

**BISHOP'S COUNCIL AND STANDING COMMITTEE
and the Board of Directors of the
Bradford Diocesan Board of Finance**



Minutes of the meeting of the above Council held in the Board Room, Kadugli House, on Thursday 20 November 2008 at 7 p.m.

Present: The Rt Revd David James (Chairman)
Mrs Sharron Arnold
The Revd Paul Ayers
Mrs Janet Bower
Mr Tony Hesselwood
The Very Revd David Ison
The Ven David Lee
Mr Roger Marks
Mr Mike Moss
The Revd Canon John Nowell
The Ven Paul Slater – from 8.45 p.m.
Mrs Nora Whitham

In attendance: Mr Malcolm Halliday (Diocesan Secretary)
Mrs Debbie Child (Assistant Secretary)
Mr Peter Foskett (Diocesan Registrar)
Mrs Diana Chambers (Chairman, Board of Education)
Mr Ian Fletcher (Chairman, Church in the World)
Mr Stan Jenkins (Chairman, Ministry & Mission)
The Revd Canon Sam Randall (Bishop's Officer, Ch. in the World)

The meeting opened with prayer led by Canon Sam Randall on the theme "Bradford Diocese – A Place of Sanctuary".

Apologies for absence were received from:
Mr Geoffrey Garnett
Mr David Gibson
Mr Ian Hamilton
The Revd Canon Ken Medhurst
The Revd Canon David Mewis
The Revd Canon Denise Poole
The Revd Paul Tudge
Mr Chris Wilcock
Mrs Jill Wright

193. Minutes of meeting held on 12/13 September 2008 (enclosed)

The minutes of the meetings held on 12/13 September, which had been previously circulated, were APPROVED.

194. Matters arising from Minutes:-

a. Communion before Confirmation – further work

The Bishop reported that he had established a small committee, comprising the Dean, the Revd Ruth Yeoman and Mr John Fawcett and chaired by Bishop Buchanan, to look at this and to report back.

b. Environment Day

Sam Randall reported that the date had yet to be fixed. It would be known in January.

c. Green Fund

Sam Randall reported that there had been little money received so far. There was a need for more energy to be put into promoting it.

195. Future Faithful – ongoing work post Synod

Bishop David felt that the groups at Synod had been well engaged with the issues. He was slightly disappointed with the lack of debate in the plenary sessions. He had collated the written responses and would now work on a revised draft to take to deanery synods from January onwards.

196. Bishop's matter

Along with all diocesan bishops, Bishop David had received a letter from Dr Priscilla Chadwick, the Chair of the Dioceses Commission inviting their personal comments on the priorities which the Commission should give to various aspects of its brief. He had spoken with the Bishops of Ripon & Leeds and Wakefield and together they had concluded that, although they would not mind Yorkshire or West Yorkshire being the first area of the country to be subject to a review, they felt that this was not the moment for such to take place. They had concluded that a review of diocesan administration for the three dioceses might be appropriate and he intended to say that. The Secretary expressed concern that nothing be said to the Commission which might pre-empt the outcome of the Diocesan Synod's consideration of the Future of the Diocese Working Party on 28 February. The Archdeacon of Craven, who chaired that Working Party, was absent but David Ison said that he did not think that it would prejudice what might result from the Synod meeting; in fact he thought that the Report if adopted might set an agenda and provide a significant challenge to the Commission. John Nowell said that the group had spent considerable time in producing the Report and it would be a mature and well considered piece of work.

197. New Initiatives Fund applications

Tony Hesselwood reported that two applications had been received by the Grants Panel and as both fell below the £10,000 threshold, the Group had decided as follows:-

St Barnabas Thwaites Brow:	£500 (towards a total of £1,500) on a Toddler Club.
Frizinghall:	50% of the costs of employing a co-ordinator for Open the Book, ie £2,000 in each of three years + £250 towards set up costs in the first year.

