



Standard Dashboard

Sharing CEEP participants insights and experiences for engaging “Millennials” today

Total Convergence Participants: 127
 Processed: 74 (58%)
 Outstanding: 53 (42%) AI= 73 28 =Sentiment
 Latest response: Sun, Feb 19, at 6:09 pm

Category Statistics

Description	AI	Points Raised	SchellingPoints	Convergent	Moderately Convergent	Divergent	Minimal (Discard)
G Goals/Objectives/Indicators of Success	78	9	0	3	4	2 (+1)	0 (-1)
U Potential Unintended Consequences	71	2	0	1	0	1	0
I Issues and Barriers	62	4	0	2	0	2	0
A Underlying Assumptions/Current State	73	9	0	3	2	4	0

Points

G Goals/Objectives/Indicators of Success

G Convergent

Congregations should create more small groups on a variety of topics/activities to build intergenerational relationships. CD 89 63

- Assumes larger congregations.
- At my church, we build intergenerational relationships through special Sunday morning workshops and gatherings (during the usual Sunday School hour). We also invite millennials to join pre-existing groups. We just elected 2 millennials to a Vestry that already includes at least one millennial, plus a number of Gen Xers. My closest intergenerational friendship have developed through Choir.
- I think every time you are getting different generations together you have a chance to build community. Adults need to know the children in the congregation and the children need to know the adults. They should all have relationships with each other.
- Millenials (and most people now days) response much better to small group "discussion" - and it is there that they build relationships, including intergenerational ones. For instance, The Alpha Cpurse which is now in 134 countries and has brought 100's of thousands into the church uses a small group model and often millennial are mixed with other ages in small groups on the course.
- This is a terrible idea. What small groups? Who's going to be in them? If they are just smaller groups of fearful white people...then what is the point? I don't know where we got the idea that small groups are the answer to all of our problems, but this doesn't solve anything.

To engage millennials, particularly as government programs are being reduced, congregations should significantly increase ministries that care for the "least of these" (Matthew 25:40). CD 86 54

- While millennials are generally interested in social justice ministries, they are also interested in choir, strategic planning for the future, and in many liturgical and faith formation ministries. One should avoid pigeon-holing or over-generalizing about millennials--they're just as different from each other as are baby boomers or Gen Xers.
- The daughter of the altar guild chair at my parents' church has said: "You don't need to be a Christian to be a good person." She doesn't come to church, but she engages in a great deal of social justice work. She's not wrong. Why do we imagine that millennials would suddenly become Christians via engagement in programs that any secular group also undertake? Our experience should teach us that most people would rather work with organizations that don't try to slip in the Nicene Creed. We should engage in these ministries, but we should not imagine them as a panacea for engaging millennials.
- not a millenial attraction exercise, but a Biblical mandate for all
- The church ought to do all it can, in the name of Jesus, to reach out to the "least of these" because it is the right thing to do, and for no other reason.
- It isn't clear that a motivation for this should be the engagement of millennials--it should be done because it is the right thing to do.
- I think inexpensive programs are fine to offer and provide, however, there always seems to be a time of day, day of week issue, always an excuse as to why they are not attending. We have attempted my ways to engage the least of these. Other than a free meal, handout at the door to help pay the next bill, we are not experiencing a strong increase of this demographic.

Congregations should expand ministries specifically attractive to young adults. CD 85 55


- My response is no different than the one I made in remarks #2

G Moderately Convergent


There should be opportunities for millennials to engage at a variety of times of day through a variety of media, (e.g. online compline service at 10pm). CD 82 50

- I would hate to see us do everything (particularly when it comes to worship) online.


- Not all parishes have these resources, it smaller churches. And I think the multi generation aspect of church is a strong dynamic.
- You have to have someone to lead all of this and update all the social media. Not every church has resources to do that. Plus not all millennials are that engaged during the day.
- Caveat: I may not be the target audience for online worship. I think there is something vital about being in a room with other believers when possible. But, I can see where an online service could have its role. These are the sorts of things that I think need to arise organically, though. It's not the maxim "If you build it, they will come." What if the majority of your millennials are new parents who fall asleep in their kid's rocking chair at 9:00 p.m.? Meet the needs of the people you have. If you get the feedback, I'd love to come to the noon eucharist, but can't get away from work for that long, ask someone what would be possible. Before launching something,
- Although different times would be more convenient, it is community that makes a church. Millennials will make time for what is important. When church is authentic and provides a place for real transformations and an encounter with Christ, people will come. Studies have been conducted that show that those who invest more in social media are less engaged socially and are less happy than those who engage in real relationships which have depth. As a 34 year old who was the Director of Young Adults (22-39 year olds) for four and half years, my recommendations is that we don't cheapen the experience of corporate worship.
- I think YouTube-streamed services and the like are a net good. They can be modes of evangelism. But if we believe that church is something that is embodied and happens in community, then we must be serious about it. I think, even anecdotally, we can know that a person who has only online "friends," but who lacks flesh and blood contact with actual humans, would be a sad and pitiable individual. So it's not clear why we think that a church with no human contact would be any less barren a place.
- Perhaps. Cost is a factor, resources, etc also come into play. Would like to hear and learn more about that. Success stories specifically.

▼ There should be increased collaboration among parishes to achieve a critical mass in small group ministries for young adults. CD 81  45

- Not everyone has a parish close to them. We have a few but not many.
- This depends on the location and make-up of the church. The church where I grew up I would strongly agree with this statement because there was not a critical mass and they could partner with other churches, via the Diocese or Deanery, to make this happen. The churches I have worked in various capacities have been larger urban parishes where there is a critical mass of 20/30s and coordinating regular collaboration might hinder efforts to develop that group, although the group can come together with other churches on occasion I do not see this working well as a regular thing.
- one, Holy, catholic and apostolic church seems to ring a bell. Are we preserving Parishes or building the Church??
- Yes and no, we are a very large parish and there is no other parish of near our size within 100 miles. We say we have a problem we are often not taken seriously. They just wish they had our numbers. But yes we should try harder
- This may be true for the average-sized Episcopal church. But I only know big churches, and so it's not true in my experience.
- Perhaps opportunities there if things were offered across the diocese at different times, days so that we might catch them somewhere in the diocese and be able to provide ministry and worship experiences.
- In practicality I have not found this to work. The "culture" of a parish/church body wants to stay together and work together. Growth has been shown to come from even a small number of highly committed - and theologically unified leaders. It is not the particular theological bent -- but the unified culture which makes the cell group stronger.
- I do think there should be more collaboration among parishes, but not for this reason. We should do a better job of not treating young people like unicorns in our churches.

▼ Congregations should have formal training on ways to intentionally form intergenerational relationships. CD 80  41

- Not sure training is what's needed. Infrastructure needs to encourage it.
- Perhaps there is good training available for something like this. I have not seen it. My feeling is that it has to happen organically and naturally for it to be authentic and sustainable.
- I disagree that congregations can be "trained" to have relationships. Either they want to or they don't, and it is the leadership's responsibility to inculcate the spirit of hospitality that welcomes all generations.
- This is terrible approach to the problem. The main issue is that we expect that the same formula will work. Dump some money for training to affirm that we are doing something even when in the long run it might just bear small insignificant results. But better than nothing for sure
- I disagree with this statement because it perpetuates and affirms what the actual problem is with the current church in how the church is dealing with the Boomers. Generation X was marginalized when they were coming up in the church by a cultural shift of the "Moral Majority" movement of the late 80s and early 90s and the swing not to ordain nearly as many GenX clergy. The boomers, who moved into leadership when their parents stepped aside, never let GenX have leadership. Now we are facing a problem, created by Boomers, where they realize the problem and want to bring in more Millennials under terms set up by Boomers who are holding onto their vestiges of leadership and power, do not want to retire, open up committees, relinquish control to others, and generally think "I know best." GenX and Millennials adore the "Greatest Generation" and would love to form relationships with others, but the current construct only allows for a one-way relationship dictated by Boomers terms. They have to appoint, step aside, lift-up, and support leadership from GenX and Millennials as their parents and grandparents did for them. The absence of GenX within the church has caused a ripple effect that we are all now paying for.
- This is probably subject to your definition of 'formal training'. So I will wait to hear more from others before adjusting my opinion.
- It can't hurt, but would anyone attend?
- Most of our programs are VERY intergenerational and those programs are the most successful.
- Interferational relationships should only be formed once newcomers are fully integrated and involved in the life of the community. Time and energy is better spent on training for hospitality and how to best welcome millennials, not starting with the assumption that they wish to be friends, or have a conception of what it means to be a part of a church community that even remotely matched ours.

