

DRAFT REPORT OF THE DIOCESAN COMMITTEE ON RESOLUTIONS

The following resolutions were submitted to the Resolutions Committee this year:¹

Resolution #1: Nominal Payments to Nonstipendiary Deacons
Resolution #2: Adding Mary Oliver to Lesser Feasts and Fasts
Resolution #3: Carbon Sequestration - Creates an Internal Carbon Offset Program
Resolution #4: Racial Justice & Reconciliation Memorial
Resolution #5: Addressing Voter Suppression
Resolution #6: Sabbatical Leave Policy for Clergy
Resolution #7: Standardized Templates for Key Common Personnel and Administrative Documents
Resolution #8: Affirming Non-Binary and Transgender Identities
Resolution #9: Spanish Language-Latine/Hispanic Centered Day of Discernment
Resolution #10: Disability Sensitivity and Anti-Ableism Training

The following resolutions were accorded Favored Five treatment²:

Resolution #3: Carbon Sequestration - Creates an Internal Carbon Offset Program
Resolution #5: Addressing Voter Suppression
Resolution #6: Sabbatical Leave Policy for Clergy
Resolution #8: Affirming Non-Binary and Transgender Identities
Resolution #9: Spanish Language-Latine/Hispanic Centered Day of Discernment

These Favored Five resolutions will be placed on the Convention agenda, debated and voted upon without further action by the sponsors.

Resolution #4: Racial Justice & Reconciliation Memorial was referred to the Committee on Dispatch of Business for possible inclusion on the Consent Calendar. This Resolution #4 will not be placed on the agenda nor debated unless there is an objection from the Convention floor to its being on the consent calendar.

One Resolution (*Resolution #7: Standardized Templates for Key Common Personnel and*

¹ An additional resolution was submitted by an ineligible sponsor, and the Resolutions Committee was accordingly without jurisdiction to consider it or work with the sponsor on revisions. (*Resolution #11: Creation of a Young Professionals Program*). This resolution can be brought to the floor of Convention, upon motion of an eligible sponsor, upon a 2/3 vote. The Resolutions Committee recommends against such a vote, since, as noted, it lacked jurisdiction to work with the sponsor in revisions.

² Rules of Order Section 1.5 (“The Committee on Resolutions shall submit no more than five (5) resolutions to the Convention for its consideration....”)

Administrative Documents) was referred to Executive Council to determine whether it could develop a common sense– and affordable– policy to enable personnel, administrative, and other legal documents to be developed and disseminated to the congregations and other groups using them, and to provide any necessary training and updating related thereto. EC has been requested to provide the result of its review, and any policy it might adopt, to the next Convention.

The remaining three Resolutions (*Resolution #1: Nominal Payments to Nonstipendiary Deacons*, *Resolution #2: Adding Mary Oliver to Lesser Feasts and Fasts*, and *Resolution #10: Disability Sensitivity and Anti-Ableism Training*) will not be reported to the Convention by the Resolutions Committee and will be required to obtain a 2/3 vote of the Convention if they are to be heard.³ In addition, Resolution 7, on Common Templates, can also be brought before the Convention on a 2/3 vote. In that case, the referral to Executive Council will be withdrawn.

Rules of Order Section 1.11 provides that “Any resolutions submitted to the Committee on Resolutions and not submitted to the Convention, unless withdrawn, shall be identified by the Committee in its report. The report shall include the name or subject of each resolution, the name(s) of the proposer(s), and the reason it was not submitted to the Convention.”⁴

Resolutions 4 and 7 were not submitted because they received alternate dispositions, as noted above. To explain the non-Favored Five disposition of the remaining resolutions, some background is necessary.

Over the last decade and more, the Committee has strongly encouraged use of the resolutions process, pointing out that Committee members were available to help in drafting well written resolutions, and that submitting resolutions was a central part of the diocesan democratic process. For sponsors, the process vitally involved them in the policymaking aspects of the Diocese as they moved through the sundry drafts, presented final product to the deaneries, and argued their cases on the floor. All of these considerations are still true. It was never the Committee’s intent, however, to incentivize a failure to work with the ongoing instrumentalities of the Diocese and TEC, especially where those bodies were better designed to deal with the problem presented in the resolution at hand. The Committee, in working with sponsors, has always stressed the importance of working with existing institutions, developing more co-sponsors and endorsers, and listening carefully to the comments received in the resulting interactions. That is part of democratic– and Christian– conversation.

³ See Rules of Order Section 1.09 (“1.9 Any proposed resolution that does not meet the foregoing criteria may be considered by the Convention only upon the affirmative vote of two-thirds (2/3rds) of those present and voting in Convention. If the Convention agrees to consider a resolution, it shall be referred by the Chair to the Committee on Resolutions or other appropriate Committee of Convention.”)

⁴ The Sponsors and endorsers of the sundry resolutions are available on the diocesan Convention website, and are incorporated here by reference. (*See* <https://www.diocalconvention.org/resolutions-resoluciones>)

This year, two phrases kept coming up in the Committee's internal conversations: "convention micromanagement of the Diocese" and "inadequate discussion with existing institutions." For example, we elect Executive Council to make policy and implement it over the years so that a given policy does not fail for want of needed updating or ongoing attention. We elect the General Convention Deputation to make good policy and exercise good political judgments, on our behalf, knowing that a resolution's mere words on paper will serve us far less well than the Deputation's accumulated experience. Simply put, in many cases, a proposed resolution is the least effective method of solving a perceived problem, and working with our established institutions is the best. Sponsors should have discussions with the institutions that will be called upon to enforce or pay for a resolution before they start the drafting process; they may well find that a resolution is unnecessary.

None of the resolutions that failed to make the Favored Five are in any sense "bad resolutions." They represent thoughtful work on the part of the sponsors, and may be deserving of consideration by the appropriate bodies. In earlier years, they might have been among the Favored Five. But this year, faced with ten resolutions and a limit of five, the Committee was forced to make choices.

Resolution #1: Nominal Payments to Nonstipendiary Deacons. As we worked with this resolution, we learned that no action by Convention is actually required. Individual congregations and deacons can work directly with the Church Pension Group to implement the action that is being requested. We also learned that not all deacons support making that action mandatory. Hence, no Favored Five treatment because there is an effective alternative approach that would be acceptable to most deacons.

Resolution #2: Adding Mary Oliver to Lesser Feasts and Fasts, requires more talks between the Deputation, the Sponsors, and even some permanent GC commissions because it appears to require an exception to General Convention guidelines for adding someone to LFF. Again: no Favored Five Treatment where more discussion is necessary with the primary bodies.

Resolution #10: Disability Sensitivity and Anti-Ableism Training. Again, a sensitive and thoughtful resolution that could well be better implemented through other means than a commanding resolution. The sponsors, to their credit, are actually working on a pilot program, and should be working with Executive Council and the Finance Committee to make this work. It is also working with the Deputation at the GC level. So, again: no Favored Five treatment because more discussion is appropriate.

Mr. Secretary, the resolutions heretofore lodged with this Convention are now filed.

Respectfully submitted,

Jay Luther
Chair
Committee on Resolutions