He reported that Eric Kyte has resigned from the Grants Panel and the members suggested that Geoff Garnett assume the Chair and that Sharron Arnold be appointed to fill the vacant place. This was AGREED.

John Nowell asked how much was left unallocated and Tony reported that as at 31.12.08 there was about £130,000 uncommitted.

John Nowell took the Chair

198. Ministry & Mission matters

a. Clergy & Lay Conferences

Rogers Marks introduced paper (BISCOU/08/34) submitted by the Synodical Liaison Committee for Ministry and Mission. He said that it might now be doubtful to be able to organize a venue for a conference, of whatever kind, in 2010 and it would probably be 2011 at the earliest. There was an argument that the content of a conference programme might very well be duplicated between clergy and laity and in cost terms, if nothing else, it would be better to have a joint conference.

Janet Bower asked that if a joint conference was held how many attendees were expected? Tony Hesselwood said that using the costs mentioned it would seem that there was just funds for 120 people attending a 48 hours programme.

David Ison was troubled by the first three of the five purposes mentioned in the paper. They needed to be sharper. The Bishop said that the purposes seemed negative and perhaps needed to acknowledge that Synod had just voted for "Future Faithful" priorities to run for 2010 to 2012. Several members observed that if we were to affirm the role of laity then the timing needed to acknowledge their availability. The Bishop felt that in such a case the conference should be held from Friday evening to Sunday evening, and Sunday service in parishes should be staffed to permit maximum clergy attendance at the Conference. Tony Hesselwood supported this, saying that if we wanted young people to be involved the timing could not encroach upon the working/studying week.

Bishop David and David Lee could not imagine that we would want to have a conference just for clergy alone if we were trying to model shared ministry. Paul Ayers did not entirely agree: clergy had a leadership role but not all laity who might attend would come from a similar perspective unless the programme was designed for lay leaders alone. Ian Fletcher wondered if it was intended to have an academic programme or something else. He supported the request for greater clarity about the purpose.

Janet Bower said that if there was a separate clergy conference there must also be a separate lay one. Stan Jenkins explained that having received the paper, the Synodical Liaison Committee had come down in favour of a joint conference but afterwards clergy had indicated that they really wanted a clergy one. David Ison asked why it was inequitable to hold just a conference for clergy. They were the staff and it was the Church's responsibility to hold such event for training etc for its workforce. Was it best use of resources to fund, at considerable expense, something for a wider group?

Tony Hesselwood could see a reason for a clergy only conference but not for a lay only version.

Some members wondered why a booking could not be made so a slot could be reserved and a later decision made as to who should attend. The Secretary said that the timing within the week of the slot needed to be arranged by those who would be

attending: a clergy only conference would not be held at the weekend.

The Chairman felt there needed to be stronger arguments written into the paper, firstly for the holding of a conference and for the purpose. The Bishop suggested that if held in 2010 the Diocesan day would not be held and the Ministry for Mission theme should inform the Conference purpose. However if held in 2011 then perhaps there should be a "way forward" theme. Paul Ayers thought that the theme might dictate who would attend.

Peter Foskett could not understand why a decision could not be taken then and there. The Chairman then sought a straw poll on the simple question of whether there should be a conference at all. There were 8 in favour but 4 people abstained. The Chairman felt that that was not a sufficient expression of confidence for the Council to proceed there and then and asked that Ministry and Mission obtain clearer thinking on the point being made and come back in January with a refined proposal.

b. Adviser in Evangelism – part-time post

The Bishop explained that previously there had been a scheme drawn up for the appointment of a part-time Adviser in Evangelism but this had been put on hold due to the moratorium. An alternative had then been found by the invitation to two incumbents to set aside some time to act as Advisers and a group drawn up to work with them. These people had established a programme in Fresh Expressions and missiology: also Back to Church Sunday and a Conference for Clergy in "Leading your church into growth" and two days for laity. There was however much more to do and he and the Going for Growth Group thought it was now time to take up the original plan and seek to appoint a ½ time Adviser. If the person appointed was a priest, there was a possible ½ parochial appointment that could be linked to it. The posts would be advertised separately and separate interviews held. If a common person surfaced as the candidate to appoint then a joint appointment would be made.