▼ In our desire to attract millennials, we should heed Paul's warning to the Christians in Rome not to be conformed to this world, but to be transformed by the renewing of their minds (Romans 12:2). CD 77  40

- If this means doctrinal orthodoxy, I disagree. If it means living the gospel in imitation of Jesus - radical hospitality, love and justice - then I would change my answer
- I don't think we should "transform" who we are in order to attract more millennials. If we offer good and enduring values, excellent liturgy and music, and important social justice programs, millennials will be attracted to us. This seems to be the case in my church.
- The question is misleading but yes I strongly disagree our failure has been to cling so much to tradition that our chances to try new things had been completely undermined. Our goal should be to engaged the world allow our Christianity to conformed by while sustaining a transformative effect that leads to liberation only there our transformation will be a true reflection of the sing of the times.
- My issue with this question is the generally perceived notion that we don't already heed this warning in becoming attractional to any group -- including millennials. There is a commonly held belief that millennials can't be attracted unless they're given what they want, and told that it's okay to feel however they want to feel. From this belief comes a concern that, in order to attract millennials to our group, we'll abandon our principles in order to become "attractive". I simply do not affirm that belief. There is no special need to "heed

- Paul's warning" in relation to millennial attraction, because 1) it's not necessary to ignore Paul's words to attract them and 2) the temptation to do so exists in attracting *any* group of people to the Church.
- It may well be a matter of semantics, but one of the things I like about the Episcopal Church is that it seems, to me at least, very comfortable being "in" this world when so many fundamentalist/"evangelical" denominations seem to focus on "getting to heaven/being saved", i.e. getting to the "other" world. Transformation via "renewing of one's mind" never seems like a BAD thing to do, however! ;-) Transformation via "renewing one's heart" is even more appealing to me . . .
 - I think Paul's statement is presumptuous. We should not try to change their minds but understand where they are coming from. We should model the Love of God.
 - The better Pauline references might come from 1 Corinthians 3 where Paul outlines how he's adapted his teaching and care for the sake of the Growth of the church in Corinth, or better yet, "I have become all things to all people." The above verse lets us off the hook by thinking that we can change minimally and still succeed in attracting those who have minimal experience with or negative impressions of the Church.
 - I worry that this kind of reference ignores the very different way that millennials connect with their world. I'm all for transformation by the renewal of minds, but if your message is relevant, you've lost the battle.
 - Clearly, the "renewing of their minds" is not working, otherwise there wouldn't be a worry about churches closing and sustainable congregations. Something needs to change. That doesn't mean completely conform, but rather to embrace change. Understand this is a technologically focused group, and therefore to attract them a focus must also be placed on technology. Then there's the problem of image, how the word "church" can bring about certain negative connotations to the un-churched. It's probably the biggest obstacle to millennials, and something that a "renewal of minds" won't fix. Millennials need to see churches as part of the modern world, and how they fit into that.
 - I disagree with this question because it lacks all context and reason.

G Divergent

▼ The church should have more deacons doing ministry in the community in a way that builds relationships with non-church going millennials.

CD 67  26

- In my experience men and women who become energized by their faith (often in middle age) are the perfect evangelists for this century. They are a remarkable resource - ready to volunteer their time, do ministry in the community and spread the gospel both by word and their sacramental presence as servant to the disadvantaged. I admit that I am here raising the question of how long the tradition of the "paid professional minister" will last and posit an approach where the priest is the de facto bishop to several deacon-led groups.
- As the order of ministers who have one foot in the church and one in the world, I can think of no other group better suited to forge connections with non-church going millennials, especially those who are "spiritual but not religious" or "the nones."
- Using deacons in that way would force the church closer to the ground. Few people seek the priesthood, and the preparation for it is long and complicated. Deacons can be in places, and in numbers, that can't be achieved with priests.
- My understanding is that deacons are unpaid. I also understand that becoming ordained as a deacon is a rigorous process: expensive, emotionally wrenching, and time-consuming. Christian faith is necessary for the ministry described here, and a kind heart, and a willingness to build said relationships. But ordination to the diaconate is not required.
- Seeing deacons can enlighten that faith can be lived and expressed in different ways, and can be "of this world"
- Deacons Schmeeckens. Shouldn't all lay ministers (the Baptized) be working to build relationships with millennials? Why just Deacons? That's like "let's put it all off on the unpaid clergy in the universe." Why fall on deacons for crying out loud?
- Thinking outside the walls of the church is important to connect with younger people and those in the community. The emphasis on service and leading by example through the community (working with non-profits, schools, and the interfaith leaders) shows that creating a loving community where all of God's people are treated equally is more powerful, in some ways, than work going on behind the walls of the church.
- I know of no evidence that having deacons doing ministry in the community is going to build relationships with non-church-going millennials. Having lay people out doing God's work probably does.
- Slightly agree cause statement seemed to put burden for this on deacons.
- There is nothing wrong with more deacons reaching out to non-churchgoing millennials. Bless them both! My only reservation is that this is not the role only for deacons. My choice affirmed the potential of deacons doing this ministry without limiting it to deacons.
- Given the many time demands on millennials, it is difficult to convince them to spend time at church. Reaching out to them within their community directly offers an opportunity for contact. Having a deacon doing the ministry in the millennials environment shows that clergy are interested in them and are willing to embrace meet them more than half way.
- They have a special comfort and courage to occupy the space between community and church.
- Our church is very confused about what diaconal ministry is and where/how it is carried out. Different dioceses, different regions of the country do this differently. This statement is hard to fully agree with until we are clear about diaconal and baptismal roles in the church. I believe that all Christians should be in ministry in the community with our non-church-going neighbors, not just deacons.
- The only way to break the sense that clericalism is to be able to position people that are engaged in other forms of ministry beyond a full time position (which historically has been reserved for priest) deacons because of the nature of their ministry are already in the best position to address the issue in question
- We should have more PEOPLE doing this, not necessarily deacons. I feel this question assumes a particular division of duties amongst clergy and laity.
- Any actions taken to reach into the community, increase our impact upon society, enhance our communication help to bring enhanced 'value' to those who have not been raised in a faith community.
- The reason for the slightly agree is that we should not put that responsibility just on the deacons. Deacons are great and I hope we can grow that ministry. Becoming a deacon is a long process and sometimes a long process can deter what people want to do naturally. The question I think should be - how do we as a church develop disciples and apostles who are equipped to go out into the world?
- not just with millennials
- I think we do the church a GREAT disservice to one of the most incredible ministries in the church. AS millennials are attracted to servant ministry- the diaconal ministry is right there speaking to them and their role is to be in and out of the church as those who reach across and bring the church out and those into the church.
- The community needs to see Christians living in the real-world not only in a church/institutional setting. More "tent-making". Have more influence by identifying oneself as a Christian and showing Christian values and priorities through life rather than through telling.
- I agree with this statement because I would agree with it even if the word "millennials" were removed, or replaced with any other group of people. We need more boots-on-the-ground. And I believe a valuable way to invest our resources - financially and otherwise - is to reach outside ourselves and build relationships with non-churchgoers. Including but certainly not limited to millennials.
- I'm not sure this is specifically true for deacons vs. lay persons and all ordained people.
- This will be helpful to gain hands-on experience about the community and world they will be serving.
- Building relationships builds trust. Trust allows relationships to safely share thoughts which may not be heard unless the relationship of trust is developed.

- I have a tremendous amount of respect for the permanent diaconate because I personally know many people who serve so well in this capacity - I think people called to ordained but not priestly ministry have an incredibly important role in carrying the church into other institutions (hospitals, prisons, schools, etc.) and into relationships with other people.
- I just love this idea.
- I think it's always good to build relationships in the community and also I think there are many non-church going millennials who were raised in the church and who may come back to church at some point in their lives, particularly if there are clergy out there within their worlds whom they can relate to easily. True, "church" may look different as millennials age but having a spiritual family is a great support in life, even if you relate to that family in different ways as technology advances change things more and more.
- I think this could be one of many things deacons do. But mostly, I think whomever is working on this needs to have a passion for it - priest, deacon, or lay.
- Millennials are the future of churches, and even though they aren't necessarily members they can still support the church in other ways, such as designing graphics for the church, and attending church events that aren't really religious may influence them down the road.
- Specifically targeting non-church-going millennials can be off-putting and feel judgmental to those who are specifically targeted. I do think the church can do a better job even of engaging millennials who do go to church, and have generation-specific activities that include both church-goers and non-church-goers.
- I'm not sure that most Episcopal leaders have a clear view of the Diaconate. Which isn't really fair to this question, but it is part of why I answered this way. We should employ more deacons, and identify more transitional deacons, for the ministry of reaching into the millennial community. I am willing to bet that if we urge younger people into these roles, you will find that the mysterious millennials are not all the mysterious after all.
- This is true of deacons, other ordained persons -- and, of course, churching laity. Some deacons can build meaningful understanding and relationships with millennials and others. These relationships may or may not draw people to the worshipping community.
- Building relationships among God's people - churching and unchurching - in service is the example deacons are called to: "serve all people, particularly the poor, the weak, the sick, and the lonely" ... "interpret the needs, concerns, and hopes of the world" ... "at all times, your life and teaching are to show Christ's people that in serving the helpless they are serving Christ himself." (BCP, page 543, Examination in Ordination: Deacon) How better can we demonstrate the work of Christ and build relationships with those who care about the ills of the world?
- Same comment as last question: I do not think it is necessary for deacons to wear their collars in public places, unless they are in a venue which the Church should have a visible presence (i.e. protests, public forums, town-halls, etc). I do think that easily identifiable Episcopal clergy in spaces and at events where socially-minded millennials are present and looking to be engaged with like minded people, regardless of age, could have a positive impact on my generation's view of the Church.
- Get more people involved without the commitment of a full time cleric profession.
- Deacons' specific role is to be with and to communicate to the church the needs of people on the margins -- whether or not those people identify themselves as being on the margins. Why wouldn't we want to build more relationships in the community??

▼ Clergy should spend a significant part of their week wearing their collar in public spaces, (e.g. sports events, arts activities, coffee shops, community events).


