

**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
at Parcevall Hall on 8 and 9 May 2009**

Present: Bishop David James (Chairman)
Mrs Sharron Arnold
The Revd Paul Ayers
Mrs Janet Bower
Mr Geoffrey Garnett
Mr Ian Hamilton
The Very Revd David Ison
The Ven. David Lee (absent Sat pm)
Mr Roger Marks
The Revd Peter Mayo-Smith
The Revd Canon David Mewis
Mr Mike Moss
The Revd Canon John Nowell
The Ven Paul Slater
The Revd Paul Tudge
Mrs Jill Wright

In attendance: Mr Malcolm Halliday (Diocesan Secretary)
Mrs Debbie Child (Assistant Secretary)
Mr Peter Foskett (Diocesan Registrar)
Mr Ian Fletcher (Chairman, Church in the World)
Mr Stan Jenkins (Chairman, Ministry & Mission)
The Revd Canon Denise Poole (Bishop's Chaplain)

FRIDAY - SESSION 1

Bishop David in the chair

228. Apologies for absence received from:

For Friday evening:
Mrs Diana Chambers (Chairman, Board of Education)
Mr David Gibson
Mr Chris Wilcock
Mrs Nora Whitham

For Saturday afternoon:
The Ven. David Lee

For both Friday and Saturday:
The Revd Sam Randall
The Revd Canon Ken Medhurst

229. Declaration of non-agenda-ed business

There was none

Sharron Arnold in the chair.

230. Financial Statements to 31.12.08

Board of Finance

(a) Statutory Report & Financial Statement

Sharron Arnold reported that KPMG were very pleased with the presentation of the accounts and that the Bishop's Council should be grateful to Peter Capel-Cure, Shaun Birch and Malcolm Halliday for all the hard work put into their production. Bishop's Council authorised the accounts to be signed and sent to the DBF annual meeting.

(b) Proposal to circulate a Summary of Financial Statements to DBF AGM

Sharron had proposed to circulate a summary of the financial statements to Synod members instead of the full 45 page set of accounts. It had been pointed out that the Articles of Association required a full set to be sent to members, so it was agreed that both the abridged and the full set would be provided this year.

(c) Summary Statement to refer to DBF AGM

It was agreed we would seek approval from members to amend the Articles at the November EGM, in order to enable consultation with the Charity Commission for changes in the future, ie to produce abridged accounts for the Board members.

(d) Directors' letter of presentation

This was approved with a change of date and also the addition of Directors where it simply said Board.

Board of Education

(e) Statutory Report and Financial Statements

Malcolm Halliday explained the funding of the Bradford Academy and the accounts showing £½ million paid by the DBF as sponsors of the project. Malcolm pointed out that a £¼ million had actually been paid and £¼ million which was a commitment was provided for also. The Board of Education has also undertaken to endeavour to meet a further £½ million contribution.

The accounts were noted by the Bishop's Council and referred to the Diocesan Synod.

Other financial statements

(f) The Trusts

Malcolm Halliday referred to the various trusts listed in the Annual Reports. It was pointed out that the Birmingham Midshires Building Society (page 50) no

longer exists and the Church Buildings Fund Trustees' report should be amended.

The Trust accounts were noted.

231. Audit Committee report (BISCOU/09/08)

This was noted.

232. Other Financial Business

(a) Minutes of the Financial Committee meeting on 9 March 2009

These were noted.

(b) Matters arising from the minutes

Minute 252: Paul Ayers was concerned with the reference to the fact that PCC members were liable for any shortfalls in project funding. This had always been the case, but members of the PCC were liable only if they had not acted in good faith when starting out on projects or if they had acted recklessly. Malcolm Halliday said that this had been stated with particular reference to very large projects where the Diocese had previously been expected to provide funding where there was a shortfall, but was no longer in a position to undertake to do this. Paul Ayers felt the minutes should be altered to reflect this, because the statement was likely to put people off becoming members of PCCs.

There was a suggestion that the Diocese ought to continue to underwrite large project shortfalls because it reflected badly on the Church if projects go under; however it was agreed that should the Diocese go to the wall after bailing out projects, this would reflect very badly on the Church as a whole!

The Registrar was asked to provide a note to clarify the legal position.

(c) Cottingley Loan

The Archdeacon explained the current situation. The Trustees were seeking to establish a borrowing facility which should enable them to repay the diocesan loan in full by the end of the year. The Finance Committee will discuss this further at its meeting in June.