The Bishop explained that he was not seeking an addition to the budget. There was funding for ¾ of a Fresh Expressions post that was still available and perhaps also one to two bits and pieces from allocations that had not been taken. The Bishop tabled a draft of a job description for the Adviser and explained that the duties were different from those of the two-day a week Diocesan Evangelist.

The post and a possible part-time parochial post would be advertised next week.

David Ison wondered whether the Adviser could become responsible for continuing some of the present work of the two full-time Fresh Expressions priests when they moved on. Bishop David said it was possible but we must guard against overburdening the person appointed. David Ison asked that this be revisited after 18 months.

The Council AGREED to support the appointment of an ½ time Adviser in Evangelism.

The Bishop resumed the Chair

199. Church in the World matters

a. CUF Annual Delivery Plan 2009

The Plan (BISCOU/08/27) had been previously circulated. Sam Randall reminded members that Bradford was a (CUF) Grant-making Diocese and, as a result, had to produce an Annual Delivery Plan to explain how it intended to use the allocation made available to it from CUF. Ian Fletcher then highlighted Paragraph 4.7, that there had been five mustard-seed grants this year; and Paragraph 5.4.

He explained that the Urban Panel had decided to make no provision in the Plan for continuous funding of existing projects because of the limited funds available.

The Secretary said that the Agenda Group had wondered whether the Panel could produce an earlier draft for consideration by the Council in future years. This year, because of the last minute presentation to the Council, it was almost being presented with a *fait accompli*. Ian explained that the drafting could not really be commenced until the sum available was known. Sam thought however that the underlying principles for the year's allocation could be agreed by the Council at its September meeting even if the sum available was not known. Janet Bower warmed to the thematic approach adopted in the Plan. This meant that for the first time rural areas could be supported. The Bishop and Tony Hesselwood were not concerned that the Council was having to act as a rubber stamp as long as Church in the World agreed the Plan. David Lee supported Sam's suggestion that the themes (ie the Strategy) be agreed next year and then the text could flow out of them in due course. This was AGREED.

b. City of Sanctuary

A background note BISCOU/08/28 had been circulated. Sam Randall explained that a year ago the Lord Mayor of Sheffield had launched that city as a City of Sanctuary. He referred to the Hebraic Law and the Book of Numbers from which the concept of Sanctuary arose. This followed in a wonderful way until the advent of Henry VIII. A number of cities had now committed themselves. It did not commit anyone to breaking the law. 75 organisations (large and small) in Bradford had signed up, including the Cathedral, the RC Diocese of Leeds and the Bradford Teaching Hospitals Trust.

John Nowell asked what difference it made to asylum seekers and refugees. Sam drew attention to some examples set out in a paper he had circulated at the start of the meeting.

Mike Moss wondered if the Diocese signing up would lower the weight of the signatures of individual parishes. Paul Ayers asked if City of Sanctuary had policies about allocating resources. Sam referred to the simple statement to which signatories subscribed.

In answer to the question "what if C of S" Sam replied "creating an atmosphere".

Bishop David explained that he declined to sign when asked at WYEC because he wanted to know what was involved. After Christmas he intended to encourage churches across the Diocese to support the Bradford Food Bank because asylum seekers were starving. Malcolm Halliday said that signing up to the document would be in line with the Diocesan Synod Resolutions of March 2008. John Nowell was concerned about gesture politics and wondered if it would not be better to encourage all parishes to sign up and to apply pressure upon their Ward Councillors.

David Ison said that it would encourage parishes to know that the Diocese said that City of Sanctuary was a good thing.

