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The purpose of this research project is to identify clergy age trends in the United Methodist Church over the last twenty-two years so that denominational leaders will have the data for planning and a baseline for monitoring future changes. This report builds on the first report on clergy age trends issued by the Lewis Center for Church Leadership in 2006. That report, Clergy Age Trends in the United Methodist Church: 1985-2005, documented the dramatic decline in United Methodist young clergy in both numbers and percentages over twenty years. This report presents a snapshot of where clergy age trends stand in 2007.

These clergy age trends are further analyzed in The Crisis of Younger Clergy (Abingdon Press, 2008) by Lovett H. Weems, Jr., and Ann A. Michel. The book considers why the number of young clergy has declined so precipitously in recent decades and what can be done to reverse this trend. Drawing on clergy age data and recent survey results, the book profiles the young clergy population in the United Methodist Church. It exposes the many challenges younger clergy face while lifting up the unique gifts they have to offer. The book is available for purchase at Amazon.com and Cokesbury.com.

Clergy ages are not easy to track because few units of the church have up-to-date age information on clergy. The one exception is the General Board of Pension and Health Benefits. The Lewis Center for Church Leadership of Wesley Theological Seminary has worked with the Board to determine age trends for United Methodist clergy.

The project covers elders, deacons, and local pastors in the five jurisdictional conferences of the United Methodist Church. Ordained deacons as we have now in the United Methodist Church are relatively new, making trend comparisons over many years difficult, but we do report current age data. To have comparable figures across the years for elders, the figures include not only those who have been ordained elder but also those who have been commissioned on the elder track but not yet ordained. While not all clergy are in the denominational pension system, most are and the percentage not in the system tends to stay the same across the years, thus making trend comparisons possible. Readers should keep in mind that the number of total deacons is significantly lower in this report than their presence in the denomination because more deacons than other clergy work in employment settings with pension plans other than through the General Board. For local pastors, fulltime and part-time local pastors are included, but student local pastors are excluded. Since the General Board of Pension and Health Benefits does not keep records of clergy by race, we were not able to make comparisons by racial groups.

In addition to the cooperation of the General Board of Pension and Health Benefits, the Lewis Center for Church Leadership conducted this research project through funding from the Lilly Endowment, Inc. through its Sustaining Pastoral Excellence Initiative and from donors to the Lewis Center for Church Leadership.

## Study Contributors

Lovett H. Weems, Jr., distinguished professor of church leadership and founding director of the Lewis Center for Church Leadership, was project director. Joe Arnold, research manager of the Lewis Center, and Ann A. Michel, associate director of the Lewis Center, were associate directors of the project.

Barbara Boigegrain, general secretary of the General Board of Pension and Health Benefits of the United Methodist Church, and the staff of the Board, particularly Anne Borish, Peter Doheny, and Otisstean Arrington provided essential cooperation and data. Thanks go also to the General Council on Finance and Administration for sharing data they collect and to administrators and staff from other denominations for data on age trends in their churches. We have valued the collaboration of the General Board of Higher Education and Ministry with our work, given their efforts around enlistment and overall clergy issues.

## Changes since the 2005 Report

There is modest good news for United Methodists. The consistent decline in under-35 elders as a percentage of all elders hit its low point in 2005 and has held relatively steady with slight increases in 2006 and 2007.
o Young elders were 4.69 percent of all elders in 2005. In 2006 and 2007, the figures are 4.89 percent and 4.92 percent respectively.
o The actual number of young elders declined in 2007 over 2006 but still showed an increase as a percentage because of the decreasing size of the pool of elders. This trend may continue in the coming years as Baby Boomers retire in large numbers.
o Young deacons increased in percentage and numbers in both 2006 and 2007, going from 5.41 percent of all deacons in 2005 to 7.10 percent in 2007.
o Young local pastors declined in percentage and numbers between 2005 and 2007, going from 5.69 percent of all local pastors in 2005 to 5.48 percent in 2007.

On the other end of the age spectrum of active clergy, the greatest growth continues to occur in the 55 to 70 age cohort.
o This group increased from 40.90 percent in 2005 to 44.34 percent in 2007. A number of conferences have over 50 percent of their active elders in this category.
o Deacons in this older age group increased very slightly from 2006 to 2007, from 41.94 percent to 42.24 percent.
o Local pastors, traditionally an older group, continue to have a larger percentage between 55 and 70, going from 45.01 percent in 2005 to 48.39 percent in 2007.

The middle-age grouping, 35 to 54, declined since 2005.
o Elders in this age group went from 54.42 percent in 2005 to 50.74 in 2007.
o Deacons of this age declined slightly from 51.90 percent in 2006 to 50.67 in 2007.
o Middle-age local pastors declined as a proportion of all local pastors from 49.30 percent to 46.13 percent between 2005 and 2007.

Median, average, and mode ages in 2007 are:
o Median - (half older, half younger): elders, 53; deacons, 51; local pastors, 54.
o Average - elders, 53; deacons, 52; local pastors, 53.
o Mode - (single age most represented): elders, 59; deacons, 51; local pastors, 60.
Regarding other denominations, we have limited historical data, but can state the following:
o Of those denominations for which we have data for more than one year, joining the United Methodist Church in showing increases in young clergy as a percentage of total clergy was the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America, which went from 4.86 percent in 2005 to 5.92 percent in 2007.
o Young clergy in the Church of the Nazarene declined from 12.72 percent in 2006 to 10.68 percent in 2007, though they continue to have a higher percentage of young clergy than most denominations. The Presbyterian Church (U.S.A.) showed a decline from 7.10 percent in 2002 to 6.20 percent in 2007, though this is a modest decline for a five-year period, and they continue to have the strongest cohort of under-35 clergy of the traditional mainline churches.
o Other denominations showing proportionate declines in young clergy are the American Baptist (from 5.50 percent in 2006 to 5.10 percent in 2007) and the Episcopal Church (from 4.10 percent in 2006 to 3.43 percent in 2007.)

# Why Young Clergy Matter By Lovett H. Weems, J r., and Ann A. Michel 

Younger clergy aren't necessarily better. They're just younger.
And that matters.
Lovett H. Weems, Jr.
In recent decades, many North American churches have suffered a serious and sustained decline in the number and percentages of clergy under the age of 35 . In many denominations, the percentage of younger clergy has slipped close to 5 percent or even less. While middle-aged and older pastors bring vital gifts to the practice of ministry, it is troubling that the church allows so many younger persons to ignore God's call.

There are a number of important reasons why the pool of clergy must include a proportionate number of younger persons. The declining number of young clergy deprives the profession at both ends of the age spectrum. The new ideas, creativity, energy, and cultural awareness often exhibited by the young are lost. And with more persons entering ministry with fewer years to serve, the wisdom and experience that can come with long tenures in ministry are also in jeopardy.

Church leaders who gathered recently to discuss clergy age trends were asked the question "Why are young clergy important?" They responded with comments such as, "Younger clergy have an ability to see the world and the church through new eyes," "They bring enthusiasm, idealism, and fresh perspectives to the practice of ministry," and "Young clergy are more open to innovation and more nimble in working with new ideas."

In many instances, young clergy bring tremendous energy to the demands of ministry because of the mental and physical stamina associated with youth. The schedules and routines of the young may be more flexible, and they are available for and interested in innovative challenges holding significant risk.

Young clergy also have certain advantages in reaching out to their own generation. They are more likely to speak the language of an emerging generation whose world view and communication modes differ from those of their parents' generation. They show high sensitivity to diversity and other cultural realities in today's world. Just as important, the mere presence of young clergy in a church symbolizes that younger persons are valued as leaders and participants.

These factors help explain why young clergy seem particularly well-suited to the task of church planting. Research conducted in the Episcopal Church has found that pastors between the ages of 24 and 35 were the most successful in founding churches that reach 250 or more in worship attendance within seven years. An informal poll of congregational development officials in the United Methodist church also showed a preference for church planters aged 25 to 35 .

Research on the differences between younger and older seminary students sheds light on some other attributes of younger clergy. While older students tend to bring important experience in congregational life, younger students tend to enter seminary with better academic records in college or previous graduate studies, and they are more likely to have educational training in disciplines such as theology, religion, philosophy, and other humanities traditionally regarded as appropriate preparation for theological study. And preliminary data from Lewis Center research on pastoral effectiveness indicate that laity tend to rate young clergy as highly effective, even though they may not be as self confident as their older peers.

But just as youthfulness has advantages in ministry, so does experience. Leadership is a form of expertise that has a long gestation period. In most fields, attaining the status of expert requires at least ten years of extensive experience and training. Without sufficient numbers of younger persons entering the profession, there will be fewer clergy in the pipeline who have achieved the longevity of service required for the most challenging pastoral assignments and denominational leadership roles. While the growing number of middle-aged and older persons who enter ministry bring many important gifts, it is also true that many will not achieve the longevity of service needed for some of the most demanding ministry roles such as serving as lead pastor of a very large congregation.

The dearth of young clergy is contributing to an impending leadership crisis in yet another way. The growing percentage of elders who are 55 and older raises the specter of a tidal wave of retirements hitting the system in the not-too-distant future. The aging of the church's clergy pool poses other practical and institutional challenges such as pension and health care challenges.