The assurances sought by the Trustees were noted and the DBF Chairman's draft reply was agreed.

(d) Any urgent financial business

There was none.

The Bishop in the chair.

233. Minutes of Council meeting held on 19 March 2009

These were agreed.

234. Matters arising from Minutes of Bishop's Council meeting held on 19 March

219c Lay & Clergy Conferences

Paul Slater reported that in view of the current economic climate this item was on hold.

219a Environment Day

There was no update.

220 Presence & Engagement Group

Denise Poole, Dale Barton, Arun John, Sue Hope, Zahida Mallard and Sam Randall have agreed to be members of this group. Adrian Botwright has been asked to chair the Group. The headteacher of Heaton St Barnabas, Mrs Gill Evans, has refused due to ill health. It was agreed that the Board of Education may be able to suggest an appropriate headteacher of a church school to join the group.

222 English Heritage Project Worker

The Bishop reported that Ripon & Leeds had appointed a full time worker, but he still intended to speak to Wakefield Diocese, although it may possibly be too late. David Lee said that this might not be the case as Trevor Mitchell (English Heritage) had said that English Heritage do still have some money available and that we may be able to take this forward. It was suggested that the DAC prepare a job description but John Nowell, Chairman of the DAC, felt this would be difficult given that the DAC had previously said they were against this post. Bishop David pointed out that Bishop's Council were in a position to ask the DAC to do this. Malcolm Halliday suggested that it should be left until the budget decisions were made. This was agreed.

235. Annual Report of Boards, Council and Committee to 31.12.07 (BISCOU/09/08)

David Lee suggested that a note from the Bishop should go at the front of this book thanking people for all their work.

Peter Foskett queried why there appeared to be no expenditure shown in the Board of Education accounts in relation to staffing and other expenses. It was explained that as this came out of Share (ie the DBF) there was no line shown in the DBE accounts. Ian Hamilton queried the high level of education administration expenditure, saying that the total cost was as much as it was to run our Diocesan Office. He felt that the level of expenditure was particularly high in relation to the staffing costs and running of the office in Harrogate seemed particularly excessive, when the Bradford figures were only meeting half of the total costs.

The reports of the Boards and Committees were noted and referred to the Synod. Proposed by Mike Moss and seconded by Roger Marks.

236. Appointment matters

It was agreed that Janet Bower replace Eric Kyte (who had resigned) on the Employment and Personnel Committee for the remainder of the triennium.

237. Synod matters

(a) General Synod - diocesan motion at July Session (DIOSYN/09/09)

There was a long discussion on the Calverley Deanery motion. It was agreed that the Dean would substantially redraft the background paper in order to narrow down its focus. Paul Ayers felt that it would be good if we could find out how General Synod was to respond. There was a considerable amount of concern because neither General Synod members nor Bishop's Council members were quite comfortable with the motion, which appeared only to be looking at one facet of ministry. It was agreed that the background paper (a Bradford diocesan paper as opposed to a deanery one) should focus more narrowly on the specific issue, which is likely to be of concern to the General Synod, and may be received more favourably. It was agreed that the Dean would redraft the paper.

(b) Diocesan Synod - reflections on "How are we doing?" (DIOSYN/09/10)

Ian Hamilton said that a start had been made on this but there was more work to do. Café style was very popular with members but it seemed that few people really understood the standing orders and perhaps a training session on this would help. The feedback had generally been very positive but it was suggested that more time needed to be spent in discussion groups and then time provided for plenary after this.

238. Bishop's matters

(a) Report on Diocesan Day 2009

The Bishop reported that there were 540 people at Diocesan Day; the worship was appreciated; the speakers had been very well received; there has been a very good feeling and there had been some quality seminars.

(b) Others

Bishop David reported that the Church Commissioners were waiting for strategy papers from dioceses and that Bradford's would be with them by July.

SATURDAY - SESSIONS 2 AND 3

Bishop David in the chair.

239. National financial information (BISCOU/09/11)

Malcolm Halliday presented his paper which provoked significant discussion on pensions with considerable input from Ian Fletcher who felt that the diocesan finance provision for pensions for 2010 was inadequate. Geoff Garnett felt that Ian was taking a very pessimistic view; at the time the pension figures were produced the financial state admittedly was bad but there was every possibility it might get better by the next formal valuation. There was much discussion around defined benefits and people's experience of it. Paul Ayers was concerned for clergy, saying that it was difficult for clergy if they were left feeling that they were a burden to parishes, so the Bishop invited lay members of the Bishop's Council to comment on this. It was felt generally that congregations supported their clergy and understood that they were paid a stipend much less than salary; that they had to live in a tithed house and,

therefore, with their pension needed to buy a house at retirement. Some still felt that the Church Commissioners could offer some more pension support to dioceses. Malcolm Halliday said that any extra provision from the Church Commissioners to relieve some of the diocesan liabilities incurred since 1 January 1998 would have a major knock on to the Church Commissioner's ability to make future annual grants to needy dioceses such as Bradford.