The Bishop then sought approval to the Council on behalf of the Diocese signing up to City of Sanctuary and this was AGREED NEM COM.

c. Other matters

Sam referred to the recent media coverage of BNP membership of which 280 were Bradford residents. He reminded members of the visit of the Revd Giles Fraser to Bradford on 23 November for the signing of a new Bradford Declaration on the 75th Anniversary of the visit to Bradford by Dietrich Bonhoeffer and the signing of the original Declaration.

200. Board of Education matters – DC

a. Education Adviser

Diana Chambers thanked the Secretary for circulating the letter BISCOU/08/29. This was an urgent matter now. The Board had been functioning with one permanent full-time Adviser on the staff and casual staff plus one senior Adviser retained on a fee basis who had now retired. There was a definite need for a permanent full-time Adviser and there was funding for that. She emphasised the last sentence of the letter about avenues available if funding streams started to reduce.

Members AGREED to the appointment of a second full-time Adviser to be employed jointly by the DBF and the Ripon and Leeds DBF.

b. "Global Education"

Diana drew members' attention to the above publication prepared on behalf of the Joint Boards and widely commended. It had been funded by "Christian Aid" and the Ripon & Leeds Board of Finance. Bishop David commended the publication and asked that a flyer be made available so that it could be promoted nationally.

c. Immanuel Community College

Diana reported that the College's Christian ethos had been strongly commended in its recent report.

201. Communication Committee matters

There were none to report.

Tony Hesselwood took the Chair

202. Financial matters

a. Minutes of Finance Committee meetings held on 8 September 2008.

These had been previously circulated.

b. Matters arising

No matters had been raised.

c. DBF Vice-Chairman/woman

The Secretary reported that the Agenda Committee considered that it would be helpful if Sharron, as the Chairman to be proposed to the DBF in February, indicated the type of Vice-Chair she would find helpful as she took up the reins. Sharron indicated that, though clearly succession beyond her tenure needed to be addressed in due course, she did not consider that to be an immediate driver in this matter. She would find it helpful to have a Vice-Chair with whom she could discuss ideas and share decisions. Malcolm asked members to consider this brief and to bring names to the next meeting. Meanwhile he suggested that the views of the Finance Committee be sought as well.

d. Diocesan Church Buildings Trustees

The Council noted that a recent meeting of the outgoing trustees had clarified the situation and four of their number were prepared to continue in office until the Structures Review had come up with proposals about the way forward. The Secretary said that Jeremy Mackrell, Alex McLelland, David O'Brien and Shirley Rycroft would continue and he asked the Council to appoint Sharron Arnold as an additional trustee. She had agreed to take over as Treasurer of the Fund. This was AGREED.

e. Confidential minute

A minute of a commercially confidential matter is recorded in the private minute book.

f. Any other urgent business

There was no other urgent financial business

203. Stipends 2009

The paper BISCOU/08/31 prepared by the HR Manager had been circulated and its proposals were APPROVED.

204. Employment & Appointments matters

- a. A minute of a confidential staff matter is recorded in the private minute book.**

Debbie Child left the meeting

- b. Human Resources Provision**

A background paper BISCOU/08/33 had been circulated in advance. The Bishop explained that with the advent of Clergy Terms of Service it was necessary for all dioceses to determine how the additional work was to be handled. In HR matters Bradford was well ahead of the game. It had had a part-time HR Manager for some years. As we considered whether our option was just to build upon what we had, particularly the considerable skills of the present post-holder, we had to do so as a matter of principle. There was a strong movement across the Church that more should be done collaboratively. The Bishops of the NE Dioceses had asked that the Diocesan Secretaries prepare a plan to create a team to provide advice and support across the whole region on clergy HR. This plan had now been published and Bishop David's personal view was that we should not undermine what the rest of the NE Dioceses wished to do.

The Bishop drew members' attentions to the detail of the Secretary's objective paper and members asked a number of specific questions which Malcolm endeavoured to answer, eg the expected qualifications and training to be sought in the regional team members and the experience and qualifications of Bradford's present HR Manager.

