

Talking points from the IESDG Response to the Restructure of the Church Document

IESDG leaders will take responsibility to define these talking points so that their intent is clear. Names in blue are people that will be contacted to help refine these talking points. Talking points need about 1-2 short paragraphs explaining the specific issue in the plan.

Talking Points: (in no particular order)

- 1) No consultation with constituents (CT members, racial/ethnics)

 - 2) 15-member board not representative; criteria problematic (competency and effectiveness); Central Conferences / Racial Ethnic / Youth—Age.

 - 3) 45-member body only advisory—no decision-making power; Lacks clear process, equity.

 - 4) How are young people included, empowered?

 - 5) Failure to recognize the contributions, and successful ministries, good work of general agencies.

 - 6) What would the church look like without the work of general agencies? For example—If work of ethnic plans were left to annual conferences, it wouldn't happen. Annual conferences are already focused on their own issues.

 - 7) Call to Action Study--conclusions based on limited info. Is it really representative? Call to Action mostly focused on local churches, as opposed to other levels of the Church.

 - 8) Limitations of using a corporate model—Not mission oriented, not ministry-driven.

 - 9) Abandons the values our church has placed on holy conferencing, and the council model (our history of Council)

 - 10) Centralization of power and authority is not Wesleyan.
Asking GC to empower other units is unconstitutional. Only GC reserves the right to establish and affirm how funds are to be allocated.

 - 11) Calls for GC to empower other units, which is unconstitutional
-

12) Where are special agendas reflected in the plan?—racism, gender equality, repercussions of losing or diminishing the roles of GCORR and COSROW, the Ethnic Plans are more than congregational development.

13) No evaluation of impact caused by drastic change. Gauge: GCORR's Racial/Gender Equity Impact Assessment tool.

14) Diversion from 4 Areas of Focus—detraction from emphasis, distancing?

15) Too radical, drastic, extreme; happening too fast.

Alternatives for delegates:

- Do nothing
- Refer to committee for study
- Support legislation brought by other entities
- Amend proposal

What other legislation will we support? Review general agency proposals:

- GBGM (on website)
- GCCCUIC
- GBOD
- UMW—legislation is on website
- Council of Bishops—realign agencies, redesign Council of Bishops, clergy/leadership development, use next 10 years to drive vital congregations.
- Go to the Methodists for Social Action (MFSa) website for their response and alternatives to church restructure (www.mfsagc12.org)
- GCORR (attached)
- GBHEM
- GCSRW—(on website)

Adaptive Challenge

- The plan diminishes the role of laity. Concentrates more power in Council of Bishops.
 - Effectiveness of bishops by jurisdiction Episcopal committees—not consistent, not right.
 - Consultants without biblical & theological understanding used a business model as basis for proposal
 - Where are the needs of the local church expressed?
 - Who is around the table—who wrote the proposal. Outside consultants, a group of corporate thinkers without the theological & biblical background. Created a model in the church that has not been tested sufficiently.
-