CD 56  13

- The traditional role of the rector is to be the pastor/teacher/preacher/celebrant IN the church - equipping the saints for the work of ministry. This often means we are isolated from the rest of the world. I believe, however, that if we are not out in the community we miss the opportunity to witness to the continued meaning of the church in the world. This is particularly true for the family sized congregations which are the vast majority of our congregations. "Over half of Episcopal congregations (58%) are small, family-sized congregations where average worship attendance is 75 persons or less".
- I would not go to the mat for this one and I am speaking as a female clergy person in the south. I have tried it both ways. In this culture a woman in a clerical collar is somewhat of an anomaly. I have to search my own motives for wearing one - am I making a point or does wearing it actually help spread the message of the Gospel. I have found it often puts up barriers in individual conversations but witnesses in situations where the church is coming alongside others in a public forum. I prefer people to discover I am a normal person who happens to be a Christian than to start with me being odd or set apart and climbing from there.
- As a priest, I believe an important component of my ministry is visibility. Clergy have the ability to be present to their community, and whether people choose to engage with the clergy or simply notice that clergy are out in the world, such engagement puts a human face to the church. On several occasions I have had strangers approach me simply because I was out in a public space wearing my collar.
- I'm sure it will strike some clerics as a hassle. I think it is, certainly at a community level, of "flying the flag." At a time when religion and the religious are increasingly described as out of step with modern life it shows that our church leaders are out in public, participating in the life of the community. Ordained people have told me people just come up to them and talk...a gift brought on by the collar.
- Clergy should spend a significant part of their week in public spaces. But the collar is not altogether necessary. Individuals have different reactions to collars. This is why I said "slightly agree." Clergy need to be out, and need to have a feel for the community-- young, old, poor, well-to-do, but I would suggest clergy experiment on their own, sometimes wearing a collar and other times, in plainclothes.
- Seeing the collar in public "normalizes" the experience, and may help the non-churching see clergy as more accessible, more human, less as rigid representatives of an institution.
- Yes. Collars are a signal to the rest of the population that the person is a member of the clergy. An outward and visible sign, as it were. You cannot expect people to become interested in CHurch if they don't know you represent Church.
- Until becoming a member of the Episcopal community, I did not know that (Episcopalian) priests wore collars. Many of my friends who are Protestant or non-religious are unaware of this as well. As a way to help educate people, the more priests who are people of color, female, or homosexual that wear their color in public the more it demonstrates the inclusive and diverse nature of the Episcopal Church and its leaders.
- I go back and forth on this one -- in my opinion, as well as in my practice. It's all contextual. I wear it often (not always) in public places, but would, for example, probably never wear it to a sports event.
- In the communities in which I have served the clerical collar still is understood as a distinctive symbol of Christian ministry. When I wear my collar I have been approached with questions, concerns, or requests for prayers by young and old and Christians and non-Christians.
- If they are representing the church, I feel it is up to the clergy and the particular environment as to whether a collar is appropriate in public spaces.
- My priest has told many stories about random good conversations he had when collared, that would not have occurred otherwise.
- I think it's free advertising. If you're in your collar people are going to ask what church? It's a conversation starter.
- When I see clergy out of the church environment with their collars on having fun and doing the same activities that I enjoy - it gives me a sense of connection. The clergy person becomes more reachable and easier to approach. I think other people seeing clergy with the collar reminds us that ordained work also includes everyday activities and enjoyable events.
- It encourages us to act Christ-like.
- Depending on the culture, this can be very helpful and inviting or very distancing and provoking (in a negative way). The bigger, deeper issue revolves around how all Christians have a ministry of presence wherever they find themselves.
- It is a conversation starter.


- Church needs to go out to the people who are NOT coming in in order to be seen. Invisibility is not a mission technique
- I think that wearing the collar in public events shows that the church goes beyond the walls, is accessible and can be welcoming not off putting.
- If we don't wear our collars people won't know that the church is there with them, and we will become even less relevant. Having a public breakfast table each week and wearing my collar to it is creating a welcoming space in a local coffee shop and people are starting to get curious. However, I only slightly agree because clergy need their anonymous time in public too.
- I feel that when clergy wear their collar they are letting others know that they are proud of their relationship with God and the church.
- Participating in community activities, etc is important in attracting new members to the church. The "Piped Piper Effect". However this should not be at the expense of other ministries like pastoral care, evangelism, Christian formation.
- Being present in the community doing "normal" things invites others to engage with clergy in their settings. As I write this, I am in a Starbucks working in my collar. When I am out in my community, people engage me frequently. It also enables me to engage others on a more personal level.
- I have seen where wearing collar has clearly identified clergy is a benefit. During a march or in church the collar I believe is a benefit. I also think clergy need to have time to relax and not always be on when with their family.
- I think this is an incredible opportunity in a society where many people no longer participate in a faith community and may never have the opportunity to engage clergy in conversation. Although I am not ordained - and this may color my perception - the anecdotal stories I've heard from clergy are that when they wear their collars in public, they are often approached by people who have no other connection to faith communities, or who have severed connections because of past frustrations or hurts.
- In a secular society, it's important for the public to the clergy--and the laity with them--out and about.
- My parents were both clergy in another denomination and always felt their clerical garb was a positive witness in the world and I still agree with that notion. I certainly do believe, however, that clergy should feel free to wear "private" garb when they are in a place where they feel more at ease/comfortable without a collar.
- I think it is important to be seen as a priest among the community. It helps people connect with you and know who you are.
- My clergy friends have described their collars as "ask me about Jesus" signs and feel that the response from the public is generally positive. People are curious about religion but often afraid to ask or don't know where to start, and the collar gives them a way into a conversation that they might not otherwise have.
- Sure, why not? Some of the time, if not "a significant part of the week." Hanging in a coffee shop, participating in "Ashes to go" and other "get out there" expressions can be conversation starters toward meaningful relationships. Even though many or most people ignore persons who are obviously clergy -- and a few will ridicule us.
- I do not think it is necessary for clergy to wear their collars in public places, unless they are in a venue which the Church should have a visible presence (i.e. protests, public forums, town-halls, etc). I do think that easily identifiable Episcopal clergy in spaces and at events where socially-minded millennials are present and looking to be engaged with like minded people, regardless of age, could have a positive impact on my generation's view of the Church.
- Well, I always meet folks in public spaces and think its good for us to be visible in the community. I would actually say slightly agree....we can overdo it.
- In the Southeastern US, women clergy are still enough of an anomaly that being seen in public in collar is quite powerful. It becomes an open door for conversation more often than not and I am grateful for the opportunity to interact. People seem to think I am more approachable, perhaps even more so than what I hear from my male counterparts.

U Potential Unintended Consequences

U Convergent

Increasing parish resources to attract millennials will reduce those available to meet the expectations of existing members. CD 64  -18


U Divergent

Millennials attending our churches with religiously pluralistic beliefs will conflict with our traditional, stated Christian beliefs. CD 78  -39


B Issues and Barriers

B Convergent

Young people don't see enough people who are their age in our congregations. CD 81  48

Baby boomers make too many judgmental statements about millennials' behavior creating an unwelcoming environment. CD 63  15


B Divergent

It is very difficult to convince millennials to commit to the activities needed to run a church. CD 51  1


A financially stable, vital parish lacks urgency around engaging more millennials. CD 51  -6

A Underlying Assumptions/Current State


A Convergent

It is essential to the future growth of the church to support leaders who take risks on innovative ministries. CD 89  63

- There is a certain timelessness in much of what we do -- and I would say in the most important things we do. How we do them must change and adapt. I might have just as easily checked "agree" on this one.
- I don't see a connection between "growth" and "taking risks on innovative ministries." Sometimes, risky new ministries flop, or attract the same old participants. Being true to your core identity and core ministries is more important in attracting newcomers than creating risky new ministries.
- I think we must be judicious about which "innovative ministries" we support. Church in the Woods, for example, has generated a great deal of positive press and undertaken some laudable work, but it is at best a fringe endeavor. Our resources should be put behind those ministries that are most scalable and successful at bringing people into the church. At the moment, we either have NO idea what these ministries look like, or we are unwilling to fully commit to those we know to work (i.e. jettison our liturgy, polity, and political commitments and ape Willow Creek). ALSO, why would I switch my answer because other people think differently?
- Give me that old-time religion./ fads are fun


▼ **Endowed Episcopal parishes have the resources to experiment with new approaches to ministry.** ^{CD} 86  55

- Just because we are endowed doesn't mean we have access to the money. We have over a million in our endowment but still struggle every year. You just can keep going to the endowment every time you need money. You will drain your endowment.
- It depends on the way the endowment was positioned to donors when they made their donation decision. If completely unrestricted, then endowment income may be used as the appropriate governing body sees fit. Ideally, "new approaches to ministry" should be determined and funded by current parishioners unless an endowment is specifically devoted to new ministries.
- While some parishes have resources and like mine have dedicated dollars to young adult ministry, the results indicate money not well spent. An initial gathering was just ok in attendance and no commitment to attend future gatherings. Events/gatherings cost money and much of ours went to engage people who are already here, not the younger folks we were trying to attract.

▼ **There is institutional fear of a financial crisis in the Episcopal church as individual parishes decline.** ^{CD} 81  44

- While an important part of our fear as individual parishes may be declining is connected with finances, I believe a more important factor is the fear of lost identity. To that, financial struggles are a symptom of that loss of identity rather than the ultimate source. As Christians, community is crucial to our identity, and when communities dwindle, whether in individual parishes or the dramatic decline of the Episcopal Church as a whole, we naturally express concern about the viability of the church. In the end, I suspect we are all scared of losing our identity as Episcopalians more than any other factor.
- I don't see it yet in the Pacific Northwest, and certainly not at my church.
- Scarcity nags at us all, but God is a gracious giver.
- have not seen evidence
- I could switch to "agree". Aging buildings and declining congregations are a problem for most. However, If we can turn ourselves to seeing the possibilities and listening for the Holy Spirit in our situations, life becomes much more hopeful. Our bishop, Mark Beckwith, has been doing a great job in trying to help congregations begin to think positively and not just moan.
- If we can identify failing churches, we can come up with way to revive them. The more financially able churches can provide support to the churches that need assistance.
- While our parish remains quite strong and financially healthy, I know many others throughout the country that are not. I am not convinced mega parishes are financially thriving and looking at a secure financial future either. With the younger set, millennials, specifically, in my opinion haven't been brought up as church attendance being a priority in their lives. Therefore the financial support for such institutions is not second nature and not even on the radar. The church overall is in jeopardy as the our primary demographic that is supporting the church will soon be dying off and I am not sure who is going to rise up to keep the churches across the country alive and well.
- Individual parishes may be experiencing some anxiety about finances, particularly smaller congregations, but I don't think that equates to fear of an institution-wide crisis.

