



LEADERSHIP.
EXCELLENCE.
AGILITY.
DISCOVERY.

LEGAL TRAINING SESSION

Number of Bishops in the U.S.



Legislative Committee passed the Jurisdictional Study Committee version unchanged

Legislation stated that each Jurisdiction would be entitled to 5 bishops paid for by the Episcopal Fund.

Any Jurisdiction that determined for missional reasons they needed more than 5 bishops would need to make a request to the IJCOE for the additional bishops and agree to pay the costs of those bishops.

Number of Bishops in the U.S.



The JSC proposal passed 666/43 after amendments on the floor

Amended to add “the General Council on Finance and Administration shall include the cost of such bishops when recommending a quadrennial budget as provided in paragraph 818” for the 25 bishops

Additional language was also added to deal with any complications that could arise if a jurisdiction doesn’t pay for the bishops they requested.

- Apportionment dollars can’t be used because the *Discipline* says only 25 bishops are to be paid from the Episcopal Fund
- Judicial Council ruled a bishop must be paid so if the jurisdiction doesn’t send in the funds for the additional bishops where does the money come from?

There was a default effective date of **1/1/2025**

Number of Bishops in the U.S.



To address the number of bishops for the 2024 elections, Alex Shanks brought an amendment to another piece of legislation for ¶ 404.2

This legislation tasked the IJCOE with proposing the number of bishops to the General Conference using missional and financial information to make the recommendation.

Amended on the floor to require a minimum of 5 bishops per jurisdiction

Approved by the plenary and immediately went into effect

The IJCOE began meeting and proposed to the General Conference WJ- 5, NCJ- 6, SCJ- 6, NEJ- 6, SEJ- 9- these numbers were approved by General Conference

Current ¶ 404.2



In the jurisdictions, the number of bishops shall be determined on the basis of missional reasons, as approved by the General Conference on recommendation of the Interjurisdictional Committee on Episcopacy. Before recommending the number of episcopal areas, the Interjurisdictional Committee on Episcopacy shall:

a) consider these criteria in the following order of priority: 1. The number of charge conferences and the number of active clergy in episcopal areas; 2. the geographic size of episcopal areas; 3. The overall church membership in the annual conferences in the episcopal areas.

b) conduct an analysis of the context and missional potential of changes in episcopal areas.

c) analyze the capacity of the episcopal fund to determine the number of bishops that can be funded. The following groups shall be consulted during this analysis of the episcopal fund: the executive committee of the Interjurisdictional Committee on Episcopacy, the officers of the Council of Bishops, and the officers of the General Council on Finance and Administration.

Each jurisdiction shall be entitled to a minimum of five bishops. The General Council on Finance and Administration shall include the costs of such bishops when recommending a quadrennial budget as provided by and required in ¶ 819.

Current ¶ 404.2



d) A jurisdiction, through its jurisdictional committee on episcopacy may request additional bishops exceeding the numbers provided in sub-paragraph 2.a-c) above; provided, however, that the salary and other expenses of such bishops, as calculated by the General Council on Finance and Administration, shall be apportioned to the annual conferences of such jurisdiction. Any jurisdiction seeking any bishop(s) over the base number provided in subparagraph 2.a-c) shall be able to demonstrate their ability to fund any additional bishops by providing a surety to the General Council on Finance and Administration that they are sufficiently capable to meet the full funding of additional bishop(s) for the coming quadrennium. The General Council of Finance and Administration will establish the base cost for the funding of an office of episcopal leader which shall be used by any jurisdiction seeking to fund a number of bishops over the base number of five. It shall be the responsibility of the affected jurisdiction, through its Committee on Episcopacy, to request consideration of its missional need for additional bishops, and in the absence of such a request, there shall be no obligation on the part of the Interjurisdictional Committee on Episcopacy to consider such additional bishops nor to make any report or recommendation on such additional bishops to General Conference. In no case shall there be any constraint on General Conference's power to act in the absence of such a recommendation or to reject any recommendation that might be received. Further, the provisions of this paragraph shall not be construed to limit the authority of the jurisdictional conferences to determine the number, names, and boundaries of the annual conferences and episcopal areas (¶ 41) or of the Colleges of Bishops to arrange the plan of episcopal supervision (¶ 49).

After GC2020/24



	GC Approved	Bishops after Retirement
NCJ	6	7*
NEJ	6	5
SCJ	6	6
SEJ	9	10
WJ	5	3
Total	32	31

After GC2020/24



ICJOE faced several challenges in relation to GC-approved allocation

- The numbers recommended to and approved by General Conference anticipated 3 bishop transfers to other jurisdictions - that didn't happen
- Without the transfers there were "extra" bishops in some jurisdictions
- One additional bishop announced retirement after General Conference which created one election opportunity
- One bishop went on Long Term Disability

2 elections were held in the western jurisdiction

2 bishops were assigned to serve across jurisdictional lines

Response to ICJOE's Recommendation



Three items ended up on the Judicial Council docket, all from NEJ

- Decision of law review
- Two declaratory decision requests

A lot of overlap across the three docket items

- Numerous specific questions posed, focusing on various aspects of the ICJOE process and its ultimate recommendations

Judicial Council consolidated the three items and issued a single decision

Decision 1513



Addresses only one of the many questions posed:

- “Did the IJCOE act within its disciplinary authority in recommending to the jurisdictional conferences for their consideration and action the assignment of a bishop to the West Virginia Episcopal Area in the NEJ and the Holston Episcopal Area in the SEJ?”

Answer: No

- Having a bishop serving in both NEJ and SEJ results in SEJ having 10 bishops, instead of the 9 approved by the General Conference

Decision 1513



What's the immediate impact?

- Seemingly nothing
- The Judicial Council stopped short of requiring any kind of change/remedy

Going forward

- In any future distribution of bishops that would have one or more crossing jurisdictional lines, the bishop would go towards the total permitted in each jurisdiction

Questions?





Thank You!



615-329-2393



ConnectionalRelations@gcfa.org



1908 Grand Ave. Nashville, TN 37212



www.GCFA.org



FINANCE & ADMINISTRATION

General Council on Finance and Administration

THE UNITED METHODIST CHURCH