There was discussion about a pay freeze. Malcolm Halliday reported that other dioceses were considering this possibility for 2010. Exeter had frozen pay in 2009.

Malcolm Halliday pointed out that Share income is coming in at a level of at least what was expected and officers will continue to monitor this very closely.

240. Diocesan financial prospects for next 5 years (BISCOU/09/12)

Malcolm Halliday had circulated various scenarios and had begun to explain these when the Chairman asked him to restrict the presentation to the income forecast up to 2014 (not the expenditure). This led to a long discussion around the possible deficits under the various different Scenarios (see Minute 242).

It was noted that the Sheffield allocation from the National Church showed numbers reducing from 103 to 95 by 2014. The four Scenarios which were presented reflected that cash available to parochial ministry need not reduce at the same rate.

Malcolm Halliday explained that possible recovery of loan capital from Cottingley PCC was not included in these forecasts but the interest on the loan had been taken into account, therefore, if the loan was repaid it would be a considerable boost to the reserves. He also explained that a substantial amount of DBF cash had been spent on building projects, ie replacement vicarages and it was expected by the end of the year to have recovered quite a lot of this outlay by the sale of the three replaced vicarages, and hopefully those that weren't sold in 2010 would be sold by the end of 2011. As things stood with any of the Scenarios, the reserves by 2014 would still be at least twice the desired amount of the working reserves of 12% of expenditure.

David Lee was keen to invest the net profit from house sales to form an endowment fund which would begin to build some reserve funds to generate a parallel income stream to supplement the Share for the future and he thought this should be discussed. John Nowell said that the Income and Expenditure Review Group had considered this and intended to invite David to discuss this with them.

There was concern about the risk of requested Share not being received and that perhaps that ought to be addressed. Paul Ayers pointed out again that as our giving is good, then we must 'Go for Growth' and increase our givers. This was supported by Ian Fletcher who was more pessimistic about the Share receipts holding up than Malcolm Halliday.

241. Future Faithful (BISCOU/09/13)

Bishop David spoke to his paper explaining that this was an ongoing process and this part of it would be completed at the June Synod. He intended to meet with churchwardens in the autumn and would then produce a summary of this

document for PCCs, with the full version available on the web or in hard copy. He had considered encompassing all the good news stories in this paper but the Media Adviser had suggested that it would be better for these to go out in "Newsround" and hopefully in the local papers.

He still wanted to emphasise that he felt that finance was secondary. Money will shape what we do, but what we do will shape the money. He felt that the balance sheet should always show what we believe in, that we have an obligation to the future as a Church and we must look to the future through a God of hope. We must engage in making things happen.

As the average age of congregations seems to be increasing by a year each year, he felt that Going for Growth must be a priority and the Church must be open to new people who come through its doors.

Bishop David talked about the changing patterns and shapes of ministry and how we must learn to work collaboratively at all levels; between churches, across boundaries, lay and clerical, and focus much more on clusters. He saw the pattern for 30 clusters with 2 priests for each cluster so, say, 60 cluster priests and then 20 to 30 priests not attached to anything/anywhere in particular and, therefore, open and free to do other things. He felt we must have the space to do new things and take risks.

There was first some open discussion about the general principles of the document. Ian Fletcher stressed the need to include in the document a way of measuring the proposals. He felt that it was necessary to put in the document a way of measuring what we were proposing. He also felt that the vision was not clear from the text and that everything related to diocesan committees and not to the parishes. Bishop David said that proposals still need to be prioritised and a timescale set. He said that it was a diocesan strategy because it is impossible for the Diocese to impose strategies on parishes.

Mike Moss also wondered what we were trying to achieve. He wasn't sure how the proposals built into the provision. David Lee felt that the document would benefit from an abstract at the beginning to sum up the vision which might help parishes to relate to the bigger picture.