A Moderately Convergent

▼ **The Episcopal church is well positioned for millennials to explore their life's purpose.** ^{CD} 77  40

- Well positioned? Meaning prepared to do so, or well branded so that millennial know the EC is a resource? Slightly agree on former, disagree on latter.
- Outdated approach to mission and community engagement that does not listen to the needs of the average seeker before beginning outreach and/or evangelism.
- I don't think we use social media to it's potential. Plus with the decline in church attendance we are not reaching millennials like we should.
- We need more programs to encourage millennials participation as their own group. Additional intergenerational activities are also a good opportunity for participation.
- Millennials have too many options for spirituality and fulfilling life's purpose and the Episcopal church has not been explicit enough about why we are a good choice for them
- How is this happening?
- substitute "people's" for "millenials"
- I think the internal beliefs, plans and goals of the Episcopal Church may help them reach millenials but I don't think millennials know who or what the Episcopal Church is about. I don't know that "Episcopal" would come up if you asked them to name 3 Christian churches/denominations. Hopefully I am wrong.
- Well positioned as in having all the tools available (prayer book, Eucharist, rich history, etc.), but is the church today, as a whole, prepared to connect the gospel to a young person's life and future?
- I don't think the church is well positioned for millennials to explore their life's purpose if millennials aren't attending church. In order to be well positioned, the church needs to become important to millennials.
- The fact that most churches are asking what they have to do differently to attract millenials suggests that the churches are not so well positioned. If they were, they wouldn't be asking the question.
- Depends on the offerings and those who take advantage of those opportunities. Not feeling as if that is going to be happening.
- I think the Episcopal Church inherently is a place for questions and doubts. But I do not think we have made ourselves as accessible as we need too. We are not great at marketing what we do.
- The Episcopal Church needs to develop more programs that engage youth beyond pizza and games. I have seen youth grow in their faith when presented with the opportunity to explore challenging questions of contemporary concern from a theological standpoint, and gain the tools to articulate themselves as Christians.
- I'm not sure TEC has communicated that "exploring one's life purpose" is what we are about for ANY age group -- but we are very

good at communicating that we should all be exploring the purpose of the church in our lives. So we end up with a very church-centric focus to our message rather than a message of the church existing for the sake of God's people as God's gift to us.

▼ Millennials are interested in forming intergenerational friendships.

CD 74  30

- We have not found this to be true. While millennials enjoy mingling at an oyster roast or Shrove Tuesday dinner, there has been push-back when we have tried to form inter-generational classes or small groups.
- Yes they are - if the people in the friendships have pretty much the rather rigid world view they tend to have.
- May I be grossly wrong in this assessment! I have no evidence to the contrary. Most of the initiative for forming intergenerational friendships comes from the older generations, 50 year olds to 70 year olds.
- I believe millennials are interested in forming relationships, not necessarily friendships. On the flip side, I see boomers interested in mentoring more so than creating friendships.
- I don't believe that millennials are interested in forming intergenerational friendships. Millennials appear to be "all about me" and not interested in reaching beyond the "borders" of their immediate circles.
- Everyone says they are interested in diversity, but most people associate with persons like themselves. Millennials are no different.
- No, they are not. In my opinion or experience. They don't want to be in diverse groups in terms of ages.
- Intergenerational friendships can be beneficial, (emphasis on can) any Church cohort is looking to form bonds with those who share similar interests and life experiences. The gap between boomers and millennials in terms of life experience and expectation is vast, and it is the common experience of millennials that these relationships are fraught with judgement and conflict.
- The other end of the generations -- the people older than 60 -- are perhaps not modeling a desire from their end to have relationships with millennials. That message comes across as unwelcoming, so millennials may not desire intergenerational relationships when they don't perceive such a thing is mutually desired.

A Divergent

▼ Our congregations are not sustainable with participation of people younger than 40 about 35% less than the same demographic group several decades ago.

CD 66  21

- In 2014 figures from the Episcopal Church (see TEC website) over 55 percent of congregants in TEC are over 50. Only 10 percent are between 20 and 35. This percentage might increase as these folks age into the 35-50 group and have more stable lifestyles and are thinking about family but there is no way they will replace the current "top tier" without serious change. 67 percent of Episcopal Parishes have 40 percent of their parishioners over 65. There are lots of factors: 1. Financial. The 65 plus age group has a lot of accumulated wealth and discretionary spending power (notwithstanding glitches in the market) which younger generations will not have. 2. Stability. Episcopal Congregations are traditionally built around stable communities. Tasks are often complex for both congregations and volunteers and group norms and expectations are high and specific. The sort of learning and investment required to become normative member of these groups is not something which appeals to many younger people. This is a cultural issue - there are ways of maintaining identity without inducing guilt. Most congregations have no idea how they are perceived. It is the syndrome of telling your grandchildren off for using their phones at the table rather than providing an environment where they will not want to. 3. Generational. Generation X and beyond are not "joiners" or they are only joiners in limited circles. There is no cultural narrative that church is necessary or expected in many places. With less discretionary spending many are not willing to give to a cause which they see as primarily self-sustaining. Many Churches do not offer anything outside Sunday morning, so instead of being a main point of community they become an add-on to a busy life. Face with this narrative many church members reflect that they are reaching out, that the church is a hub and that "all" their friends are through the Church. This disconnect between internal and external dialogue is deadly. 4. Culture is not suspicious of hegemony. Traditional churches are hierarchical. This may change with the generation who were born after 2000. I stand by my answer. To be blunt, I think many people are naive.
- I don't see a clear path back into church at 40+ for the bulk of those stepping away under 40. Frankly, I think having young children is one of the biggest anchors to pull people back into the church (at least it has been for my peers). If we don't pull them in under 40 - and get them engaged/participating and taking ownership of the church's activities in even a small way - we aren't going to get them later.
- This age group is not the future, but rather the church of today. They must embrace leadership for the church to thrive.
- That's what we all think. But maybe the gift of the Episcopal Church is to attract the middle aged?
- Concerned about the education of this cohorts children, particularly as something in the world that can be a place of love, caring, kindness
- In my church people 40 and younger are a very small percentage of members. Also very few of them volunteer or are stepping up to be engaged in the church.
- This statistic certainly calls for deep listening and faithful initiatives to include more young adults. The church will continue as it shifts and as these persons pass the 40 year old mark seeking a deeper spirituality.
- We need to nurture the idea of commitment to the church community and set a back drop to encourage further participation in the church. As these young adults start to reach a point in their lives where they have more time (and money) to devote to church life, we want them to happily embrace it.
- This statement may be true in some places and not in others. Neighborhood, town/city, and regional demographics must be taken into account. In our diocese, we have one congregation that is in the middle of a retirement community. That congregation will never be dependent on how many people younger than 40 are present.
- Young families are key: parents waking up after the focus on themselves since childhood and hopefully a stable work life should lead them to consider the spiritual health of their children and we need to capture their engagement then.
- The word sustainable here least me to think of a holistic approach to healthy congregations our current job of welcoming younger generations is poorly done however I think it is a reflection of the old demographic that is part of the church in general. People will not be welcome and affirm when it is just a group of white older people the main demographic that the church serves
- Churches have always needed young people and especially young families to continue the next generation of Christian believers. Not only are these the people the fill the pews, they give hope across generations that God's hope and light are being shared with the world. With the rise of religious nones, many young adults have decided that the church isn't necessary for them to live out their convictions, be they political, social, or religious. While churches can live on with a small group of dedicated followers, the reality is that they are institutions that require funding to continue as they currently exist. This is especially true when a congregation has an older physical plant that requires significant capital maintenance funding. Churches cannot solely rely on existing investments, wills, estates, or endowments to carry them into the future - at some point that money runs out. Lack of commitment to pledging also seems to represent a lack of investment in the life of the church, or a belief that some of its work is better carried out by nonprofits dedicated to specific goals of easing societal ills.
- 20s - 40s are trying to decide if the church is relevant today. If efforts are not made for that age range, it effects not only that age but also their children. At the same time, 35% is not 100%.
- The engagement of young people, and especially young families who raise their children in church, is vital to the future of the church. The "Episcopal Handbook" says that 50% of Episcopalians are converts. And yet the church is smaller than it once was. This indicates that a great many of those raised in the church are no longer members, which is a fairly damning indictment of the ways in which the church has turned to social justice and away from nourishing its members to lead lives of Christian charity and conscience.