Having a proportionate number of young persons entering ordained ministry is vital to the vibrancy of the church, as well as its ability to attract younger congregants and form new congregations. And it is essential for developing the long-term experience in ministry necessary for the most challenging assignments. Young clergy do, indeed, matter.

Lovett H. Weems, Jr., and Ann A. Michel are the authors of The Crisis of Younger Clergy, copyright 2008, Abingdon Press. This material is adapted from chapter three of that book and used by permission.

## Elders

To have comparable figures across the years for elders, the figures include not only those who have been ordained elder but also those who have been commissioned on the elder track but not yet ordained. Since the General Board of Pension and Health Benefits does not keep records of clergy by race, we were not able to make comparisons by racial groups.



Number of Eders Under 35 in 2007


Elders by Jurisdiction

| Jurisdiction | $\begin{gathered} \text { Elders } \\ \text { under } 35 \\ 2007 \end{gathered}$ | \% Elders under 35 2007 | $\begin{gathered} \text { Elders } \\ 35-54 \\ 2007 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { \% Elders } \\ 35-54 \\ 2007 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Elders } \\ 55-70 \\ 2007 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { \% Elders } \\ & 55-70 \\ & 2007 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | Total Elders 2007 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| North Central | 168 | 4.22\% | 2,095 | 52.59\% | 1,721 | 43.20\% | 3,984 |
| Northeastern | 117 | 3.43\% | 1,644 | 48.15\% | 1,653 | 48.42\% | 3,414 |
| South Central | 169 | 5.38\% | 1,598 | 50.83\% | 1,377 | 43.80\% | 3,144 |
| Southeastern | 363 | 6.32\% | 2,977 | 51.80\% | 2,407 | 41.88\% | 5,747 |
| Western | 59 | 3.90\% | 718 | 47.52\% | 734 | 48.58\% | 1,511 |
| Total | 876 | 4.92\% | 9,032 | 50.74\% | 7,892 | 44.34\% | 17,800 |

Percent of Young Clergy By Jurisdiction


Comparisons of Elders under 35 with U.S. Population Ages 25-34

| Change in Ratio of Elders under 35 to Population 25-34 |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Year | Population 25-34 | Elders under 35 | Ratio |
| 1985 | $42,027,000$ | 3,219 | $1: 13,000$ |
| 1990 | $43,161,000$ | 2,385 | $1: 18,000$ |
| 1995 | $40,730,000$ | 1,312 | $1: 31,000$ |
| 2000 | $39,891,000$ | 906 | $1: 44,000$ |
| 2005 | $39,600,000$ | 850 | $1: 47,000$ |
| 2007 | $40,100,000$ | 876 | $1: 45,000$ |

Ratio of Elders under 35 to Population 25-34 by Jurisdictions (2007)

| Jurisdiction | Population 25-34 | Elders under 35 | Ratio |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| North Central | $7,481,000$ | 169 | $1: 44,000$ |
| Northeastern | $8,210,000$ | 116 | $1: 70,000$ |
| South Central | $6,482,000$ | 150 | $1: 43,000$ |
| Southeastern | $8,504,000$ | 388 | $1: 22,000$ |
| Western | $9,423,000$ | 58 | $1: 162,000$ |
|  |  |  |  |
| Total | $40,100,000$ | 876 | $1: 45,000$ |


| Percentage of Elders under 35 Compared to <br> Population 25-34 by Jurisdictions (2006) |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Jurisdiction | \% Population 25-34 | \% Elders under 35 |
| North Central | $18 \%$ | $19 \%$ |
| Northeastern | $20 \%$ | $13 \%$ |
| South Central | $16 \%$ | $17 \%$ |
| Southeastern | $22 \%$ | $44 \%$ |
| Western | $24 \%$ | $7 \%$ |

Comparisons of Elders under 35 with Membership, Churches, and Charges

| Change in Ratio of Elders under 35 to Membership |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Year | Membership | Elders under 35 | Ratio |
| 1985 | $9,301,863$ | 3,219 | $1: 2,900$ |
| 1990 | $8,872,370$ | 2,385 | $1: 3,700$ |
| 1995 | $8,611,021$ | 1,312 | $1: 6,600$ |
| 2000 | $8,356,816$ | 906 | $1: 9,200$ |
| 2005 | $8,074,697$ | 850 | $1: 9,500$ |
| 2006 | $7,931,733$ | 881 | $1: 9,000$ |


| Change in Ratio of Elders under 35 to Number of Churches |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Year | Churches | Elder under 35 | Ratio |
| 1985 | 37,988 | 3,219 | $1: 12$ |
| 1990 | 37,407 | 2,385 | 116 |
| 1995 | 36,559 | 1,312 | $1: 28$ |
| 2000 | 35,609 | 906 | $1: 39$ |
| 2005 | 34,892 | 850 | $1: 41$ |
| 2006 | 34,398 | 881 | $1: 39$ |

Change in Ratio of Elders under 35 to Number of Pastoral Charges

| Year | Charges | Elders under 35 | Ratio |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1985 | 25,727 | 3,219 | $1: 8$ |
| 1990 | 25,880 | 2,385 | $1: 11$ |
| 1995 | 25,934 | 1,312 | $1: 20$ |
| 2000 | 26,201 | 906 | $1: 29$ |
| 2005 | 26,307 | 850 | $1: 31$ |
| 2006 | 26,083 | 881 | $1: 30$ |

2007 data were not available when this report was prepared.

Gender Breakdown within Age Cohorts - Elders

|  | Under 35 | $\mathbf{3 5 - 5 4}$ | $\mathbf{5 5 - 7 0}$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Men |  |  |  |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 5}$ | $69 \%$ | $75 \%$ | $77 \%$ |
| 2006 | $69 \%$ | $75 \%$ | $77 \%$ |
| 2007 | $67 \%$ | $74 \%$ | $76 \%$ |
| Women |  |  |  |
| 2005 | $31 \%$ | $25 \%$ | $23 \%$ |
| 2006 | $31 \%$ | $25 \%$ | $23 \%$ |
| 2007 | $33 \%$ | $26 \%$ | $24 \%$ |

Median, Average, and Mode Ages by Year - Elders

| Year | Median* Age | Average Age | Mode* Age |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{1 9 8 5}$ | 48 | 46.8 | 54 |
| $\mathbf{1 9 9 0}$ | 47 | 47.5 | 43 |
| $\mathbf{1 9 9 5}$ | 48 | 48.4 | 48 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 0}$ | 50 | 49.5 | 53 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 5}$ | 52 | 51.5 | 58 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 6}$ | 53 | 51.8 | 59 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 7}$ | 53 | 52.0 | 59 |

*Median - half older, half younger
*Mode - single age most represented

## Data on Age Trends for Elders 1985-2007

|  | No. of |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Year | Elders <br> under <br> $\mathbf{3 5}$ | \% <br> Elders <br> under <br> $\mathbf{3 5}$ | Elders <br> $\mathbf{3 5 - 5 4}$ | \% <br> Elders <br> $\mathbf{3 5 - 5 4}$ | Elders <br> $55-70$ | \% <br> Elders <br> $\mathbf{5 5 - 7 0}$ |  |
| $\mathbf{1 9 8 5}$ | 21,378 | 3,219 | $15.06 \%$ | 12,305 | $57.56 \%$ | 5,854 | $27.38 \%$ |
| $\mathbf{1 9 9 0}$ | 21,507 | 2,385 | $11.09 \%$ | 12,678 | $58.95 \%$ | 6,444 | $29.96 \%$ |
| $\mathbf{1 9 9 5}$ | 20,117 | 1,312 | $6.52 \%$ | 12,843 | $63.84 \%$ | 5,962 | $29.64 \%$ |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 0}$ | 18,576 | 906 | $4.88 \%$ | 12,005 | $64.63 \%$ | 5,665 | $30.50 \%$ |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 5}$ | 18,141 | 850 | $4.69 \%$ | 9,872 | $54.42 \%$ | 7,419 | $40.90 \%$ |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 6}$ | 18,005 | 881 | $4.89 \%$ | 9,482 | $52.66 \%$ | 7,642 | $42.44 \%$ |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 7}$ | 17,800 | 876 | $4.92 \%$ | 9,032 | $50.74 \%$ | 7,892 | $44.34 \%$ |

