

The One Church Plan

The One Church Plan gives churches the room they need to maximize the presence of a United Methodist witness in as many places in the world as possible.

Changes to the adaptable paragraphs in The Book of Discipline apply only to the Jurisdictional Conferences in the United States. Central conferences, through the work of the Standing Committee on Central Conference Matters, will have the authority to retain the present language regarding chargeable offenses of clergy and questions of ordination related to homosexuality found in The 2016 Book of Discipline or adopt wording in these paragraphs that best serves their missional contexts.

Summary of Plan

The One Church Plan provides a generous unity that gives conferences, churches, and pastors the flexibility to uniquely reach their missional context without disbanding the connectional nature of the United Methodist Church. In the One Church Plan, no annual conferences, bishops, congregations, or pastors are compelled to act contrary to their convictions.

The plan maintains the leadership structure of the United Methodist Church, including the Council of Bishops, the General Conference, and the annual conferences as one body and one church. It offers greater freedom to many who desire change but do not want to violate The Book of Discipline. Voting is kept to a minimum except where it is helpful. There is no mandate that requires local churches, conferences, or pastors to participate in a vote that divides, segments, or separates. The United Methodist Church remains in connection, upholding unity of mission without uniformity of practice. The plan grants space for traditionalists to continue to offer ministry as they have in the past; space for progressives to exercise freely a more complete ministry with LGBTQ persons; and space for all United Methodists to continue to coexist without disrupting their ministries.

Additionally, this plan creates space for annual conferences in various part of the world to practice ministry according to their national or regional contexts with the connectional autonomy of their own regional Book of Discipline. The One Church Plan removes the language from The Book of Discipline used in the United States that restricts pastors and churches from conducting same-sex weddings and annual conferences from ordaining self-avowed practicing homosexual persons. It adds language that intentionally protects the religious freedom of pastors and churches who choose not to perform or host same-sex weddings and Boards of Ordained Ministry and bishops who choose not to credential or ordain self-avowed practicing homosexual persons. Central conferences can adapt portions of The Book of Discipline for their own contextual practices, and are not bound by decisions taken in Jurisdictional Conferences.

This plan provides United Methodists the ability to address their missional contexts in different ways. The plan ends the threat of church trials over same-sex weddings. Boards of Ordained Ministry already have the authority to discern whom to credential. Local churches already have the authority to establish wedding policies. Pastors already discern whom they will or will not marry. While some annual conferences and related Boards of Ordained Ministry can adopt new practices, no annual conferences must make further choices or amend current practices unless they desire to do so. United Methodist institutions, foundations, universities, agencies, and

General Boards will continue to offer their ministries without significant disruption or costly legal counsel related to their charters or articles of incorporation. Wespeth will be able to continue to offer its services without disruption.

The One Church plan also asks GCFA to find a means consistent with The Book of Discipline to assure that each jurisdictional conference or area supports the costs of its own episcopal leader and offices. All jurisdictional conference bishops will be paid the same salary, but the area where a bishop is assigned will, through a process developed by GCFA, provide the funding, similar to how episcopal housing allowances are now managed. This plan continues our historic Episcopacy Fund to help support central conference bishops, and provide for our ecumenical commitments. This does not affect central conferences. Central conference bishops and episcopal services will continue to be covered out of the current General Church Episcopal Fund.

Summary of Connectional Conference Model

The Connectional Conference Model reflects a unified core that includes shared doctrine and services. This model creates three values-based connectional conferences that have distinctive definitions of accountability, contextualization and justice. Current central conferences have the choice of becoming their own connectional conference (up to five additional connectional conferences) or joining one of the three values-based connectional conferences. A redefined Council of Bishops focuses on ecumenical relationships and shared learning. Episcopal oversight, accountability, elections, assignments and funding occur within the College of Bishops of each connectional conference.

Features of Connectional Conference Model:

- Five U.S. jurisdictions are replaced by three connectional conferences, each covering the whole country, based on theology including perspectives on LGBTQ ministry (i.e. progressive, unity, and traditional) (note: see page 50 of the report for a full description).
- Cross-connectional conference cooperation, relationships, and partnerships in mission and ministry continue as they do now, at the initiative of the entities involved. All connectional conferences would continue to support mission work and sustain ministry in the areas outside the U.S.
- General Conference is shortened and would still have authority over the shared doctrine and services of continuing general agencies. It would also serve as a venue for connecting the connectional conferences, worship, sharing of best practices/learning, and inspiration.
- Continuing general agencies include: Wespeth, Publishing House, GCFA, Archives & History and parts of GBGM (as determined in consultation among the connectional conferences inside and outside the U.S.). Future structure of other general agencies would be decided based on which connectional conferences desire to participate in them, after a transition period. Any connectional conference could contract with any agency for fee-based services.
- The Council of Bishops houses ecumenical relations and functions as a collegial learning and nurturing body.

