

**RESOLUTION**  
**THE EPISCOPAL DIOCESE OF NORTHERN CALIFORNIA**  
**DIOCESAN CONVENTION**  
**NOVEMBER 3-5, 2016**

**TITLE: Quorum Resolution**

**PROPOSED BY:** Canon Charles R. Mack, Chancellor

**NAME OF REPRESENTATIVE:** Canon Charles R. Mack, Chancellor

**REPRESENTATIVE AT CONVENTION:** Canon Charles R. Mack, Chancellor

**DATE:** August 26, 2016

RESOLVED, That Article IX of the Constitution of this Diocese is hereby amended to read as follows:

**ARTICLE IX**

**Quorum**

**Section 1.** ~~Thirty (30%) A majority (50% + 1)~~ of the Clergy entitled to seat and votes in the Convention, and Lay Delegates from a majority (50% + 1) of the congregations entitled to representation, when duly assembled, shall constitute a quorum for the transaction of business.

**Section 2.** In the event that a quorum is not present at any meeting of Convention or of any Committee or Commission, the members present may adjourn from time to time until a quorum is obtained.

**EXPLANATION OF RESOLUTION:**

It is appropriate to modify the quorum requirement for clergy to reflect actual circumstances. Increasingly during recent years the proportion of clergy attending Convention has dropped. This has occurred as the proportion of clergy in retirement has increased. The drop reflects age and infirmity. It also reflects the outside claims upon the time and attention on non-congregational clergy.

This diocese is not alone. A sampling of quorum requirement in other diocese indicates that we are not alone in experiencing the issue. Two principal remedies are seen.

One approach is to set a quorum requirement lower than a majority of clergy although representation of a majority of congregations is retained for the laity. This approach recognizes that the order of clergy as a whole is not uniformly tied to congregations but nevertheless shares a common bond that distinguishes them from laity. It recognizes that a quorum requirement should reflect this diversity and this common distinguishing bond.

A second ties the clergy quorum requirement to congregational clergy. This approach recognizes the greater likelihood that congregational clergy will be free from competing claims and will be free to participate in Convention.

This resolution elects the first approach on the ground that it is important to recognize the diversity reflected in both congregational and non-congregational clergy and also recognizing the common bond among them that distinguishes them from laity.



C1-16

**FISCAL IMPACT:**

There is no direct fiscal impact; however, adoption lessens to likelihood of the expense of a Convention delayed and rescheduled for want of a quorum.

**RELATION TO DIOCESAN STRATEGIC PRIORITIES:**

This resolution furthers the goal of creating, developing and supporting healthy congregations by strengthening the ability of Convention to support congregations.

Canon Charles R. Mack, Chancellor and Representative at Convention

## **SUPPLEMENTAL EXPLANATION OF RESOLUTION**

From the floor discussion of this proposal at the 2016 Convention it became apparent that there was concern that this proposal may be outside the mainstream of diocesan quorum requirements. The following is a quick sampling of quorum requirements of the first 50 of the 106 dioceses listed on the TEC website. It may miss further restrictions such as requiring clergy to be geographically resident or serving in congregations if the restrictions are not reflected in the quorum provisions.

The sampling sets forth a great variety of provisions. They vary from a low of any lay and clergy who appear (the recommendation of our Northern California website for parish and mission meetings) to a lone high two-thirds of both clergy and lay delegates. Some are measured by eligible delegates; some, by number of congregations; some, by both.

A quorum may be formed as follows:

In Nevada and Wyoming: no clergy requirement and lay delegates from a majority of congregations

In Pittsburgh: any number of clergy or lay delegates

In Newark: with 113 congregations any number of clergy and lay delegates from 10 congregations

In Southwest Virginia with 56 congregations: 10 clergy and 10 lay delegates

In Springfield: 15 clergy and lay delegates from 10 congregations

In Maryland with 112 congregations: 20 clergy and any 20 lay delegates

In Central New York: 20 clergy and lay delegates from 20 congregations

In Delaware with 38 congregations: 20 clergy and any 40 lay delegates

In New York with 200+ congregations: 50 clergy and lay delegates from 40 congregations

In Long Island with 132 congregations: 60 clergy and lay delegates from 60 congregations

In New Jersey: 1/5 of clergy and lay delegates from 1/4 of congregations

In Pennsylvania: 1/4 actually resident clergy and lay delegates from 1/4 congregations

In Minnesota with 106 congregations: 1/4 clergy and lay delegates from 1/4 congregations

**Proposed Northern California: 30% actually resident clergy and lay delegates from a majority of congregations**

In Massachusetts with 194 congregations: 1/3 physically resident, not retired clergy and any 1/3 lay delegates

In Central Florida: 1/3 active clergy, 1/3 lay delegates

In Tennessee: 1/3 clergy and 1/3 lay delegates

In Hawaii: 1/3 geographically resident clergy and majority of lay delegates

In Lexington, Los Angeles with 147 congregations, and Wyoming: 1/3 clergy and any 1/3 lay delegates

In Kansas with 46 congregations, Mississippi, New Hampshire with 50 congregations, Rhode Island with 65 congregations, Rochester, San Joaquin, and Vermont: 1/3 clergy and lay delegates from 1/3 congregations

In Fort Worth with 20 congregations: 1/3 clergy, 1/3 lay delegates from 1/3 congregations

In Virginia: 1/3 clergy and 1/2 lay delegates

In Arizona: 1/2 active clergy and lay delegates from 1/4 congregations

In Nebraska: 1/2 parochial clergy and lay delegates from 1/2 congregations

In Oregon: 1/2 clergy and 1/3 lay delegates

In Eastern Michigan with 47 congregations and Southwest Florida with 79 congregations: 1/2 clergy and lay delegates from 1/2 congregations

In Western Kansas: majority of parochial clergy and lay delegates from a majority of congregations

In California: clergy and lay delegates each from a majority of congregations

In North Carolina: majority of geographically resident clergy and a majority of lay delegates

In Central Gulf Coast, East Carolina with 75 congregations, and North Dakota with 23 congregations: majority parochial clergy and majority of lay delegates

In Kentucky, Oklahoma with 72 congregations, San Diego with 45 congregations, and South Dakota: majority clergy and majority lay delegates

In Idaho and Northwest Texas with 80 congregations: majority of clergy and a majority of lay delegates

In Eastern Oregon: majority clergy and majority of lay delegates from a majority of congregations

In Easton with 39 congregations: 2/3 clergy and 2/3 lay delegates