- People will die and if we are not bringing up new members of all ages we will only have a church of aged people. If we are not teaching discipleship and stewardship to all ages and bringing in the new (in 20 years old) leadership, we are in trouble. Perhaps I misunderstood the question?
- Without people younger than 40 we are missing the opportunity to raise up that generation in the practices, beliefs and morals of the church and the chance for them to pass on those things to their children. This makes reaching the current and future younger generations much harder. This is also a group that can have a strong financial impact on the Church - good or bad.
- The statistics indicate that the participation of younger people is declining steeply. The trajectory is towards extinction, which is clearly not a sustainable position.
- If we continue to lose young people, who will keep the church going?
- Close call here, don't think I have to make a strong argument
- This seems like a basic statistic statement - a congregation with significantly fewer younger members will be unsustainable as older members die off. There ARE congregations that have higher rates of participation from people under 40, and I believe those congregations will continue. We need to explore ways in which those congregations are effectively reaching and engaging younger generations.
- This would seem to be a duh question. Older members like myself are going to die off. Unless the later marriage of millennials and/or delay in having children, when many younger people go back to church, is skewing the numbers this seems to be the biggest problem facing the church today.
- I suppose my answer is extreme...but just seems like the demographic trend is not looking good.
- I think we will have "re-vision" what "church" looks like and how we engage people in order to sustain our congregations, we have to have people younger than 40 or we will die out (!) -- I don't think future congregations are going to look like what they used to several decades ago, ever.
- Not only is our population smaller in that demographic, they are also more likely to be busy with family matters, and prioritize that work (sports, scouts, etc.).
- This is a simple matter of math. The same demographic group was significantly larger several decades ago, and as we move forward many in that group are retiring, or paying for college, etc. So significant decreases already, coupled with a younger workforce that is A) smaller and B) less involved and therefore less willing to contribute.
- I think this is a fundraising fact. I also believe we should rethink sustainable.
- Many congregations have had a bigger drop than 35% in people under forty. If most people in the congregation are 65+, do the math to forecast the death of the congregation as its members die. Examples already abound -- across denominations.
- Our Churches are becoming grayer and grayer, self included.
- Most christian congregations are losing membership as their members die.
- We need young folks to grow older for many reasons particularly sharing time, talent, and financial resources
- Simple attrition by age, death, increased mobility due to economics, will tell you this is likely the situation is true. However, we have to redefine "sustainability" according to what exactly we wish to sustain: the physical plant? The relationships? The worship traditions?

Without transformational change the vast majority of un-endowed Episcopal congregations will close in 25 years.

CD 66  17

- The research is hard to deny. Attendance of those born after 1980 is significantly less than previous generations. At the current rate (70 per year) 1750 churches will close in the next 25 years...and the rate sadly will probably increase as this generation ages.
- My personal theory is that this is as much about how we do as what we do (within limits of course!). If we are engaged, transparent, honest and willing to enter into conversation which may change our own view then we are appealing - God shines through us. If we are stuck in the past, holding on tightly, judgemental and controlling we strangle the life out of the Church. The latter is often true. People have no idea they are doing it, are reluctant to face reality and then have no idea how to fix it. We will die in sterile traditionalism if we cannot figure out how to live into a holy and uplifting tradition. If we cannot, the majority of Episcopal Congregations will die within 25 years.
- Some of the endowed parishes will close within this time period, too. And this is not a reason, or a time, to be without hope. Some things about how we are church are changing.
- Current consumer culture doesn't understand pledging or value investing in institutions for the long-term. Continuing as if it's the same as 100 years ago threatens existence.
- They might. They might not. They might be getting endowments and just not know it yet. Also, what is the definition of transformational change? That's a pretty loosey goosey word.
- If churches don't change to meet the needs of all generations and they keep losing members, then they will close. Churches need to be leading by example on what it means to be a force for good, take care of others, and be sustainable for the future.
- I only said "slightly agree" because I do not have hard data to substantiate my impressions. It is true, however, that without engaging younger generations, our congregations will not survive. I don't know what that timeline looks like.
- It seems to me that the "non-denominational" church is becoming more and more popular, but doesn't seem to keep parishioners for more than a few years. As a cradle Episcopalian, I have a tough time with the strict Roman upbringing of many of my friends. Having said that, we have a healthy respect for consequences for our actions (or lack of) in and outside of the church. This has got to be hard for smaller churches, while the larger ones will continue to grow in my opinion.
- Without transformational change, churches in general will close, particularly smaller ones
- I believe that some congregations will close, but I do not believe that the "vast majority" - what is that? 60% or 70% or more - of congregations will close in the next 25 years. Some? yes. That many? no.
- The demographics and trends are against us...just a fact.
- There is way to see a sustainable future for smaller un-endowed congregations we had filed to make the demographic shifts when it mattered. Now we cannot even find a way to welcome and affirm minorities in the church
- Follow the money. Without looking fresh at funding structures, we can't keep paying the light bills.
- In my limited experience of visiting smaller Episcopal churches after living in a large city with Texas-sized Episcopal congregations, as well as working in three major mainline denominations, I believe that Episcopalians on the whole are introverts. While providing hospitality well in some cases, the connection beyond that can be lacking unless a new member shows intense interest in lay worship ministries or wants to join a guild. In other cases, hospitality has been awful. It's like people need a refresher on how to act at a party or how to make small talk for coffee hour. They behave in ways they never would at the grocery store (lack of eye contact with someone walking by you), walking their dog (at least waving hello), immediately asking you to teach Sunday School just because you have a young child. I once brought my toddler to a church and found my way to the fellowship time for coffee despite lack of signage and no one inviting me. Once we sat down at a table (as the youngest adult with the youngest child in the room), people came and took all the other chairs taken away so people could sit with folks they already knew. The final straw was a woman coming up to me (without telling me her name) and telling me to "be sure to introduce yourself to anyone you don't know." If that is considered welcome, no wonder young people don't want to come to church. I'm more warmly greeted at my local coffee shop. The Episcopal church has a unique and beautiful offering in the array of Christian practice. For instance, it is one of the big churches that did not split over slavery and has worked to own up to its sins in that regard. That is a powerful message in a time of deepening racial divides in our country. Our Presiding Bishop speaks truth to power. Our practice of common prayer is deep, beautiful, and sobering. We need to be able to

- become storytellers to connect people with those messages. We need to become bond-forgers to make new friends, and to be comfortable with those friendships looking different than in eras past.
- There is an increasing concern that contributions due to other pressures, will decline over the coming years. In our church, the elderly are among the larger contributors.
 - I think that all churches, endowed or un-endowed, need a vision that proclaims the Gospel and acts like Christ in the world. Church is not where people come to pretend they are perfect, it should be that people come together as broken people to care for a broken world because we are strengthened by Christ. The Church has a unique opportunity to be the one place in this world where people can be themselves and are equipped to grow in their faith.
 - Those parishes that have strong clergy leadership, who root a congregation in the knowledge and love of God and of his Son Jesus Christ, I think will endure. But most un-endowed congregations are staffed with bumbling do-gooders who are ill equipped to raise up disciples of Christ. They are very nice people, but they cannot cultivate a congregation. As a result, our un-endowed parishes are sort of like mediocre mafias, which beget every rigid, unwelcoming trait that people rightly lament in parish churches. If we understand that water seeks its own level, then the transformational change we seek must begin with (a) recruiting men and women of faith and judgment to the ordained ministry and (b) making it possible for those with talent to serve in small, less well resourced churches (i.e. via free seminary tuition).
 - what more is there to say?
 - Without reserves to fall back on for radical new initiatives, churches will keep on doing business as usual, which isn't working, and they will ultimately have to close. The church will be transformed but it may be a death and resurrection scenario,
 - Church membership continues to decline - if things do not change, congregations will be forced to close due to lack of funding.
 - I would change my opinion to agree, as over 50% of the parishes in my diocese have part time rectors/vicars. However, people hate losing their church home and will do a great deal to keep them open. This is after going to diocesan convention since I filled out the form.
 - I'm confused here, it seems my answer aligns with the majority answer, why am I flagged?
 - WE need to come to the aid of failing churches and actively step into support them and their community.
 - I made a mistake. I do think there will need to be transformational change in the Church or lose the community to others who know how to create an environment people want to belong to.
 - Again - statistics. If the majority of Episcopal congregations (endowed or otherwise) don't have enough members to sustain them, they will most likely close. However, that's not to say that thriving congregations don't exist - they do. It's not to say that small congregations can't be vibrant - they can. I believe that we "are" undergoing a fundamental transformation in which the idea of doing "church" is becoming more about community engagement than being limited to worship on Sunday. Congregations that engage in their community and in the wider world will exist; I believe inward facing congregations will be more likely to fold.
 - See above, yes unfortunately.
 - Same as above; the trend is not good. That loyalty to institutions is just not there in this younger generation of millennials.
 - It's very difficult to 1) have as much staff as we'd like in my parish (clergy and lay) and 2) to keep our historic building repaired, clean and in good physical shape -- even with an endowment, so I can't imagine what it must be like for parishes without endowments! It seems to me that transformational change is vital for ALL of us and particularly so for un-endowed parishes. Declining numbers almost always mean declining income and declining income makes it harder and harder to keep afloat and to keep the doors open.
 - Unendowed Episcopal Churches have a a more real understanding of what it means if we are not thriving. We have no cushion.
 - With an aging majority of most churches moving toward retirement, a strong focus needs to be placed on youth and young adults to ensure they will be involved throughout their lives. Otherwise churches begin to lost a lot of money, numbers dwindle, and churches are forced to shut down.
 - The current model just isn't sustainable with the current level of attendance among people who are going to be alive in 25 years. There also just aren't that many young people with a lot of disposable income who can and/or want to give a substantial proportion of that income, and so a tithe/pledge model for church incomes is becoming less and less sustainable.
 - The vast majority in a quarter of a century? Who knows. But if living, giving members die off and are not replaced, who funds the ministries? A related question is what to do with the endowment funds of churches that fail despite having money in the bank.
 - My state has seen the demise, and sometimes closure, of several congregations in the past two years due to financial difficulties.
 - I slightly agree, because church membership across the country is in decline. I do not know more on the statistics, so I cannot go into specifics. Personally, I think that the "transformational change" has happened in the Episcopal Church. The issue is, do millennials know about it? I do not think so. This is more of a branding issue rather than a change issue.
 - Not sure it's just the ones without the endowments that are at risk, but we must begin to redefine what it is we desire to keep "open" instead of letting something "close." The buildings? The programs? The clergy involvement?