- Connectional conference Colleges of Bishops have authority for supervision and mutual accountability of bishops in their respective colleges.
- Each connectional conference elects and (in the U.S.) pays for its own bishops. Bishops outside the U.S. would continue to be supported by all U.S. annual conferences.
- Each connectional conference would create its own Book of Discipline, which would begin with The General Book of Discipline, including Articles of Religion, Confessions of Faith, the General Rules and other items that are commonly agreed upon by United Methodists. Each connectional conference also has the authority to adapt those items not included in The General Book of Discipline.
- The Judicial Council would continue as the supreme judicial body, with authority over all judicial matters based on the respective connectional conference Books of Discipline. The Judicial Council would consist of two persons elected by each connectional conference.
- Connectional conferences at their discretion could have separate connectional conference judicial courts with authority in rulings related to the connectional conference Book of Discipline. Such rulings could be appealed to Judicial Council.
- Justice ministries related to racism and sexism would be organized at the connectional conference level and held accountable by the general church. During the 2021-25 quadrennium, GCORR and GCSRW would assist in the development of principles and benchmarks for connectional conferences to measure efforts to combat racism and sexism. Quadrennial reports would be made by each connectional conference to a Standing Committee on Connectional Conferences (see below).
- Central conferences have the choice of becoming their own connectional conference with the same powers as U.S. connectional conferences, or have the option of joining a U.S. connectional conference. U.S. connectional conferences joined by a central conference become a global instead of a U.S. connectional conference. Annual conferences that disagree with the decision of their central conference could vote to join a different connectional conference than their central conference. The central conferences in Africa could decide to unite in forming one African connectional conference (an option that is being discussed currently by African leadership).
- In addition to the shared doctrine and shared services, each connectional conference has its own structure, agencies, and method of financing its ministry and the shared services, as well as support for bishops and annual conferences outside the U.S.
- Each connectional conference has its own policies regarding LGBTQ weddings and ordination.
- Each connectional conference sets its own standards for ministerial credentialing and list of approved schools/seminaries.
- Jurisdictional conferences would have the first level vote regarding connectional conference affiliation. Annual conferences that disagree with the decision of their jurisdiction may decide to

affiliate with a different connectional conference. No local church is required to take a vote unless it decides to join a different connectional conference than its annual conference.

- Jurisdictional property would belong to the connectional conference chosen by the jurisdiction for affiliation. Church-owned or church-related entities could change their affiliation to a different connectional conference, to multiple connectional conferences, or to no connectional conference based on the bylaws governing each institution.
- When the connectional conferences are organized and put into effect, jurisdictions and central conferences would cease to exist, unless a connectional conference decides to include a mid-level judicatory in its structure. In that case, it would be encouraged to consult with other connectional conferences to use a different name than jurisdiction or central conference for such a mid-level judicatory.
- Central conferences would be authorized to elect bishops in 2020, as scheduled, unless they determine otherwise. Jurisdictions and any central conferences not electing bishops in 2020 would have the mandatory retirement age of bishops waived until 2022 in order to avoid a potential mismatch in the number of bishops for each branch.
- The blanket tax exemption (501(c)3) would move to each connectional conference, filed with the assistance of GCFA. GCFA is being asked to provide an estimate for legal costs of implementing this model and a plan for funding such costs.
- A Standing Committee on Connectional Conferences would be established by the 2020 General Conference to help the Council of Bishops facilitate cross-connectional conference connections and cooperative ministry. Legislation for this would be written by the Transition Team and submitted for the 2020 General Conference.
- General Conference 2024 would be postponed to 2025 to allow time for the transition. This would disconnect succeeding General Conferences from the U.S. election cycle.

Traditional Model

The Traditional Model maintains our global United Methodist teaching on human sexuality while providing space for a new form of unity with those who cannot in good conscience uphold our discipline.

Summary of the Plan

This model maintains the current stance of the church regarding the definition of marriage and the ministry of and with LGBTQ persons. It flows from the presupposition that The United Methodist Church ought to have one unified moral stance on the issues of marriage and sexuality. This model continues to affirm that LGBTQ persons are welcome to attend worship services, participate in church programs, receive the sacraments, upon baptism be admitted as baptized members, and upon taking vows of membership become members of local churches.

At the same time, the Traditional Model acknowledges the deep conscientious objections on the part of some to the current stance and practices of the church. It accommodates those objections

by fostering a gracious and respectful way for those persons who cannot live within the current boundaries of church practice to form or join self-governing bodies that allow them the freedom to follow their conscience and institute practices in keeping with their understanding of Scripture, tradition, reason, and experience. Such a self-governing body could constitute a Wesleyan denomination that could maintain an ongoing connection with The United Methodist Church through a Concordat Agreement (§ 574).

Various changes are proposed to increase the accountability of bishops and conferences for upholding and enforcing the discipline of the Church. Contextual differentiation is achieved through provisions allowing freedom and flexibility in a new connectional status for those requiring greater autonomy from United Methodist requirements. This plan is an authentic expression of the instruction given to the Commission on a Way Forward by the Council of Bishops in the *Mission, Vision, and Scope* document to design “new ways of being in relationship across cultures and jurisdictions, in understandings of episcopacy, in contextual definitions of autonomy for annual conferences, and in the design and purpose of the apportionment.”

The model fulfills the Commission’s mission of “an openness to developing new relationships with each other.” It honors the Commission’s vision for an approach “that allows for as much contextual differentiation as possible, and that balances an approach to different theological understandings of human sexuality with a desire for as much unity as possible.”

This model respects different theological understandings by giving each a space in which to do authentic ministry without harming the ministry of those with whom they disagree. It proposes “‘new forms and structures’ of relationship” that give “greater freedom and flexibility to a future United Methodist Church that will redefine our present connectionality.”