Paul Slater reported that he understood that some of the NE Dioceses expected to employ an additional lower graded administrator within each home diocese to supplement the Regional specialists. Nora Whitham was anxious about there being no local HR advice. The set up at Kadugli was good and should be maintained. Mike Moss said that it was inadequate for any future provision to ignore support for parishes in relation to their employees. We ignored the lay position at our peril.

Paul Slater then said that some members of Bishop's Staff had preferred to have local provision with the backup of occasional specialist advice coming from London. However, we did need to ensure that Bradford's "street cred" with the rest of the region was maintained. Malcolm said that other dioceses clearly understood that our approach would inevitably flow from the fact we were starting from a different position to the others. He had already had an indication that if we remained alone, our HR Manager would be welcome to liaise across the diocesan boundary and would be invited to periodic meetings, as happened with regional groups of other specialisms.

Paul Ayers agreed that provision for advice in relation to parish appointments was vital but not sure it had to be within the Diocese. Though he knew that he got advice in relation to these from Debbie, he was not sure that it was actually within her brief. Malcolm confirmed that it was and that she made this clear in documents circulated to parishes.

Paul went on to say that he thought that it should not be automatically assumed that the future requirements would be the same as for secular employees and he went on to criticize the use of the phrase “employee office-holders” in Malcolm’s paper.

Ian Fletcher said that his practice experience was that, for large organizations, centralizing HR had not worked and such clients were, where possible, reversing the arrangement. He strongly favoured the work being done in the Diocese where people know where to look for support and advice.

David Lee was loathe to lose what went well for something which was an unknown quantity. Would it not be possible to retain our arrangement but still support the regional concept? Why could it not be based in Bradford? On this last point, Malcolm said that Wakefield was on the main train and motorway routes and the Diocesan Office had space to accommodate the two staff members to be based in the south of the region. Bradford was not convenient for the Officers’ movements that would be necessary. Tony Hesselwood supported this idea of a middle ground with some link negotiated so that advice from the regional HR team could be drawn upon when necessary.

On the matter of Finance, in answer to Paul Ayers, Malcolm said that he thought that it was likely that the sums initially quoted for the regional HR service would be inadequate – especially if those dioceses were to employ extra staff at home base as well.

The figure in the 2009 budget for Bradford had been based upon a very early estimate made by the region. However, as we moved forward, he expected that the budgetary provision would be inadequate, but there would be greater possibility of gently growing the service as required if our provision was based in Bradford or that part of the region and tailored to the needs of the Diocese, its clergy and its parishes.

Peter Foskett said that what was proposed was an archetypical C of E response and he thought that little real thought had been given to efficiency and efficacy. People needed to know who the HR person was on the ground rather than at a distance. The latter would just reinforce the problems that would inevitably be encountered with the advent of Clergy Terms of Service. He thought what was proposed for the region was inadequate.

Janet Bower said that in the groups at the recent Synod there had been expressions of the need for more collaboration – but “not if we have to share Debbie”. The trouble with the work being carried out at a distance would be that people did not ring until there was a major problem.

Stan Jenkins had regretted the change in society from the use of “personnel” to “human resources” and now to move the work from the Diocese to the region would just make it more focused on managing resources rather than people. As Christians we always needed to have the pastoral emphasis in our approach and not treat people as mere resources.

The Bishop suggested that there were perhaps three options before members. He proposed that he put the suggestion that we go entirely with the NE region as the main motion. As an amendment he would put the Archdeacon of Bradford's suggestion that we continue with the local service based as at present but explore how we might also use the expertise to be based in Wakefield. If both were lost, then the work would remain entirely in Bradford with no reference to the region.

The amendment was put first and carried by 11 votes in favour with the Bishop in the Chair abstaining.

The main motion as amended by the above was then put and was CARRIED by 11 votes in favour with the Bishop in the Chair abstaining.

Meeting closed with the Blessing given by Bishop David.

Date of next meeting:

Thursday 29 January 2009 at 7 p.m. at Kadugli House