▼ Church leaders are genuinely seeking ways to better engage millennials.

CD 58  6

- I see evidence of this when speaking to leaders in all denominations.
- I think the will is there but I also think that it is much harder than this. "Millennials" find the "millennial" tag insulting - it is as if they are an alien race who "we" are trying to incorporate (I have heard this from many in this age range). The generational traits of those born from the early eighties to the close of the millenium trend in certain directions, electronic media being one. The problem is "Millennial" to most people means "anyone who is under 35". In order to engage folks, especially younger folks, there is often a struggle to find "new and exciting" ways of being church. These can be spectacular. Often though, they are external actions without any theological reflection or understanding of Anglican and Episcopal polity. The dilution of identity can be devastating. We are not called to compete with Saddleback. Many of the approaches I see are underfunded, underresourced and most of all done grudgingly. It sets up a feedback loop. We have changed for you (millennials) and you still are not interested. Well, of course they are not interested, they are attending half-hearted worship which is full of people gritting their teeth because noone really likes it. The actual solution is much, much harder work. It is about each congregation finding identity and passion within their life in Christ and having confidence that it really is OK and wonderful to do this as Episcopalians. It is not a quick fix. Not everyone will like it. Numbers may not grow quickly. Some churches will close. But, by allowing communities to build strong and confident identity we lay solid building blocks. Leaders and clergy then become coaches, not military commanders. This is much riskier work because it removes the veneer of the all-knowing from the clergy. No, leaders are not genuinely seeking better ways to engage millennials, they have never been taught to ask the questions, or given the materials and support that will allow them to do that.
- Every church I have ever encountered has said they want their congregation to attract more young families and young adults. While those efforts may not always be successful or have complete congregational buy-in, I do not doubt that church leaders are genuine in their desire to engage with millennials.
- As a millennial (have I mentioned that I hate that term), I get pointed to in meetings regularly (no kidding) with statements like 'well, let's ask our millennial how her group would feel about that.' I do think they are thinking about it. The problem is that they are seeing millennials as a stereotype and not as the complex group of adults (not even particularly young adults!) we are - parents, dual-working couples, community leaders, volunteers in multiple organizations with strong skills.
- It is an understandable fallacy to assume that because we haven't been extremely successful, we aren't doing anything. Dioceses around the country have been experimenting with liturgies, physical spaces, and outreach meant to touch the unchurched in the way our traditional buildings and approaches don't. The Christian "brand" is battered, this is not something we're going to fix quickly or easily.

- I have seen a growth in ministry to young adults
- Yes they are. They are genuinely seeking ways - just not always successful.
- It depends on the parish, but most of the clergy I have talked with are seeking ways to better engage millennials. Although it is appreciated, I do find it frustrating when church leaders use this idea that millennials are so different that the church has to change everything. The church needs to evolve and has evolved throughout history. So, it is more productive to say that with the rise of technology, population shift, and social changes that have occurred in the last 20 years there are new ideas that need to be discussed as a way to better connect with all generations.
- I'm pretty sure we all want to. We are certainly experiencing greater engagement from millennials in our parish, and we're doing it by being authentically who we are. We are not "marketing" to millennials, but we are definitely see millennials in our congregation taking initiative to reach out to their own peers, and drawing them in in increasing numbers. Our new Senior Warden just turned 30, so we are taking steps to live into a generational transfer of leadership in what has until recently been thought of as an aging parish.
- I answered slightly agree because in my experience clergy are thinking and talking about how to engage millennials, but decisions and programs lag.
- In our church, both clergy and lay leaders are reaching out to millennials - in person and also in various types of media. We are not reaching all, but are off to a good start.
- In my church, we have a special 20s and 30s group, to encourage friendships and participation among young adults. We have increased our social media postings, primarily on Facebook and Instagram. We name millennials to committees and task forces whenever we can, to get their opinions and participation.
- We discuss this at our vestry meetings. We are always looking at better ways to engage people of all backgrounds and ages in our church community.
- They are coming to us, seeking. We must respond and seek to understand.
- Would like to see more of an effort to share our traditional, biblical more structured faith with millennials. We must strongly make our case/
- I think church leaders have always wanted to draw in young people, no matter what the generation. So, I do think that some church leaders are genuinely seeking ways to engage the current generation of young adults. It is hard to know where to begin, though, because with this particular generation, there are not a lot of practices that have yielded consistent results. This is largely due to the fact that millennials aren't super easy to define or pin down. With a population of young people that is transient, participating in multi-generational living situations, and more non-comital than generations past, it is hard to "meet them where they are." There is no magic pizza party or contemporary music service that will bring them into the doors in droves. Many young people have also been hurt by the church, so coaxing them in isn't easy. This is where I think relationships are paramount - church leaders can best engage millennials by befriending them. Do things you like to do and meet people. One thing millennials despise is a lack of authenticity. Go read at a coffee shop, go to art shows, go to concerts. With the widespread use of social media, access to audio files and video streaming, young people have new ways of connecting to churches and remaining connected even after they are no longer geographically nearby. If you establish relationships with people and deeply care about them, what shapes your life will no doubt seep into theirs. Also, this is where the church needs to do what it does best, be the church. Young adults, like other adults, have a desire for depth and meaning, conversation and engagement. So, do worship really well. Strive for excellence in a few things. Offer inter-generational activities. Don't stratify based solely on age. There is nothing more terrifying about visiting a church where it is clear that you are one of the only young people and you feel like they won't let you leave until you've signed up to bring your friends or help them infuse their flailing young adult ministry with new blood. Just be a person. Demonstrate interest in others. Some of the most "successful" ministries I've seen to engage young adults are service projects open to the entire congregation. This is a group of people that grew up getting mandatory service hours in school, logging community service time for college applications, going on mission trips if they were involved in youth groups as teens. Dedicated church leaders should be out in the community forging alliances with nonprofits, other faith leaders, and community businesses. One of my favorite ways that our curate got to know the congregation was hosting pizza and evening prayer at her house. 10-15 people would show up and chip in \$5 for pizza and we'd hang out and say either compile or evening prayer depending on when the majority of people came from work. I met the head of a major art museum, an IBM exec, people younger than me, people my age. It was low-key and an opportunity to get to know people. Easy entry points are what is needed. Finally, expect more of people you already have, not less. The large, thriving mega-churches that engage young adults most are the ones that have stringent codes of living. That doesn't have to be replicated, but a call to a life of prayer is indeed a difficult road to walk.
- This is a frequent topic for discussion and concern in our church.
- I think there is progress in the church to engage millennials but my fear is that the church thinks millennials are in need of a production instead of something authentic. Millennials want depth.
- going to conferences and trading reponses :) Again, not just millenials
- Okay, some are doing a better job than others.
- I think they know there is a problem but they don't know how to address the problem. Leaders are more concerned with day-to-day issues and needs. They will attend a workshop/training but only implement something if someone in the church takes the lead.
- Any number of national church leaders and thinkers are trying really hard to figure out how to engage millennials. The people in the pews, not so much. The leaders of my parish are sincerely concerned with this issue.
- I live in an affluent suburban community, where millennials may not be able to afford, unless they are with their parents. So I would love to reach out to millennials at our local colleges, but we simply haven't done that. I believe church leaders in other areas are trying to reach out.
- In my role, it has been my experience that church leaders are genuinely and actively looking for ways to engage many new groups, including millennials. There has been real interest in reaching this group with both new and existing programs, Bible and book studies, church activities, and digital resources. While I certainly hold space for the idea that this isn't the case across the board, I do believe there are many leaders looking for ways to be successful in their outreach to millennials.
- True....we could use guidance though. Involve young people and make them decision makers for ther church future.
- This is only an observation from what I hear clergy say as they try to bring those young folks into the church
- We now have a relatively young rector and he is actively seeking to engage more with younger members, particularly millennials
- Yes, and we need to generate more ideas and rich conversations around this topic and share the inspirations and good ideas broadly and joyfully.
- I believe church leaders see millennials as the future of the church, naturally -- if we are not genuinely seeking to engage them, we are foolish!
- That has been my experience both in our church and the Episcopal Church in Massachusetts attended by our 28 year old daughter.
- A lot of church leaders realize or are beginning to realize that this has to be a focus moving forward, and while more can always be done, some steps are being implemented, at least at the few churches I'm familiar with.
- I feel genuine interest from church leaders in young people, but often not a good understanding of practical and effective ways to actually engage young adults. Activities that require a great deal of time or money aren't appealing to us because we don't have much of either, and those organizing activities often don't understand that the reason millennials don't participate is because we simply don't have the resources to give. That being said, we are still hungry for meaningful engagement and would welcome creativity and flexibility on the part of those seeking to engage us.
- I believe that things like are genuine. Just horribly misguided.
- Most congregations are not doing enough in this regard. And we sometimes talk about doing ministry with millennials -- with no

millennials as part of the conversation. Similar to planning or "doing" ministry with seniors without asking them how these ministries should be shaped.

- I do not know of many clergy who are uninterested in engaging young adults. I think that my generation's issue is not with Jesus, or clergy, or the Church, but their perception, and the public face, of the Church. I believe millennials want to love and be loved, to find a place where they are not a topic of discussion or "mission field" but an individual who is valued.
- Agree, but it is hard as this generation still does not have roots.
- We know we need to do it, but rarely are pushing for resources and don't know how or even have the energy to go there.
- More of our energy is spent attending to the status quo than we would like to admit, and paying lip service to the "engagement of millennials."