Elders

Presence of Elders under 35
by Annual Conference 2005 to 2007

| CONFERENCE | 2005 <br> Elders | 2006 <br> Elders | 2007 <br> Elders | 2005 <br> Elders <br> under 35 | 2006 <br> Elders <br> under 35 | 2007 <br> Elders <br> under 35 | 2005 <br> Elders <br> under 35 | 2006 <br> Elders <br> under 35 | 2007 <br> Elders <br> under 35 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Alabama-West Florida | 288 | 284 | 281 | 21 | 22 | 23 | $7.29 \%$ | $7.75 \%$ | $8.19 \%$ |
| Alaska Missionary | 1 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | $0.00 \%$ | $0.00 \%$ | $0.00 \%$ |
| Arkansas | 268 | 286 | 284 | 21 | 21 | 25 | $7.84 \%$ | $7.34 \%$ | $8.80 \%$ |
| Baltimore-Washington | 472 | 473 | 453 | 15 | 15 | 17 | $3.18 \%$ | $3.17 \%$ | $3.75 \%$ |
| California-Nevada | 326 | 319 | 328 | 10 | 9 | 11 | $3.07 \%$ | $2.82 \%$ | $3.35 \%$ |
| California-Pacific | 407 | 410 | 402 | 16 | 18 | 15 | $3.93 \%$ | $4.39 \%$ | $3.73 \%$ |
| Central Pennsylvania | 339 | 330 | 322 | 18 | 20 | 20 | $5.31 \%$ | $6.06 \%$ | $6.21 \%$ |
| Central Texas | 253 | 249 | 246 | 13 | 16 | 17 | $5.14 \%$ | $6.43 \%$ | $6.91 \%$ |
| Dakotas | 151 | 153 | 145 | 10 | 12 | 12 | $6.62 \%$ | $7.84 \%$ | $8.28 \%$ |
| Desert Southwest | 138 | 137 | 137 | 8 | 7 | 7 | $5.80 \%$ | $5.11 \%$ | $5.11 \%$ |
| Detroit | 318 | 309 | 307 | 18 | 17 | 19 | $5.66 \%$ | $5.50 \%$ | $6.19 \%$ |
| East Ohio | 442 | 428 | 428 | 15 | 15 | 18 | $3.39 \%$ | $3.50 \%$ | $4.21 \%$ |
| Eastern Pennsylvania | 331 | 329 | 309 | 16 | 15 | 12 | $4.83 \%$ | $4.56 \%$ | $3.88 \%$ |
| Florida | 533 | 527 | 518 | 28 | 30 | 32 | $5.25 \%$ | $5.69 \%$ | $6.18 \%$ |
| Greater New Jersey | 405 | 410 | 398 | 11 | 16 | 14 | $2.72 \%$ | $3.90 \%$ | $3.52 \%$ |
| Holston | 335 | 328 | 322 | 35 | 28 | 28 | $10.45 \%$ | $8.54 \%$ | $8.70 \%$ |
| Illinois Great Rivers | 407 | 404 | 393 | 17 | 15 | 12 | $4.18 \%$ | $3.71 \%$ | $3.05 \%$ |
| lowa | 405 | 406 | 401 | 13 | 19 | 17 | $3.21 \%$ | $4.68 \%$ | $4.24 \%$ |
| Kansas East | 167 | 157 | 163 | 4 | 5 | 9 | $2.40 \%$ | $3.18 \%$ | $5.52 \%$ |
| Kansas West | 170 | 174 | 172 | 5 | 2 | 4 | $2.94 \%$ | $1.15 \%$ | $2.33 \%$ |
| Kentucky | 281 | 283 | 285 | 12 | 11 | 10 | $4.27 \%$ | $3.89 \%$ | $3.51 \%$ |
| Louisiana | 232 | 232 | 230 | 15 | 14 | 13 | $6.47 \%$ | $6.03 \%$ | $5.65 \%$ |
| Memphis | 201 | 194 | 191 | 6 | 8 | 5 | $2.99 \%$ | $4.12 \%$ | $2.62 \%$ |
| Minnesota | 261 | 254 | 248 | 8 | 7 | 8 | $3.07 \%$ | $2.76 \%$ | $3.23 \%$ |
| Mississippi | 355 | 368 | 364 | 25 | 33 | 26 | $7.04 \%$ | $8.97 \%$ | $7.14 \%$ |
| Missouri | 342 | 333 | 331 | 12 | 15 | 19 | $3.51 \%$ | $4.50 \%$ | $5.74 \%$ |
| Nebraska | 171 | 173 | 165 | 4 | 3 | 2 | $2.34 \%$ | $1.73 \%$ | $1.21 \%$ |
| New England | 322 | 303 | 294 | 7 | 8 | 9 | $2.17 \%$ | $2.64 \%$ | $3.06 \%$ |
| New Mexico | 107 | 112 | 109 | 2 | 4 | 4 | $1.87 \%$ | $3.57 \%$ | $3.67 \%$ |
| New York | 329 | 320 | 315 | 6 | 6 | 8 | $1.82 \%$ | $1.88 \%$ | $2.54 \%$ |
| North Alabama | 364 | 371 | 368 | 24 | 29 | 31 | $6.59 \%$ | $7.82 \%$ | $8.42 \%$ |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## Presence of Elders under 35 <br> by Annual Conference 2005 to 2007

Continued

| CONFERENCE | 2005 Elders | $\begin{gathered} 2006 \\ \text { Elders } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2007 \\ & \text { Elders } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 2005 \\ \text { Elders } \\ \text { under } \\ 35 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | 2006 Elders under 35 | 2007 <br> Elders <br> under <br> 35 | 2005 Elders under 35 | $\begin{gathered} \hline 2006 \\ \text { Elders } \\ \text { under } \\ 35 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | 2007 <br> Elders under 35 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| North Carolina | 445 | 454 | 463 | 26 | 30 | 26 | 5.84\% | 6.61\% | 7.07\% |
| North Central New York | 154 | 153 | 149 | 2 | 3 | 5 | 1.30\% | 1.96\% | 3.36\% |
| North Georgia | 613 | 601 | 596 | 43 | 46 | 38 | 7.01\% | 7.65\% | 6.38\% |
| North Indiana | 319 | 308 | 308 | 14 | 15 | 14 | 4.39\% | 4.87\% | 4.55\% |
| North Texas | 257 | 260 | 264 | 17 | 16 | 17 | 6.61\% | 6.15\% | 6.44\% |
| Northern Illinois | 341 | 330 | 325 | 14 | 10 | 13 | 4.11\% | 3.03\% | 4.00\% |
| Northwest Texas | 117 | 118 | 120 | 8 | 7 | 7 | 6.84\% | 5.93\% | 5.83\% |
| OK Indian Missionary | 13 | 13 | 14 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
| Oklahoma | 322 | 325 | 329 | 18 | 23 | 28 | 5.59\% | 7.08\% | 8.51\% |
| Oregon-Idaho | 152 | 147 | 150 | 7 | 5 | 8 | 4.61\% | 3.40\% | 5.33\% |
| Pacific Northwest | 216 | 219 | 222 | 5 | 8 | 8 | 2.31\% | 3.65\% | 3.60\% |
| Peninsula-Delaware | 182 | 180 | 183 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1.10\% | 0.56\% | 0.55\% |
| Rio Grande | 34 | 40 | 39 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
| Rocky Mountain | 235 | 220 | 217 | 10 | 10 | 9 | 4.26\% | 4.55\% | 4.15\% |
| South Carolina | 483 | 485 | 488 | 25 | 29 | 29 | 5.18\% | 5.98\% | 5.94\% |
| South Georgia | 290 | 291 | 301 | 15 | 15 | 11 | 5.17\% | 5.15\% | 3.65\% |
| South Indiana | 303 | 298 | 295 | 9 | 14 | 14 | 2.97\% | 4.70\% | 4.75\% |
| Southwest Texas | 250 | 248 | 243 | 7 | 6 | 3 | 2.80\% | 2.42\% | 1.23\% |
| Tennessee | 209 | 208 | 201 | 15 | 14 | 13 | 7.18\% | 6.73\% | 6.47\% |
| Texas | 441 | 451 | 435 | 26 | 18 | 21 | 5.90\% | 3.99\% | 4.83\% |
| Troy | 110 | 106 | 101 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0.91\% | 0.94\% | 0.99\% |
| Virginia | 669 | 659 | 644 | 32 | 37 | 36 | 4.78\% | 5.61\% | 5.59\% |
| West Michigan | 235 | 233 | 225 | 7 | 8 | 7 | 2.98\% | 3.43\% | 3.11\% |
| West Ohio | 659 | 636 | 628 | 29 | 25 | 21 | 4.40\% | 3.93\% | 3.34\% |
| West Virginia | 232 | 239 | 243 | 6 | 7 | 6 | 2.59\% | 2.93\% | 2.47\% |
| Western New York | 136 | 132 | 131 | 7 | 7 | 6 | 5.15\% | 5.30\% | 4.58\% |
| Western North Carolina | 711 | 723 | 725 | 53 | 56 | 55 | 7.45\% | 7.75\% | 7.59\% |
| Western Pennsylvania | 425 | 416 | 401 | 18 | 14 | 14 | 4.24\% | 3.37\% | 3.49\% |
| Wisconsin | 284 | 280 | 281 | 14 | 12 | 13 | 4.93\% | 4.29\% | 4.63\% |
| Wyoming | 126 | 119 | 115 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 3.17\% | 2.52\% | 3.48\% |
| Yellowstone | 57 | 54 | 53 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1.75\% | 1.85\% | 1.89\% |
| TOTAL | 18,141 | 18,447 | 17,800 | 850 | 881 | 876 | 4.69\% | 4.78\% | 4.92\% |