John Nowell was concerned about the role of the parish. The future of parishes appeared to be in question in this document. It seemed that we were to become a congregational Church. He was aware that some clergy put barriers in the way of the occasional offices and he said we must remember that we are here to provide those services for all parishioners, and we must ensure that we have appropriate coverage of parochial clergy who are properly supported by the Diocese to enable this to happen. We must be careful not to cease to be the Church of England, a church which is supposed to provide the "cure of souls" for everyone, and is why we have historic funding from the Church Commissioners.

Peter Foskett felt we must try and condense the strategy into an easier text which will encourage people to read it in full. He felt that the text was too much for most people to get through.

Bishop David said he would be providing a summary for parishes. This text was simply part of encouraging people to engage in a rolling discussion.

Looking at the parish system, Bishop David thought that wherever there was a community there should be a worshipping community, with at least one ordained person. He understood it was easier to see this in a rural community where the boundaries were more easily defined. In an urban situation many people worship beyond their parish church and in large parishes it is too difficult to administer to the whole parish. There is a theory that clergy can only relate realistically to a limited number of people (about 70) and, therefore, we must do it differently in urban areas.

David Ison felt that there should be a Preamble to pick up three points - (1) that there should be a Christian community in every community; (2) the old hierarchical parish system is failing and we need a renewal of parishes; and (3) how does the Diocese help parishes to renew their ministry and mission for the coming decades?

Paul Ayers felt that he was torn between agreeing and disagreeing; he has an ordinary parish ministry but he included in that many new things and he sees himself as a mission priest. He said we are in danger of putting forward gnostic ideas, thinking that we don't need buildings etc. Balancing this, he is aware that some of our churches are dull and are not progressing. He was keen to support the renewal of parish ministry rather than replacing it. The text suggests a dichotomy and he does not see it in this way, but feels clearly that parish priests can fulfil both roles. The old system still works well but renewal is necessary; both ways need to be combined - one should not replace the other.

Stan Jenkins felt it would be good if we had a short and pithy mission statement with a timeframe, eg "Bradford Diocese needs a growing worshipping community in every community by (date)". Paul Slater pointed out that our parish clergy are those best placed to reach the un-churched and they need support to be renewed in the combined role of parish/mission priest. Nora Whitham felt that it was all right to talk about outcomes and measurements but these needed to be wide and flexible because these are abstract, emotional things we dealing with. It's not straightforward and it may not be possible to reach those sorts of targets in this area of work without damaging people's sense of achievement. Geoff Garnett felt we needed an *overall* strategy and the future must not be left to chance or to he who shouts loudest.

Bishop David said that all he was looking at was getting away from the idea of one person going it alone. Janet Bower said she felt there was a danger of imposing one size fits all and although she was in favour of a diocesan strategy, she said there must be built into that, a flexibility for different Christian communities. Ian Hamilton was keen on the idea of collaboration although some parishes still resist this and he would like some work done on how we overcome this.

Bishop David talked about deployment of clergy - there must be a flexibility. It is a very complex situation and we need to be more subtle. There should be more dialogue - perhaps the new Mission and Pastoral Committee would be the place to have that.

Bishop David wondered to what extent SMART objectives could be included in his proposals.

There followed further general comments about the proposals:-

Ministry - the Ministry to the Elderly Group members were unaware they were supposed to be producing a report as implied in 4.2.5.

Page 14 - where it says 'several lay people' - it was pointed out again that there were 'many lay people'.

Page 26 - the appointment of a Racial Justice Officer should say "perhaps in conjunction with Ripon & Leeds Diocese".

Section 4 is extremely diverse - the scale of it, the timescale, the cost variations are great and difficult to prioritise one against the other. Is it possible to group or re-organise those into a structure of long, medium and short term?

It was agreed that objectives, timescales and costs ought to be put in where at all possible.

Mike Moss referred to the suggested motion (in the note to Bishop's Council at the end of the document). He did not feel that 'commending' was strong enough and would prefer 'requests' and to add 'reports back to Synod'. It was suggested that parishes were asked to consider their existing strategies in line with the "Future Faithful" aims. There was some concern about the timing of parish strategies; the general feeling was that it was too soon to talk about this; both John Nowell and Paul Tudge hoped that parish strategies would develop in the light of the six-session "Future Faithful" course which featured in the Future Faithful document.

It was suggested that instead of the Bishop only talking to churchwardens, it would be better if he talked to PCC representatives, and as Deanery Synods had been used so successfully for the recent consultation, Jill Wright asked that they are not cut out of the next stage.