▼ Our society risks losing its moral compass as we become an increasingly unchurched society.

CD

57



17

- I looked at this from a local perspective and I live in an area that has been called the buckle in the Bible Belt. We are still a very highly churched and reasonably homogeneous city where they may not be as much evidence of moral decay. If I had thought about this from a global perspective I probably would have answered differently.
- Church is one of the only institutions that exists to teach love, generosity, forgiveness.
- Although many people do not go to church, by in large they are highly ethical - especially the millennials. They are committed to philanthropy, environmentalism, health on all levels - but tend to see the Church as not supporting those areas in the public square.
- I'm not convinced that we are any more at risk of losing our moral compass than at any other time in our history. It is always a risk. And it is always easy to imagine that we are more at risk now than at other times. I also take issue with the correlation to our increasingly "unchurched society." It presumes, first of all, that our being "churched" directly correlates with our having a strong moral compass. Given the tendency for "churched" folks to vote overwhelmingly for the most morally questionable character in a presidential election ever, I question this correlation. And as for us becoming increasingly unchurched, I would prefer to believe that a realignment is taking place, and that the church for many is becoming increasingly relevant, and even thought of more favorably in recent polls.
- I've grown up in the church and to me it is a second home. The more violence I see in the news, the more I wonder if people in general have lost their moral compass.
- Church revives a consistent, unflinching moral compass. Society can be very moral, but there can be subtle erosion over time. I see lots of acceptance of lying.
- Religious institutions have the potential to provide a deeper foundation and source for society's "moral compass," namely a deep connection with the Divine that connects us all and a community that regularly nurtured a deepening spiritual life. Of course, religious institutions can also do the opposite. My choice is grounded in a hopeful and faithful view of the positive character of communities of faith.
- I'm actually neutral on this statement. Morality is certainly encouraged through the formal church, but a moral core can be achieved through good works, positive activities and a strong faith in God.
- Church can be a School of the Spirit, where deep truth and meaning of life may be discovered. The alternative un-church society seems shallow, skin-deep, lost. The Spirit is not confined to the church, but it does like to pause therein.
- Our society is currently increasingly preoccupied with politics while being decreasingly grounded in values-based commitments and conversations. People don't have the language, habits, and community connections they need (religious and otherwise) to be able to work out their differences and still treat one another with respect and dignity.
- I believe there are other legitimate "moral compasses" available to young folks and we must COMPETE for hearts and minds. Things like social justice initiatives, simplification, hindu/kindness philosophies, etc.
- Religion in general can provide a moral anchor. Christianity in particular demands something of those who bear the name.
- Regrettably, the family structure/strength is under pressure from: divorce, financial pressure, job losses, drugs, etc. So where can folks turn? If they have not included faith of some sort, where is their barometer? So to speak, where is their fallback?
- Jesus called us to be radical. Loving our enemy, caring for the widows and orphans, visiting those in prison, are all actions that I do not believe come naturally. It is the church that calls us to care for others and to put aside our selfish nature. Being in a Church environment provides us with opportunities and can hold us accountable.
- Absent the Gospel command, why should anyone really care about his neighbor? In such a world, human relations all reduce to competition for power and domination. This should worry us Christians a great deal, as concepts of justice and mercy cannot be separated from self interest without Christ.
- ethics are increasingly situational, from police shootings to abortion as birth control.
- The many and varied voices of society have a much easier time being heard because of today's de-centralized communication systems. The Church has been and can be a central supporter of a particular moral setting that can then support/create a larger and louder voice through institutional channels and the personal channels of its members.
- I believe that the combination of no faith formation with the absence of ethical education in schools does lead to a societal loss of a moral compass. That's why we are seeing such a rapid increase in hateful acts since the election: when people feel encouraged by the administration to act out of hate there's nothing to hold them back.
- If we become an unchurched society, I am concerned that we will lose one of the most important places where we learn about morality.
- Millennials seem more interested in going through the big door of materialism vice the small door of salvation. This has hurt the Traditional Churches. It seems that be entertained is more important than learning about the Bible
- There are not many places in our world where we can talk about moral and ethical issues. At its best, churches can be such a place.
- I grew up unchurched. Although I had a sense of morally right and wrong, I struggled to find a strong reason/basis for these opinions. That made it much harder to hold to what would be morally OK.
- The inability of our families and communities to united together to build common ground. Individual value systems seem to be interpreted and influenced by our personal view of the world and what we believe to be important which may not be shared by others who have traditional values system.
- This was a difficult statement in the way that it was worded. My issue is not so much that society is "unchurched" but increasingly secular. I think people of faith - of all faiths - have a role to play in not so much 'morality' but offering an alternate narrative to the consumer/success/individualistic one that is perpetuated by society.
- I think that although I personally would prefer people to have some church affiliation many people who do not have a church relationship have perfectly good moral compasses.
- Although I certainly acknowledge and appreciate an innate sense of good v. evil and how our families and the larger culture form us as moral beings, I still see and appreciate the unique and essential role that religious institutions--not just churches--play in forming us and supporting us in our moral development.
- I think the church has a voice to share and we are losing that voice as we lose our ability to reach the unchurched.
- I can understand disagreeing with the politics of churches today, and there are a lot of them, but religions in general teach some of the most important life lessons about caring for each other and living a good life. The physical locations are also opportunities to care for the underprivileged and provide unique opportunities that much of society would otherwise be sheltered from. You can only learn so much from TV, and nowadays you can't believe half of what you see anywhere.
- I have witnessed that the Church helps people to love their neighbors as themselves. This provides the basis for a moral society.

Thoughtful theology leads to care and community. My evidence is the lives of the thousands I have seen come in to the church and become more responsible moral citizens.

- We are becoming an increasingly unchurched society. Demonstrably. This loss in communities of faith can erode the moral compass of the larger community, society or culture. (On the other hand, extreme, radical faith beliefs can cause divisions and animosity rather than civil discourse and religious dialogue.)
- I think we've all heard an increasing number of unchurched young persons say "I'm spiritual but not religious," which I believe is, at least partially, due to unethical behavior of some religious leaders. While overall, there is a proven correlation between ethical/moral standards and religion, but social conventions and codes of conduct also play an important factor.
- Not necessarily unchurched, but poor family structure and role models.
- I am basing my opinion on what I'm seeing in many people's lives who have lost connection to the church and or other faith communities that help shape character.

A Ungrouped

▼ Are there any other comments you would like to make regarding engaging millennials?

- We will need to consider "tent maker" ministers and "churches without walls" if we are going to remain relevant in the coming decades.
- There is a danger in using the term "millennials". I have answered the survey - but we are generally highly patronising of people under 40. Millennials are no longer teens and often have stable relationships, careers and children. The post-millennial generation is going to be an interesting one - will they truly have lost the baby-boomers hatred of institution and find that the hyper-individualism of gen x and ad hoc communities of the millennials actually lead them back to a more modernist approach to life. Some of my kids are millennials, some post-millennials - none want to be patronised by church, all want to ask questions and my millennial children want to be allowed a plurality of belief without judgement. Uniformity and standard practice are items of a bygone age. Off the shelf is not going to work. Living with our people, learning names and passions and worries. Allowing wisdom no matter age. Trusting in our own ability to grow together and trusting in our own way of being church without apology seem more important than a rather old fashioned version of schemes and curricula. Passion breeds passion, engagement breeds engagement. If we are in the courts of God, it shows and it is profoundly appealing.
- As a millennial, I caution against making too many assumptions. This is an age group with a wide range of life experiences, and ministering to young singles out of college is different than ministering to young couples with children. We also rarely consider millennials who choose a path other than traditional 4-year colleges. Ministering to millennials does not necessarily mean creating new ways of engagement; see St. Mark's Cathedral in Seattle, with their great success in drawing in millennials for traditional sung Compline.
- "Millennials" are not some alien species that came from some other planet. They are our neighbors, workmates, friends (or, at least, our kids' friends). Yes, there are some cultural differences, but don't make them out to be exotic, unknown, unknowable.
- Millennials need to be leading this charge. Too many workshops and conferences led by Gen X people to speak about Millennials.
- They are all different--all individuals. I dislike generalizing about groups of people, whether by age, ethnic origin, economic status, etc.
- Formal dress expectations can be a turn off for millennials. Special informal services can be important. A mix of mystery, outreach, community, and formation is golden. Contemplative prayer (Christian meditation) can be a way of linking experiences of mindfulness with ancient Christian tradition. The harvest is plentiful!
- You might consider attending Friday's presentation at CEEP on what the Diocese of Indianapolis is doing to respond to this need.
- I see some flaws in the reasoning of these survey questions. The issues are important, but they are important across the generations and across the church. I infer an "us and them" mentality in these questions. Millennials will not save the church, but they do help change it.
- Regarding question 15, millennials are not less likely to commit, they just commit in different ways than the church has historically asked people to commit. They will volunteer for service projects, and projects that build relationships; they will commit if a role has a shorter time frame (ex teaching Sunday School for 6 months, vs signing on for a year). Regarding 23, the increasingly unchurched society is a GIFT and OPPORTUNITY for the church - if we think the society had a superior moral compass in the 50s and 60s which we are losing today, we are not paying attention. Regarding questions 1, millennials have a bull-shit detector, and they won't stick around if they feel a church/community is being inauthentic. Authenticity and risk are what the church needs to nurture - which are also values of the gospel.
- Many of the questions on this survey are grounded in assumptions which I believe need to be challenged. Among these are assumptions that all congregations need to change their practices and engage millennials when in many cases congregational life is constructed in such a way that millennials will have no interest. Another assumption seems to be that engaging millennials is a/the focal point for efforts to save congregations and the denomination as a whole. This assumption is in error. Congregations need to engage their neighbors and the particularities of life in their unique context. I am currently researching and writing about several aspects of ministry in mainline congregations which cause congregations not to be as inviting, welcoming and spiritually sustaining as they are called to be.
- Time pressures and the closed minded attitudes of some older parishioners keep millennials from attending Sunday services. They could be engaged through service opportunities and could connect with multiple generations through those events.
- thank you!
- I know "millennials" often hate being described/categorized as such. Because people born in that generation are media-saturated, they have very strong BS detectors: making church "to attract more young people" is different from living into an authentic calling as a faith community.
- 1. Don't talk about "attracting" millennials. As a millennial and a priest, I can tell you, millennials don't want to be "attracted". We want to be a living part of authentic community, worship, and service. We are used to being sold items and we can smell it a mile away. 2. The number one way to increase millennial participation is to invite them into important leadership roles in the parish. Don't make them the heads of youth or young adult ministries -- elect them onto your vestries and as delegates to diocesan convention. Continue to ordain them, and support them and their families with decent parental leave and other such benefits. 3. Moreover, do NOT try to reach millennials by putting worship online. Millennials LIVE ONLINE -- our jobs are on computers, our social lives are on computers. Millennials want living, breathing, participatory worship that feels grounded in ancient tradition. My former bishop had most recently served as dean of the cathedral in Louisville, KY, and there the most popular service for college students and young adults was 9pm compline with candles and incense on Friday and Saturday night -- they'd go worship and then go out with their friends. Questions like #4 above are for BABY BOOMERS, NOT for Millennials. See https://www.washingtonpost.com/opinions/jesus-doesnt-tweet/2015/04/30/fb07ef1a-ed01-11e4-8666-a1d756d0218e_story.html?utm_term=.041748c71788 4. If your reason for wanting millennials in the pews is to keep your church from closing, then you're starting from the wrong place -- and millennials will know it. They will know that you are reaching out to them out of selfish wants and fears rather than out of genuine love and concern for them, and they will not come. They want to be needed out of love and genuine desire of their participation and community, not so that they can help you pay your bills. Live the Gospel authentically, invite them to the Table, and they will come.
- Most churches and leadership do not understand millennials because the current leadership has been in their position for longer than any previous generation of clergy. Generation X has incredibly small representation within the church which means there was never a transfer to GenX and now Boomers are attempting to relate to millennials, of which I am one, in a way that could not be more unauthentic. The church is too focused on a millennial silver bullet that will be fired by a Boomer when in reality they need to share in ministry with other generations and allow them to flourish and be okay with mistakes made on the way. This is one of my passions and