## Presence of Elders under 35

by 2007 Percentage 2005 to 2007

| CONFERENCE | 2005 <br> Elders | 2006 <br> Elders | $\begin{aligned} & 2007 \\ & \text { Elders } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2005 \\ \text { Elders } \\ \text { under } \\ 35 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2006 \\ \text { Elders } \\ \text { under } \\ 35 \end{gathered}$ | 2007 <br> Elders under 35 | 2005 <br> Elders <br> under 35 | $\begin{gathered} 2006 \\ \text { Elders } \\ \text { under } \\ 35 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 2007 \\ \text { Elders } \\ \text { under } \\ 35 \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Arkansas | 268 | 286 | 284 | 21 | 21 | 25 | 7.84\% | 7.34\% | 8.80\% |
| Holston | 335 | 328 | 322 | 35 | 28 | 28 | 10.45\% | 8.54\% | 8.70\% |
| Oklahoma | 322 | 325 | 329 | 18 | 23 | 28 | 5.59\% | 7.08\% | 8.51\% |
| North Alabama | 364 | 371 | 368 | 24 | 29 | 31 | 6.59\% | 7.82\% | 8.42\% |
| Dakotas | 151 | 153 | 145 | 10 | 12 | 12 | 6.62\% | 7.84\% | 8.28\% |
| Alabama-West Florida | 288 | 284 | 281 | 21 | 22 | 23 | 7.29\% | 7.75\% | 8.19\% |
| Western North Carolina | 711 | 723 | 725 | 53 | 56 | 55 | 7.45\% | 7.75\% | 7.59\% |
| Mississippi | 355 | 368 | 364 | 25 | 33 | 26 | 7.04\% | 8.97\% | 7.14\% |
| North Carolina | 445 | 454 | 463 | 26 | 30 | 26 | 5.84\% | 6.61\% | 7.14\% |
| Central Texas | 253 | 249 | 246 | 13 | 16 | 17 | 5.14\% | 6.43\% | 6.91\% |
| Tennessee | 209 | 208 | 201 | 15 | 14 | 13 | 7.18\% | 6.73\% | 6.47\% |
| North Texas | 257 | 260 | 264 | 17 | 16 | 17 | 6.61\% | 6.15\% | 6.44\% |
| North Georgia | 613 | 601 | 596 | 43 | 46 | 38 | 7.01\% | 7.65\% | 6.38\% |
| Central Pennsylvania | 339 | 330 | 322 | 18 | 20 | 20 | 5.31\% | 6.06\% | 6.21\% |
| Detroit | 318 | 309 | 307 | 18 | 17 | 19 | 5.66\% | 5.50\% | 6.19\% |
| Florida | 533 | 527 | 518 | 28 | 30 | 32 | 5.25\% | 5.69\% | 6.18\% |
| South Carolina | 483 | 485 | 488 | 25 | 29 | 29 | 5.18\% | 5.98\% | 5.94\% |
| Northwest Texas | 117 | 118 | 120 | 8 | 7 | 7 | 6.84\% | 5.93\% | 5.83\% |
| Missouri | 342 | 333 | 331 | 12 | 15 | 19 | 3.51\% | 4.50\% | 5.74\% |
| Louisiana | 232 | 232 | 230 | 15 | 14 | 13 | 6.47\% | 6.03\% | 5.65\% |
| Virginia | 669 | 659 | 644 | 32 | 37 | 36 | 4.78\% | 5.61\% | 5.59\% |
| Kansas East | 167 | 157 | 163 | 4 | 5 | 9 | 2.40\% | 3.18\% | 5.52\% |
| Oregon-Idaho | 152 | 147 | 150 | 7 | 5 | 8 | 4.61\% | 3.40\% | 5.33\% |
| Desert Southwest | 138 | 137 | 137 | 8 | 7 | 7 | 5.80\% | 5.11\% | 5.11\% |
| Texas | 441 | 451 | 435 | 26 | 18 | 21 | 5.90\% | 3.99\% | 4.83\% |
| South Indiana | 303 | 298 | 295 | 9 | 14 | 14 | 2.97\% | 4.70\% | 4.75\% |
| Western New York | 136 | 132 | 131 | 7 | 7 | 6 | 5.15\% | 5.30\% | 4.58\% |
| North Indiana | 319 | 308 | 308 | 14 | 15 | 14 | 4.39\% | 4.87\% | 4.55\% |
| Iowa | 405 | 406 | 401 | 13 | 19 | 17 | 3.21\% | 4.68\% | 4.24\% |
| East Ohio | 442 | 428 | 428 | 15 | 15 | 18 | 3.39\% | 3.50\% | 4.21\% |
| Rocky Mountain | 235 | 220 | 217 | 10 | 10 | 9 | 4.26\% | 4.55\% | 4.15\% |

## Elders

## Presence of Elders under 35 <br> by 2007 Percentage 2005 to 2007

Continued

| CONFERENCE | 2005 <br> Elders | 2006 <br> Elders | $\begin{gathered} 2007 \\ \text { Elders } \end{gathered}$ | 2005 <br> Elders <br> under <br> 35 | 2006 <br> Elders <br> under 35 | 2007 <br> Elders under 35 | 2005 Elders under 35 | 2006 <br> Elders <br> under <br> 35 | 2007 <br> Elders <br> under <br> 35 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Northern Illinois | 341 | 330 | 325 | 14 | 10 | 13 | 4.11\% | 3.03\% | 4.00\% |
| Eastern Pennsylvania | 331 | 329 | 309 | 16 | 15 | 12 | 4.83\% | 4.56\% | 3.88\% |
| Baltimore-Washington | 472 | 473 | 453 | 15 | 15 | 17 | 3.18\% | 3.17\% | 3.75\% |
| California-Pacific | 407 | 410 | 402 | 16 | 18 | 15 | 3.93\% | 4.39\% | 3.73\% |
| New Mexico | 107 | 112 | 109 | 2 | 4 | 4 | 1.87\% | 3.57\% | 3.67\% |
| South Georgia | 290 | 291 | 301 | 15 | 15 | 11 | 5.17\% | 5.15\% | 3.65\% |
| Pacific Northwest | 216 | 219 | 222 | 5 | 8 | 8 | 2.31\% | 3.65\% | 3.60\% |
| Greater New Jersey | 405 | 410 | 398 | 11 | 16 | 14 | 2.72\% | 3.90\% | 3.52\% |
| Kentucky | 281 | 283 | 285 | 12 | 11 | 10 | 4.27\% | 3.89\% | 3.51\% |
| Wyoming | 126 | 119 | 115 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 3.17\% | 2.52\% | 3.48\% |
| California-Nevada | 326 | 319 | 328 | 10 | 9 | 11 | 3.07\% | 2.82\% | 3.35\% |
| West Ohio | 659 | 636 | 628 | 29 | 25 | 21 | 4.40\% | 3.93\% | 3.34\% |
| Wisconsin | 284 | 280 | 281 | 14 | 12 | 13 | 4.93\% | 4.29\% | 4.63\% |
| Minnesota | 261 | 254 | 248 | 8 | 7 | 8 | 3.07\% | 2.76\% | 3.23\% |
| West Michigan | 235 | 233 | 225 | 7 | 8 | 7 | 2.98\% | 3.43\% | 3.11\% |
| New England | 322 | 303 | 294 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 2.17\% | 2.64\% | 3.06\% |
| Illinois Great Rivers | 407 | 404 | 393 | 17 | 15 | 12 | 4.18\% | 3.71\% | 3.05\% |
| Memphis | 201 | 194 | 191 | 6 | 8 | 5 | 2.99\% | 4.12\% | 2.62\% |
| New York | 329 | 320 | 315 | 6 | 6 | 8 | 1.82\% | 1.88\% | 2.54\% |
| West Virginia | 232 | 239 | 243 | 6 | 7 | 6 | 2.59\% | 2.93\% | 2.47\% |
| Kansas West | 170 | 174 | 172 | 5 | 2 | 4 | 2.94\% | 1.15\% | 2.33\% |
| Western Pennsylvania | 425 | 416 | 401 | 18 | 14 | 14 | 4.24\% | 3.37\% | 3.49\% |
| Yellowstone | 57 | 54 | 53 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1.75\% | 1.85\% | 1.89\% |
| Southwest Texas | 250 | 248 | 243 | 7 | 6 | 3 | 2.80\% | 2.42\% | 1.23\% |
| Nebraska | 171 | 173 | 165 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 2.34\% | 1.73\% | 1.21\% |
| North Central New York | 154 | 153 | 149 | 2 | 3 | 5 | 1.30\% | 1.96\% | 3.03\% |
| Troy | 110 | 106 | 101 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0.91\% | 0.94\% | 0.99\% |
| Peninsula-Delaware | 182 | 180 | 183 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1.10\% | 0.56\% | 0.55\% |
| Alaska Missionary | 1 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
| OK Indian Missionary | 13 | 13 | 14 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
| Rio Grande | 34 | 40 | 39 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
| TOTAL | 18,141 | 18,447 | 17,800 | 850 | 881 | 876 | 4.69\% | 4.78\% | 4.92\% |

Ordained deacons as we have now in the United Methodist Church are relatively new, making trend comparisons over many years difficult, but we do report current age data. We include not only those who have been ordained deacon but also those who have been commissioned on the deacon track but not yet ordained. Readers should keep in mind that the number of total deacons is significantly lower in this report than their presence in the denomination because more deacons than other clergy work in employment settings with pension plans other than through the General Board.

