 2012: Council of the Clergy Meetings meet to determine a nominee.

**A. WE NEED TO DETERMINE A METHOD FOR ADDRESSING CONCERNS ABOUT WEAKNESSES IN A CANDIDATE IN A SPHERE OF CHARITY.**

1. Rather than just opening up the floor to critical remarks and throwing away our traditions, the Committee believes that it would be possible to put aside an hour or so to address “concerns” once we are down to 2 or 3 final candidates.

## Calendar and Mode of Nomination of Our Next Executive Bishop

---

### B. WE NEED TO AGREE UPON A METHOD OF VOTING.

1. Different types of voting have been shown to tend to certain kinds of results.
2. We need to agree on what “abstain” means, and what a blank or spoiled ballot means.

### C. Voting process:

1. Here’s what we did last time:
  - i. At the close of nominations all candidates left the room and the Council continued by confidentially discussing the candidates’ qualities, stressing their individual strengths in comparison with the demands of the job. This discussion was followed by a vote.
  - ii. For each vote a single ballot was given to each full member of the Council of the Clergy. Each member then wrote the name of the minister he was voting for on his ballot. If the member wanted to cast an abstention he was to write “abstain” on the ballot. All ballots with either a name or the word “abstain” written on them were used in calculating the outcome of the vote. (Note: this is a very unusual practice. To “abstain” from voting means you don’t vote. If counted or included in the total, they become votes. According to Robert’s Rules, abstentions are not recorded or counted.) Blank ballots were not be counted (Why did we treat a blank ballot differently from an abstention?).
  - iii. After the first vote, all candidates who received less than 10% of the vote were dropped from the list and brought back into the room where they could participate in the selection process from the floor. After each subsequent vote, the candidate receiving the lowest number of votes was removed from the list and brought in. The expectation was that when a single candidate received at least 75% of the vote, that candidate would have been recognized as the clergy’s selected candidate for the office of Executive Bishop.
  - iv. Two candidates were left in the process but neither of them had received the 75% of the vote required for a selection, discussion and the voting process were repeated. When the clergy reached a point where a single candidate is unable to receive at least 75% of the votes, the clergy determined that 67% of the vote or simple majority were a

## Calendar and Mode of Nomination of Our Next Executive Bishop

---

better criterion for selection. In the case of a deadlock it was established that it was the Executive Bishop's responsibility to intervene, suggesting the possible alternatives for how to proceed.

- v. When a single candidate for the post of Assistant Bishop was determined the Clergy had the right to choose to have a final vote, giving the members a final opportunity to express their support for the candidate.
- vi. Immediately following the Clergy Meetings the candidate's name was presented to the General Church Board of Directors for its confidential counsel and affirmation.

### VII. Next steps:

- A. Summer-Fall 2012: Vote of affirmation by mail and/or electronic media by General Church membership. (Criterion for affirmation to be determined: 75%? 90?)
- B. Following the vote of affirmation (assuming threshold met and the need for ordination to the 3<sup>rd</sup> degree), the Bishop Elect would be ordained.
- C. The Bishop Elect would serve as an Assistant to the Executive Bishop (the Rt. Rev. Tom Kline) from July 1, 2013 to June 30, 2014.
  - 1. During that time he would ready himself for the role of Executive Bishop.
  - 2. He would also organize a discussion of additional Bishop or Bishops.
  - 3. He would assume the office of Executive Bishop July 1, 2014. It is assumed that the present Assistant Bishop will also retire June 30, 2014.