- right now people are seeking, people want some meaning, they yearn for what we have to offer, but are the Boomers ready to give up the hold on leadership they have held onto since the 1970s?
- It's really, really hard, mostly because they tend not to be institutionally-oriented when it comes to their life w/ God -- not that they don't love the togetherness, the beauty of corporate worship, the perks of nice facilities, etc. -- but they aren't necessarily interested in inheriting the whole kit-and-kaboodle. It's hard to know how much of the is an issue of poor inculturation or simply a true and honest manifestation of where the Church is headed -- in which case, we'd better change our business model soon. That said, I'm not sure I'm seeing that generational disposition as significantly different than our X-ers and Boomers. In each generation, there's a small number of 'Church works' who show up to do the business, and that vast majority of others, I believe, are about the work of discipleship in their daily lives w/o committing to institutional preservation. In my mind, that's simply an issue of good gifts/vocational discernment. We don't need everyone committed to 'the business,' but we do need some. The real issue is: does 'the business' support and amplify the Mission or does it inhibit and diminish it. I think these next 25 years will tell us a lot about what's essential and what isn't when it comes to gathering, praying, learning, and serving as God's people. It will be painful, in many instances, but ultimately liberating and life-giving, I trust. Thanks for doing this and look forward to your good work enriching the Church! Bless you, P+
 - Young adults really don't want to be called millennials. They want to be seen as having strengths and gifts they can contribute. 20s and 30s want to see the church loving neighbor as themselves despite religious preference, race, or class. They want to be the church in the world. Put your money where your mouth is and support ministries that better the world. Challenge everyone, have a vision and work towards that vision in constructive ways.
 - The items above are asking the wrong questions, based on assumptions that demonstrate little comprehension of the generation in question, or of the nature of religious engagement in the 21st century. Most of these queries have built-in assumptions that the two millennials completing this questionnaire together find false. They are, in order (1) the idea that millennials will be attracted by non-traditional worship and "new approaches" (these may attract people to non-Episcopal churches, but are useless to the mainline); (2) the belief that millennials are unengaged; that (3) new approaches to ministry are the panacea to our problems; and (4) that it is the FORM of worship rather than the theological poverty and social vacuousness of most parishes that discourages involvement of millennials (and, frankly, those of any other generation).
 - Start early
 - Engagement must begin with the Prayer Book and worship. These are the fundamental, elemental and authentic characteristics of the Episcopal church. The sacramental liturgy expressed in and from Prayer Book has to resonate and have meaning to millennials. The church is a worshipping body. For the body of Christ ministry is what comes from worship. Ministry in and of itself is social service. If the church subsumes the Prayer Book and worship in the hope of gaining attendance it will have surrendered its authenticity, and will lose a generation.
 - Engaging millennials means welcoming families and new technologies. Families that may not offer the pledging income available to counter the costs to run the programs that the church needs to offer. But the church should realize that without them, there will be no future.
 - It's tempting but probably counter-productive to try a one-size-fits-all approach for millennials.
 - In many cases a Church may need to add a contemporary service which sometimes threatens the traditional Episcopal Service. Music and Social media can help attract millennials.
 - As a Millennial, I am tired of hearing the panic and anxiety expressed by the rest of the Church over our generation. Many of us are in leadership positions and are actively trying to help support mission and ministry. Please stop speculating, pandering, and/or trying to come up with generalizations about all of us - we're in congregations that represent the richness and variety of the Episcopal Church in theology, practice, and expression. Stay focused on Jesus and getting the basics right.
 - I think it would have been important data to know what age person/generationally answers each survey. For instance, I'm a millennial, so my perspective might be different than that of a boomer; and it would be interesting to see how different data sets align or are not aligned by generation.
 - right now, in suburban NJ, I am not sure how many millennial there are living locally. I am told that our population in Northern NJ is younger, fewer are married, more highly educated and increasingly diverse. My guess is that we need to work on diversity of all kinds.
 - We must truly know who the Episcopal the church is first before the millennials
 - I'm a millennial, and I'm tired of being talked about and treated like a problem to solve.
 - Lack of younger parishioners is not the only thing threatening the Episcopal Church. Engagement in the community (without collars), variety of spiritual practices, intergenerational connections, etc. all needed. Young families are time constrained and stressed. We can provide a respite from that, without strings.
 - Our churches bemoan the loss of Christian values, however, the church did not stand up to the unrepentant bullying and language used by our political candidates for president. This behavior will be normalized in our culture as the church sits silent to behavior of both folks.
 - Especially in the months following the election, I've gauged a fair amount of restlessness among unchurched millennials. They are looking for ways to live out their values and participate in society post-college, but the church does not occur to them as a resource for engaging in community service and outreach or as a way to find a new community.
 - Diversity is a huge issue as well. Most well endowed Episcopal churches are not very diverse (in terms of ethnicity, financial situations, etc) and in a world where Millennials are increasingly becoming more diverse and free spirited, the lack of diversity can be uninviting.
 - Strong communities of faith -- congregations -- are the one essential. We do not seem very good at defining and developing such communities of faith none of our definitions are generating the finances and the people to sustain their life.
 - Thanks
 - My experience with millennials is that they have a deep desire to lead meaningful lives. They are drawn to the mystery of our worship, the breadth of our theology, and the broad welcome of our church. The Episcopal church offers a framework for meaning and growth in God. It also offers an exciting model of an institution that brings power to the table in the struggles of our society.
 - Ministries that simply get people in the door of the church are vital. I started going to church because I had been in the physical building for concerts before and so I knew what it looked like and it was less intimidating. Outreach music ministries and other ways to bring people in and get them curious about what happens in the life of the church are vital to building congregations. Millennials are just people, and for the most part don't want or need to be treated any differently than anybody else. We need to feel valued by the community for our unique abilities and contributions, and understanding that we may not have a great deal of time or money to contribute but feeling valued nevertheless.
 - Question 15 is flawed. It is very difficult to convince millennials to commit to the activities (we think are) needed to run a church. One of the problems you face (I'm born since 1980) is that you are stuck in a model of Church that does not allow for nor make space for new ways of doing things. Vestries, committees, budgets, and bottom lines are not interesting or particularly life giving.
 - CEEP has a role to play in opening conversations, networks, partnerships and initiatives within the church. The Board is listening and acting. Let's listen to millennial voices and Missional Voices.
 - Item 11, above, is either/or thinking, rather than both/and. It is dualistic and will not serve the church. We need to cast a wide net and welcome all religious exploration. Plus, I don't think the Episcopal Church is of one mind when it comes to beliefs, anyway, so the question is misleading from the start. We need to understand each generation's unique perspective and find common ground. Every generation has something to offer, but we aren't very good at listening. It is good to have a dialog on this.

© 2017 - SchellingPoint LLC - All Rights Reserved
Trademarks | Terms of Service | Privacy
Powered by Alignment Optimization Technology™