## Median, Average, and Mode Ages - Deacons by Year

| Year | Median* Age | Average Age | Mode* Age |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 6}$ | 53 | 51.67 | 50 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 7}$ | 52 | 51.40 | 51 |

*Median - half older, half younger
*Mode - single age most represented

Gender Breakdown within Age Cohorts - Deacons

|  | Men | Under 35 | $\mathbf{3 5 - 5 4}$ | $\mathbf{5 5 - 7 0}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 6}$ |  | $36 \%$ | $32 \%$ | $18 \%$ |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 7}$ |  | $37 \%$ | $32 \%$ | $19 \%$ |
|  | Women | Under 35 | $\mathbf{3 5 - 5 4}$ | $\mathbf{5 5 - 7 0}$ |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 6}$ |  | $64 \%$ | $68 \%$ | $82 \%$ |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 7}$ |  | $63 \%$ | $68 \%$ | $81 \%$ |

Deacons Under 35 by Jurisdiction

|  | $\mathbf{2 0 0 5}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 0 6}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 0 7}$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Jurisdiction | Under <br> $\mathbf{3 5}$ | Under <br> $\mathbf{3 5}$ | Under <br> $\mathbf{3 5}$ |
| North Central | 8 | 9 | 9 |
| Northeastern | 2 | 1 | 3 |
| South Central | 15 | 19 | 22 |
| Southeastern | 17 | 22 | 30 |
| Western | 4 | 3 | 0 |
|  |  |  |  |
| Total | 46 | 52 | 64 |

## Deacons

Presence of Deacons under 35 by Annual Conference 2005 to 2007

| CONFERENCE | $\begin{gathered} 2005 \\ \text { Deacons } \\ \text { Total } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | 2006 <br> Deacons Total | $\begin{gathered} 2007 \\ \text { Deacons } \\ \text { Total } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | 2005 <br> Deacons Under 35 | 2006 <br> Deacons Under 35 | 2007 <br> Deacons Under 35 | 2005 <br> Deacons Under 35 | 2006 <br> Deacons Under 35 | 2007 <br> Deacons Under 35 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ALABAMA WEST FLORIDA | 20 | 25 | 30 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 0.00\% | 12.00\% | 10.00\% |
| ARKANSAS | 16 | 18 | 17 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 5.88\% |
| BALTIMORE-WASHINGTON | 23 | 24 | 22 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 4.55\% |
| CALIFORNIA-NEVADA | 12 | 12 | 11 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 8.33\% | 8.33\% | 0.00\% |
| CALIFORNIA-PACIFIC | 21 | 20 | 16 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 9.52\% | 5.00\% | 0.00\% |
| CENTRAL PENNSYLVANIA | 4 | 3 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
| CENTRAL TEXAS | 21 | 26 | 26 | 1 | 4 | 3 | 4.76\% | 15.38\% | 11.54\% |
| DAKOTAS | 4 | 3 | 5 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 25.00\% | 33.33\% | 0.00\% |
| DESERT SOUTHWEST | 12 | 11 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
| DETROIT | 10 | 9 | 8 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 10.00\% | 11.11\% | 12.50\% |
| EAST OHIO | 16 | 16 | 17 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
| EASTERN PENNSYLVANIA | 8 | 6 | 6 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 25.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
| FLORIDA | 43 | 42 | 41 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 2.33\% | 4.76\% | 7.32\% |
| GREATER NEW JERSEY | 15 | 15 | 19 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0.00\% | 6.67\% | 10.53\% |
| HOLSTON | 14 | 13 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
| ILL GREAT RIVERS | 11 | 11 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
| IOWA | 9 | 11 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
| KANSAS EAST | 6 | 7 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
| KANSAS WEST | 7 | 6 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
| KENTUCKY | 18 | 20 | 24 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
| LOUISIANA | 23 | 25 | 22 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0.00\% | 4.00\% | 4.55\% |
| MEMPHIS | 10 | 9 | 11 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 10.00\% | 11.11\% | 18.18\% |
| MINNESOTA | 13 | 14 | 15 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 7.69\% | 14.29\% | 13.33\% |
| MISSISSIPPI | 20 | 19 | 24 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 10.00\% | 5.26\% | 8.33\% |
| MISSOURI | 15 | 18 | 17 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 6.67\% | 11.11\% | 5.88\% |
| NEBRASKA | 4 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
| NEW ENGLAND | 3 | 3 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
| NEW MEXICO | 8 | 7 | 8 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 12.50\% | 0.00\% | 12.50\% |
| NEW YORK | 3 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
| NO. CENTRAL NEW YORK | 3 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
| NORTH ALABAMA | 8 | 11 | 17 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 12.50\% | 9.09\% | 11.76\% |

## Deacons

Presence of Deacons under 35 by Annual Conference 2005 to 2007

Continued

| CONFERENCE | $\begin{gathered} 2005 \\ \text { Deacons } \\ \text { Total } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2006 \\ & \text { Deacons } \\ & \text { Total } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2007 \\ \text { Deacons } \\ \text { Total } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | 2005 <br> Deacons Under 35 | 2006 <br> Deacons Under 35 | 2007 <br> Deacons Under 35 | 2005 <br> Deacons Under 35 | 2006 <br> Deacons Under 35 | 2007 <br> Deacons Under 35 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| NORTH CAROLINA | 21 | 23 | 25 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
| NORTH GEORGIA | 45 | 46 | 52 | 4 | 6 | 7 | 8.89\% | 13.04\% | 13.46\% |
| NORTH INDIANA | 9 | 6 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 11.11\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
| NORTH TEXAS | 35 | 34 | 35 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 8.57\% | 11.76\% | 14.29\% |
| NORTHWEST TEXAS | 7 | 5 | 6 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 14.29\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
| NORTHERN ILLINOIS | 19 | 21 | 20 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 0.00\% | 9.52\% | 20.00\% |
| OKLAHOMA | 36 | 33 | 32 | 6 | 5 | 7 | 16.67\% | 15.15\% | 21.88\% |
| OREGON-IDAHO | 10 | 9 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
| PACIFIC NORTHWEST | 14 | 13 | 10 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 7.14\% | 7.69\% | 0.00\% |
| PENINSULA-DELAWARE | 2 | 2 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
| RIO GRANDE | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 50.00\% |
| ROCKY MOUNTAIN | 23 | 21 | 25 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
| SOUTH CAROLINA | 13 | 14 | 24 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 4.17\% |
| SOUTH GEORGIA | 15 | 15 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
| SOUTH INDIANA | 8 | 7 | 7 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 12.50\% | 14.29\% | 0.00\% |
| SOUTHWEST TEXAS | 12 | 14 | 16 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0.00\% | 7.14\% | 6.25\% |
| TENNESSEE | 29 | 31 | 34 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 3.45\% | 6.45\% | 8.82\% |
| TEXAS | 30 | 26 | 26 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 6.67\% | 0.00\% | 3.85\% |
| VIRGINIA | 25 | 22 | 29 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 4.00\% | 4.55\% | 3.45\% |
| WEST MICHIGAN | 5 | 4 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
| WEST OHIO | 32 | 26 | 25 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 9.38\% | 7.69\% | 8.00\% |
| WEST VIRGINIA | 7 | 6 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
| WESTERN NEW YORK | 6 | 6 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
| WESTERN PENNSYLVANIA | 8 | 8 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
| WESTN NORTH CAROLINA | 33 | 36 | 41 | 6 | 5 | 6 | 18.18\% | 13.89\% | 14.63\% |
| WISCONSIN | 4 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
| WYOMING | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
| YELLOWSTONE | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
| TOTAL | 850 | 844 | 902 | 46 | 52 | 64 | 5.41\% | 6.16\% | 7.10\% |

## Deacons

## Presence of Deacons under 35

 by Percentage 2005 to 2007| CONFERENCE NAME | $\begin{gathered} 2005 \\ \text { Deacons } \\ \text { Total } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2006 \\ \text { Deacons } \\ \text { Total } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2007 \\ \text { Deacons } \\ \text { Total } \end{gathered}$ | Total Under 35 05 | Total Under 35 06 | Total under 35 07 | \% younger than 35 | \% younger than 35 | \% younger than 35 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| RIO GRANDE | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 50.00\% |
| OKLAHOMA | 36 | 33 | 32 | 6 | 5 | 7 | 16.67\% | 15.15\% | 21.88\% |
| NORTHERN ILLINOIS | 19 | 21 | 20 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 0.00\% | 9.52\% | 20.00\% |
| MEMPHIS | 10 | 9 | 11 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 10.00\% | 11.11\% | 18.18\% |
| WESTN NORTH CAROLINA | 33 | 36 | 41 | 6 | 5 | 6 | 18.18\% | 13.89\% | 14.63\% |
| NORTH TEXAS | 35 | 34 | 35 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 8.57\% | 11.76\% | 14.29\% |
| NORTH GEORGIA | 45 | 46 | 52 | 4 | 6 | 7 | 8.89\% | 13.04\% | 13.46\% |
| MINNESOTA | 13 | 14 | 15 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 7.69\% | 14.29\% | 13.33\% |
| DETROIT | 10 | 9 | 8 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 10.00\% | 11.11\% | 12.50\% |
| NEW MEXICO | 8 | 7 | 8 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 12.50\% | 0.00\% | 12.50\% |
| NORTH ALABAMA | 8 | 11 | 17 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 12.50\% | 9.09\% | 11.76\% |
| CENTRAL TEXAS | 21 | 26 | 26 | 1 | 4 | 3 | 4.76\% | 15.38\% | 11.54\% |
| GREATER NEW JERSEY | 15 | 15 | 19 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0.00\% | 6.67\% | 10.53\% |
| ALABAMA WEST FLORIDA | 20 | 25 | 30 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 0.00\% | 12.00\% | 10.00\% |
| TENNESSEE | 29 | 31 | 34 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 3.45\% | 6.45\% | 8.82\% |
| MISSISSIPPI | 20 | 19 | 24 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 10.00\% | 5.26\% | 8.33\% |
| WEST OHIO | 32 | 26 | 25 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 9.38\% | 7.69\% | 8.00\% |
| FLORIDA | 43 | 42 | 41 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 2.33\% | 4.76\% | 7.32\% |
| SOUTHWEST TEXAS | 12 | 14 | 16 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0.00\% | 7.14\% | 6.25\% |
| ARKANSAS | 16 | 18 | 17 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 5.88\% |
| MISSOURI | 15 | 18 | 17 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 6.67\% | 11.11\% | 5.88\% |
| BALTIMORE-WASHINGTON | 23 | 24 | 22 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 4.55\% |
| LOUISIANA | 23 | 25 | 22 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0.00\% | 4.00\% | 4.55\% |
| SOUTH CAROLINA | 13 | 14 | 24 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 4.17\% |
| TEXAS | 30 | 26 | 26 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 6.67\% | 0.00\% | 3.85\% |
| VIRGINIA | 25 | 22 | 29 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 4.00\% | 4.55\% | 3.45\% |
| CALIFORNIA-NEVADA | 12 | 12 | 11 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 8.33\% | 8.33\% | 0.00\% |
| CALIFORNIA-PACIFIC | 21 | 20 | 16 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 9.52\% | 5.00\% | 0.00\% |
| CENTRAL PENNSYLVANIA | 4 | 3 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
| DAKOTAS | 4 | 3 | 5 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 25.00\% | 33.33\% | 0.00\% |
| DESERT SOUTHWEST | 12 | 11 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
| EAST OHIO | 16 | 16 | 17 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
| EASTERN PENNSYLVANIA | 8 | 6 | 6 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 25.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |

## Deacons

Presence of Deacons under 35
by Percentage
2005 to 2007

## Continued

| CONFERENCE NAME | $\begin{gathered} 2005 \\ \text { Deacons } \\ \text { Total } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2006 \\ \text { Deacons } \\ \text { Total } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2007 \\ \text { Deacons } \\ \text { Total } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | Total Under 35 05 | Total Under 35 06 | Total under 35 07 | younger than 35 | younger than 35 | younger than 35 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| HOLSTON | 14 | 13 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
| ILL GREAT RIVERS | 11 | 11 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
| IOWA | 9 | 11 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
| KANSAS EAST | 6 | 7 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
| KANSAS WEST | 7 | 6 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
| KENTUCKY | 18 | 20 | 24 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
| NEBRASKA | 4 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
| NEW ENGLAND | 3 | 3 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
| NEW YORK | 3 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
| NO. CENTRAL NEW YORK | 3 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
| NORTH CAROLINA | 21 | 23 | 25 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
| NORTH INDIANA | 9 | 6 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 11.11\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
| NORTHWEST TEXAS | 7 | 5 | 6 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 14.29\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
| OREGON-IDAHO | 10 | 9 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
| PACIFIC NORTHWEST | 14 | 13 | 10 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 7.14\% | 7.69\% | 0.00\% |
| PENINSULA-DELAWARE | 2 | 2 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
| ROCKY MOUNTAIN | 23 | 21 | 25 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
| SOUTH GEORGIA | 15 | 15 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
| SOUTH INDIANA | 8 | 7 | 7 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 12.50\% | 14.29\% | 0.00\% |
| WEST MICHIGAN | 5 | 4 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
| WEST VIRGINIA | 7 | 6 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
| WESTERN NEW YORK | 6 | 6 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
| WESTERN PENNSYLVANIA | 8 | 8 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
| WISCONSIN | 4 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
| WYOMING | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
| YELLOWSTONE | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
| TOTAL | 397 | 404 | 440 | 32 | 52 | 56 | 8.06\% | 6.16\% | 12.73\% |

## Local Pastors

For local pastors, full-time and part-time local pastors are included, but student local pastors are excluded.



Data on Age Trends for Local Pastors 1985-2007

| Year | No. of <br> Local <br> Pastors | Local <br> Pastors <br> Under 35 | \% Under <br> $\mathbf{3 5}$ | Local <br> Pastors <br> $\mathbf{3 5 - 5 4}$ | \% 35-54 | Local <br> Pastors <br> $\mathbf{5 5 - 7 0}$ | \% 55-70 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{1 9 8 5}$ | 3,804 | 130 | $3 \%$ | 2,212 | $58 \%$ | 1,462 | $38 \%$ |
| $\mathbf{1 9 9 0}$ | 3,936 | 163 | $4 \%$ | 2,244 | $57 \%$ | 1,529 | $39 \%$ |
| $\mathbf{1 9 9 5}$ | 4,622 | 290 | $6 \%$ | 2,641 | $57 \%$ | 1,691 | $37 \%$ |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 0}$ | 5,571 | 348 | $6 \%$ | 3,109 | $56 \%$ | 2,114 | $38 \%$ |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 5}$ | 6,517 | 371 | $6 \%$ | 3,213 | $49 \%$ | 2,933 | $45 \%$ |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 6}$ | 6,731 | 363 | $5 \%$ | 3,201 | $48 \%$ | 3,167 | $47 \%$ |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 7}$ | 6,863 | 376 | $5 \%$ | 3,166 | $46 \%$ | 3,321 | $48 \%$ |

Median, Average, and Mode Ages - Local Pastors
by Year

| Median Age | Average Age | Mode <br> Age |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 51 | 49.6 | 59 |
| 51 | 50.4 | 60 |
| 51 | 50.3 | 48 |
| 52 | 50.8 | 53 |
| 53 | 52.2 | 58 |
| 54 | 52.5 | 59 |
| 54 | 52.8 | 60 |
| * Median - half older, half younger |  |  |
| * Mode - single age most represented |  |  |

Gender Breakdown within Age Cohorts - Local Pastors

|  | Men | Under 35 | $\mathbf{3 5 - 5 4}$ | $\mathbf{5 5 - 7 0}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 6}$ |  | $76 \%$ | $71 \%$ | $70 \%$ |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 7}$ |  | $76 \%$ | $71 \%$ | $69 \%$ |
|  | Women | Under 35 | $\mathbf{3 5 - 5 4}$ | $\mathbf{5 5 - 7 0}$ |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 6}$ |  | $24 \%$ | $29 \%$ | $30 \%$ |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 7}$ |  | $24 \%$ | $29 \%$ | $31 \%$ |

Local Pastors under 35 by Jurisdictions

|  | $\mathbf{2 0 0 6}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 0 7}$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Jurisdiction | Under <br> $\mathbf{3 5}$ | Under <br> $\mathbf{3 5}$ |
|  |  |  |
| North Central | 70 | 56 |
| Northeastern | 42 | 44 |
| South Central | 91 | 93 |
| Southeastern | 143 | 164 |
| Western | 17 | 19 |
|  |  |  |
| Total | 363 | 375 |

Presence of Local Pastors under 35 by Annual Conference

| 2006 to 2007 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| CONFERENCE NAME | Under 35 in 06 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Under } 35 \\ & \text { in } 07 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | 2006 <br> Local Pastors Total | 2007 Local Pastors Total | $\begin{gathered} \text { \% Under } 35 \text { in } \\ 06 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { \% Under } 35 \\ \text { in } 07 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| ALABAMA WEST FLORIDA | 12 | 8 | 165 | 162 | 7.27\% | 4.94\% |
| ALASKA MISSIONARY | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
| ARKANSAS | 11 | 10 | 176 | 186 | 6.25\% | 5.38\% |
| BALTIMORE-WASHINGTON | 2 | 2 | 91 | 91 | 2.20\% | 2.20\% |
| CALIFORNIA NEVADA | 6 | 2 | 62 | 54 | 9.68\% | 3.70\% |
| CALIFORNIA-PACIFIC | 6 | 9 | 69 | 73 | 8.70\% | 12.33\% |
| CENTRAL PENNSYLVANIA | 10 | 10 | 131 | 137 | 7.63\% | 7.30\% |
| CENTRAL TEXAS | 4 | 5 | 48 | 45 | 8.33\% | 11.11\% |
| DAKOTAS | 1 | 2 | 31 | 33 | 3.23\% | 6.06\% |
| DESERT SOUTHWEST | 0 | 0 | 24 | 25 | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
| DETROIT | 2 | 2 | 80 | 83 | 2.50\% | 2.41\% |
| EAST OHIO | 13 | 12 | 191 | 192 | 6.81\% | 6.25\% |
| EASTERN PENNSYLVANIA | 1 | 2 | 92 | 96 | 1.09\% | 2.08\% |
| FLORIDA | 8 | 7 | 148 | 147 | 5.41\% | 4.76\% |
| GREATER NEW JERSEY | 9 | 10 | 131 | 132 | 6.87\% | 7.58\% |
| HOLSTON | 8 | 13 | 168 | 176 | 4.76\% | 7.39\% |
| ILL GREAT RIVERS | 3 | 5 | 182 | 180 | 1.65\% | 2.78\% |
| IOWA | 8 | 4 | 184 | 183 | 4.35\% | 2.19\% |
| KANSAS EAST | 7 | 8 | 68 | 65 | 10.29\% | 12.31\% |
| KANSAS WEST | 1 | 1 | 67 | 70 | 1.49\% | 1.43\% |
| KENTUCKY | 4 | 2 | 124 | 116 | 3.23\% | 1.72\% |
| LOUISIANA | 7 | 10 | 141 | 148 | 4.96\% | 6.76\% |
| MEMPHIS | 3 | 5 | 62 | 64 | 4.84\% | 7.81\% |
| MINNESOTA | 2 | 3 | 28 | 35 | 7.14\% | 8.57\% |
| MISSISSIPPI | 8 | 10 | 239 | 239 | 3.35\% | 4.18\% |
| MISSOURI | 21 | 21 | 226 | 230 | 9.29\% | 9.13\% |
| NEBRASKA | 2 | 3 | 52 | 59 | 3.85\% | 5.08\% |
| NEW ENGLAND | 1 | 3 | 101 | 99 | 0.99\% | 3.03\% |
| NEW MEXICO | 1 | 0 | 24 | 22 | 4.17\% | 0.00\% |
| NEW YORK | 4 | 6 | 66 | 68 | 6.06\% | 8.82\% |
| NO. CENTRAL NEW YORK | 1 | 1 | 67 | 76 | 1.49\% | 1.32\% |
| NORTH ALABAMA | 15 | 10 | 260 | 249 | 5.77\% | 4.02\% |
| NORTH CAROLINA | 12 | 13 | 166 | 174 | 7.23\% | 7.47\% |

Local Pastors

Presence of Local Pastors under 35
by Annual Conference
2006 to 2007
continued

| CONFERENCE NAME | Under 35 in 06 | Under 35 in 07 | 2006 <br> Local Pastors Total | 2007 Local Pastors Total | \% Under 35 in 06 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { \% Under } 35 \\ & \text { in } 07 \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| NORTH GEORGIA | 7 | 16 | 201 | 273 | 3.48\% | 5.86\% |
| NORTH INDIANA | 6 | 6 | 99 | 101 | 6.06\% | 5.94\% |
| NORTH TEXAS | 10 | 6 | 74 | 81 | 13.51\% | 7.41\% |
| NORTH WEST TEXAS | 3 | 2 | 78 | 75 | 3.85\% | 2.67\% |
| NORTHERN ILLINOIS | 9 | 3 | 51 | 41 | 17.65\% | 7.32\% |
| OKLAHOMA | 12 | 12 | 125 | 128 | 9.60\% | 9.38\% |
| OKLAHOMA INDIAN MSNY | 2 | 3 | 33 | 34 | 6.06\% | 8.82\% |
| OREGON IDAHO | 2 | 4 | 24 | 25 | 8.33\% | 16.00\% |
| PACIFIC NORTHWEST | 2 | 2 | 22 | 21 | 9.09\% | 9.52\% |
| PENINSULA-DELAWARE | 2 | 0 | 70 | 77 | 2.86\% | 0.00\% |
| RED BIRD MISSIONARY | 0 | 0 | 8 | 9 | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
| RIO GRANDE | 3 | 2 | 23 | 18 | 13.04\% | 11.11\% |
| ROCKY MOUNTAIN | 1 | 2 | 45 | 47 | 2.22\% | 4.26\% |
| SOUTH CAROLINA | 5 | 8 | 181 | 181 | 2.76\% | 4.42\% |
| SOUTH GEORGIA | 12 | 11 | 145 | 142 | 8.28\% | 7.75\% |
| SOUTH INDIANA | 3 | 2 | 103 | 94 | 2.91\% | 2.13\% |
| SOUTHWEST TEXAS | 6 | 5 | 106 | 105 | 5.66\% | 4.76\% |
| TENNESSEE | 13 | 13 | 167 | 158 | 7.78\% | 8.23\% |
| TEXAS | 1 | 5 | 172 | 170 | 0.58\% | 2.94\% |
| TROY | 2 | 1 | 55 | 53 | 3.64\% | 1.89\% |
| VIRGINIA | 23 | 26 | 240 | 257 | 9.58\% | 10.12\% |
| WEST MICHIGAN | 4 | 2 | 86 | 86 | 4.65\% | 2.33\% |
| WEST OHIO | 16 | 13 | 159 | 151 | 10.06\% | 8.61\% |
| WEST VIRGINIA | 5 | 5 | 202 | 210 | 2.48\% | 2.38\% |
| WESTERN NEW YORK | 4 | 4 | 64 | 67 | 6.25\% | 5.97\% |
| WESTERN PENNSYLVANIA | 0 | 0 | 88 | 86 | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
| WESTN NORTH CAROLINA | 13 | 22 | 273 | 291 | 4.76\% | 7.56\% |
| WISCONSIN | 3 | 2 | 86 | 86 | 3.49\% | 2.33\% |
| WYOMING | 1 | 0 | 60 | 62 | 1.67\% | 0.00\% |
| YELLOWSTONE | 0 | 0 | 25 | 23 | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
| TOTAL | 363 | 376 | 6,731 | 6,863 | 5.39\% | 5.48\% |

## Local Pastors

Presence of Local Pastors under 35 by Percentage 2006 to 2007

| CONFERENCE NAME | $\begin{gathered} \text { Under } \\ 35 \text { in } 06 \end{gathered}$ | Under 35 in 07 | $\begin{aligned} & 2006 \text { Local } \\ & \text { Pastors Total } \end{aligned}$ | 2007 Local Pastors Total | \% Under 35 in 06 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { \% Under } 35 \\ & \text { in } 07 \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| OREGON IDAHO | 2 | 4 | 24 | 25 | 8.33\% | 16.00\% |
| CALIFORNIA-PACIFIC | 6 | 9 | 69 | 73 | 8.70\% | 12.33\% |
| KANSAS EAST | 7 | 8 | 68 | 65 | 10.29\% | 12.31\% |
| CENTRAL TEXAS | 4 | 5 | 48 | 45 | 8.33\% | 11.11\% |
| VIRGINIA | 23 | 26 | 240 | 257 | 9.58\% | 10.12\% |
| RIO GRANDE | 3 | 2 | 23 | 18 | 13.04\% | 11.11\% |
| OKLAHOMA | 12 | 12 | 125 | 128 | 9.60\% | 9.38\% |
| MINNESOTA | 2 | 3 | 28 | 35 | 7.14\% | 8.57\% |
| PACIFIC NORTHWEST | 2 | 2 | 22 | 21 | 9.09\% | 9.52\% |
| MISSOURI | 21 | 21 | 226 | 230 | 9.29\% | 9.13\% |
| NEW YORK | 4 | 6 | 66 | 68 | 6.06\% | 8.82\% |
| OKLAHOMA INDIAN MSNY | 2 | 3 | 33 | 34 | 6.06\% | 8.82\% |
| WEST OHIO | 16 | 13 | 159 | 151 | 10.06\% | 8.61\% |
| TENNESSEE | 13 | 13 | 167 | 158 | 7.78\% | 8.23\% |
| NORTH TEXAS | 10 | 6 | 74 | 81 | 13.51\% | 7.41\% |
| MEMPHIS | 3 | 5 | 62 | 64 | 4.84\% | 7.81\% |
| SOUTH GEORGIA | 12 | 11 | 145 | 142 | 8.28\% | 7.75\% |
| WESTN NORTH CAROLINA | 13 | 22 | 273 | 291 | 4.76\% | 7.56\% |
| NORTH CAROLINA | 12 | 13 | 166 | 174 | 7.23\% | 7.47\% |
| GREATER NEW JERSEY | 9 | 10 | 131 | 132 | 6.87\% | 7.58\% |
| CENTRAL PENNSYLVANIA | 10 | 10 | 131 | 137 | 7.63\% | 7.30\% |
| HOLSTON | 8 | 13 | 168 | 176 | 4.76\% | 7.39\% |
| NORTHERN ILLINOIS | 9 | 3 | 51 | 41 | 17.65\% | 7.32\% |
| LOUISIANA | 7 | 10 | 141 | 148 | 4.96\% | 6.76\% |
| NORTH GEORGIA | 7 | 16 | 201 | 273 | 3.48\% | 5.86\% |
| EAST OHIO | 13 | 12 | 191 | 192 | 6.81\% | 6.25\% |
| DAKOTAS | 1 | 2 | 31 | 33 | 3.23\% | 6.06\% |
| WESTERN NEW YORK | 4 | 4 | 64 | 67 | 6.25\% | 5.97\% |
| NORTH INDIANA | 6 | 6 | 99 | 101 | 6.06\% | 5.94\% |
| ARKANSAS | 11 | 10 | 176 | 186 | 6.25\% | 5.38\% |
| NEBRASKA | 2 | 3 | 52 | 59 | 3.85\% | 5.08\% |
| ALABAMA WEST FLORIDA | 12 | 8 | 165 | 162 | 7.27\% | 4.94\% |

## Local Pastors

Presence of Local Pastors under 35 by Percentage 2006 to 2007
continued

| CONFERENCE NAME | $\begin{gathered} \text { Under } \\ 35 \text { in } 06 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Under } 35 \\ & \text { in } 07 \end{aligned}$ | 2006 Local Pastors Total | 2007 Local Pastors Tota | $\text { \% Under } 35 \text { in }$ | \% Under 35 in 07 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| SOUTHWEST TEXAS | 6 | 5 | 106 | 105 | 5.66\% | 4.76\% |
| FLORIDA | 8 | 7 | 148 | 147 | 5.41\% | 4.76\% |
| SOUTH CAROLINA | 5 | 8 | 181 | 181 | 2.76\% | 4.42\% |
| ROCKY MOUNTAIN | 1 | 2 | 45 | 47 | 2.22\% | 4.26\% |
| MISSISSIPPI | 8 | 10 | 239 | 239 | 3.35\% | 4.18\% |
| NORTH ALABAMA | 15 | 10 | 260 | 249 | 5.77\% | 4.02\% |
| CALIFORNIA NEVADA | 6 | 2 | 62 | 54 | 9.68\% | 3.70\% |
| NEW ENGLAND | 1 | 3 | 101 | 99 | 0.99\% | 3.03\% |
| TEXAS | 1 | 5 | 172 | 170 | 0.58\% | 2.94\% |
| ILL GREAT RIVERS | 3 | 5 | 182 | 180 | 1.65\% | 2.78\% |
| NORTH WEST TEXAS | 3 | 2 | 78 | 75 | 3.85\% | 2.67\% |
| DETROIT | 2 | 2 | 80 | 83 | 2.50\% | 2.41\% |
| WEST VIRGINIA | 5 | 5 | 202 | 210 | 2.48\% | 2.38\% |
| WEST MICHIGAN | 4 | 2 | 86 | 86 | 4.65\% | 2.33\% |
| WISCONSIN | 3 | 2 | 86 | 86 | 3.49\% | 2.33\% |
| IOWA | 8 | 4 | 184 | 183 | 4.35\% | 2.19\% |
| BALTIMORE-WASHINGTON | 2 | 2 | 91 | 91 | 2.20\% | 2.20\% |
| EASTERN PENNSYLVANIA | 1 | 2 | 92 | 96 | 1.09\% | 2.08\% |
| SOUTH INDIANA | 3 | 2 | 103 | 94 | 2.91\% | 2.13\% |
| TROY | 2 | 1 | 55 | 53 | 3.64\% | 1.89\% |
| KENTUCKY | 4 | 2 | 124 | 116 | 3.23\% | 1.72\% |
| KANSAS WEST | 1 | 1 | 67 | 70 | 1.49\% | 1.43\% |
| NO. CENTRAL NEW YORK | 1 | 1 | 67 | 76 | 1.49\% | 1.32\% |
| NEW MEXICO | 1 | 0 | 24 | 22 | 4.17\% | 0.00\% |
| PENINSULA-DELAWARE | 2 | 0 | 70 | 77 | 2.86\% | 0.00\% |
| WYOMING | 1 | 0 | 60 | 62 | 1.67\% | 0.00\% |
| ALASKA MISSIONARY | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
| DESERT SOUTHWEST | 0 | 0 | 24 | 25 | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
| RED BIRD MISSIONARY | 0 | 0 | 8 | 9 | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
| WESTERN PENNSYLVANIA | 0 | 0 | 88 | 86 | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
| YELLOWSTONE | 0 | 0 | 25 | 23 | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
| TOTAL | 363 | 376 | 6,731 | 6,863 | 5.39\% | 5.48\% |

## Clergy Age Comparisons Across Denominations

By Percentage

| Denomination | Under 35 | 35-54 | $\mathbf{5 5 - 7 0}$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| American Baptist | $5.10 \%$ | $51.35 \%$ | $43.54 \%$ |
| Assemblies of God 2006 Data | $7.16 \%$ | $54.64 \%$ | $38.20 \%$ |
| Christian Church (DOC) 2006 data | $5.53 \%$ | $50.79 \%$ | $43.68 \%$ |
| Church of God (Anderson, IN) | $8.41 \%$ | $52.24 \%$ | $39.34 \%$ |
| Church of the Nazarene | $10.68 \%$ | $54.00 \%$ | $35.31 \%$ |
| Episcopal Church | $3.43 \%$ | $37.81 \%$ | $58.76 \%$ |
| Evangelical Lutheran Church (ELCA) | $5.92 \%$ | $50.57 \%$ | $43.50 \%$ |
| Lutheran Church (Missouri Synod) | $8.34 \%$ | $54.59 \%$ | $37.07 \%$ |
| Presbyterian Church (USA) | $6.20 \%$ | $51.39 \%$ | $42.41 \%$ |
| Reform Judaism | $10.15 \%$ | $53.38 \%$ | $36.78 \%$ |
| Seventh Day Adventist | $1.19 \%$ | $44.72 \%$ | $54.09 \%$ |
| United Church of Canada | $2.66 \%$ | $50.38 \%$ | $48.62 \%$ |
| United Methodist Church | $4.92 \%$ | $50.74 \%$ | $44.34 \%$ |

## By Numbers

| Denomination | Under 35 | $\mathbf{3 5 - 5 4}$ | $\mathbf{5 5} \mathbf{- 7 0}$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| American Baptist | 247 | 2,486 | 2,108 |
| Assemblies of God 2006 Data | 998 | 7,620 | 5,327 |
| Christian Church (DOC) 2006 data | 223 | 2,142 | 1,842 |
| Church of God (Anderson, IN) | 278 | 1,726 | 1,300 |
| Church of the Nazarene | 623 | 3,150 | 2,060 |
| Episcopal Church | 408 | 4,500 | 6,993 |
| Evangelical Lutheran Church (ELCA) | 659 | 5,625 | 4,839 |
| Lutheran Church (Missouri Synod) | 451 | 2,952 | 2,005 |
| Presbyterian Church (USA) | 594 | 4,921 | 4,061 |
| Reform Judaism | 140 | 1,422 | 523 |
| Seventh Day Adventist | 29 | 1,088 | 1,316 |
| United Church of Canada | 59 | 1,116 | 1,077 |
| United Methodist Church | 876 | 9,032 | 7,892 |

Some Other Related Data (most recent available)

| Roman Catholic Priests in 2001 |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Under 35 | $3.10 \%$ |
| $35-54$ | $31.70 \%$ |
| 55 and older | $65.20 \%$ |
| Median Age | 60 |


| United Church of Christ 2005 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $25-44$ | $17.00 \%$ | 409 |
| $45-64$ | $81.00 \%$ | 1,929 |
| 65 and older | $2.00 \%$ | 36 |

## Sources of United Methodist Clergy Data

The United Methodist clergy age statistics in this report are prepared by the Lewis Center for Church Leadership of Wesley Theological Seminary from data provided by the General Board of Pension and Health Benefits of the United Methodist Church (GBOPHB) of "active participants." Active participants mean that the person is active in clergy service, therefore excluding statuses such as retired, sabbatical, leave of absence, maternity leave, disability, or administrative location. Those who have been commissioned on the elder and deacon tracks but not yet ordained are included. Regarding deacons, this report captures a lower percentage of active deacons because a higher percentage of them, when compared to elders, work in employment settings with pension plans other than through the General Board.

## Sources for Other Denominations

American Baptist Churches USA (ABC) - Ministers and Missionaries Benefit Board
Assemblies of God - Statistician's Office
Christian Church (Disciples of Christ) - Pension Fund
Church of God (Anderson, Indiana) - Board of Pensions
Church of the Nazarene - Pensions and Benefits USA

## Episcopal Church - Church Pension Fund

Evangelical Lutheran Church in America (ELCA) - Department of Research \& Evaluation
Lutheran Church (Missouri Synod) - Concordia Plan Services
Presbyterian Church (U.S.A.) - Board of Pensions
Reform Judaism - Reform Pension Board
Roman Catholic - No central office keeps information on Catholic priests' ages. Researchers at Catholic University did a survey of American priests in 2001 from which these figures come.
The survey had a high response rate of $71 \%$. Dean R. Hoge and Jacqueline E. Wenger, Evolving Visions of the Priesthood, Liturgical Press, 2003, p. 200.

Seventh Day Adventist Church - Adventist Retirement Plan
United Church of Canada - Ministry and Employment Services Unit
United Church of Christ - The Pension Boards

## About the Lewis Center for Church Leadership

The Lewis Center for Church Leadership was established in 2003 by Wesley Theological Seminary in Washington, DC, to advance the understanding of Christian leadership and promote the faithful and fruitful practice of Christian leadership in the church and in society. The Center is building a vision for church leadership grounded in faith, informed by knowledge, and exercised in effective action. It seeks a holistic understanding of Christian leadership that brings together theology and management, scholarship and practice, research and application.

The Lewis Center serves as a resource for seminary students, lay and clergy congregational leaders, and denominational officials. Through teaching, research, publications, and training, the Lewis Center supports visionary spiritual leaders and addresses those key leadership issues that are crucial to the church's witness. The Center seeks to be a trusted resource for church leadership helping congregations and denominations serve, thrive, and grow.

For more information or to subscribe to the Center's free online newsletter, Leading Ideas, go to: wwwchurchleadership.com
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