Denise Poole felt that we must clearly emphasise that the recent consultation was based on the premise that this exercise was about helping parishes with their mission strategies and not imposing one from outside; "Future Faithful" must be about supporting and resourcing parishes but it would be good to monitor how it does this. Stan Jenkins was keen that we asked parishes what resources they needed from the Diocese; he thought we should offer practical solutions alongside prayer to help parishes.

It was agreed to use the Archdeacons' Visitations Articles of Inquiry in Spring 2010 to illicit feedback, making it unnecessary to set up a separate process for this.

Paul Ayers pointed out that a lot of the strategy is very specific and applied only to the Bradford Met. and/or the City areas. We might agree on SMART objectives on the proposals where it was possible, but he felt that some of the costings would be difficult.

It was agreed that a Preface would be added.

There were some minor adjustments to the text and specific proposals and members then went on to look at Chapter 5 and the "Critical Success Factors".

Proposal 5.1.2 - Reduction in Parochial Clergy

Bishop David felt that we could use this reduction in order to reduce the Share requested from parishes. The reduction in priests was due to a reducing Sheffield Allocation forecast by the National Church and the financial provision expected to be available in the coming years. The reduction down to 95 is in line with the Sheffield formula. It was agreed that self-supporting ministers be included in the strategy, not just stipendiary clergy; we should also consider how many NSMs and House for Duty posts we can afford.

Proposal 5.1.3 - Introduction of a half time training officer

It was thought that this would be useful to help support the changes going on in stipendiary ministry and to train and support the growing numbers of self-supporting clergy. Paul Ayers pointed out that, yet again, we talk with one voice about central cuts and then at the same time propose adding an extra central post.

Proposal 5.1.4 - Deanery Training Officers

John Nowell was against the idea of deanery training officers and further central training provision, feeling that it would be much more useful to put the funds into specific training events, eg like the recent one at Whitby.

Proposal 5.2.1 - A health check for clergy

It was suggested that the modest annual grant from the Queen Victoria Fund could perhaps be used to fund part of this. It was agreed this would be offered to all licensed clergy and to lay employees but not extend beyond that. Debbie Child said that research with other dioceses suggested that such provision – which would be confidential and voluntary – would receive about a 1/3rd take up. Paul Slater said this would be an important provision, not least, in support of the introduction of Clergy Terms of Service processes.

Proposal 5.2.3 - Replacing unsuitable vicarages at no cost to the Diocese

It was agreed that this should be rephrased to say 'at minimal cost to the Diocese' or 'cost neutral'.

Proposal 5.3.4 - The Bishop was keen to return to granting an interview to at least one internal candidate to help free up parishes where changes might be needed and create movement necessary if overall reductions were to be required.

Proposal 5.4 - It was agreed that there should be a specific proposal written against this item.

Proposal 5.6 - Church Buildings

Bishop David said that churches must be used every day of the week. It was agreed that the DAC should be added to the action group.

It was agreed that the Bishop's suggested motion to Synod would be altered to read:-

- 1 *that this Synod do take note of the Report
"Future Faithful - the next steps for the Diocese" DIOSYN....;*
- 2 *that this Synod welcomes the report (in particular (amendment) but is excepting (amendments) and requests the appropriate Boards, Council, Committees and Officers to consider and report back to Synod; and*
- 3 *commends the strategy and accompanying report from this Synod to the PCCs of the Diocese for them to discuss and to respond to their archdeacon within the 2010 Articles of Inquiry.)*

An early draft of the Visitation Articles would go out earlier than normal, perhaps in January, so that PCCs as well as Churchwardens and Clergy could be involved in the responses.

It was agreed that BISCOU/09/13 would go to Synod with some revisions but that the Council had not, as yet, agreed to any of the specific proposals; the reduction in parochial clergy would be discussed later in the meeting. Synod would be asked to refer the document for further discussion of the specific proposals to the relevant diocesan bodies.

SESSION 4

242. Budget for 2010 (BISCOU/09/14)

The first Scenario showed stipend/salary increases of 2½% from 2010 to 2014, a pension contribution of 45%, with significant cuts in parochial ministry and central support and administration.

Scenario A showed a pay freeze in 2010 with stipend/salary increases of 2½% thereafter, a pension contribution of 45% but again, significant cuts in parochial ministry and central services.

Scenario B showed a pay freeze in 2010, but stipend/salary increases of 2½% thereafter, a pension contribution of 45%, maintaining the level of parochial clergy to the Sheffield formula plus 5%, but cutting central services and housing support in 2010/2011.

Scenario C showed a pay freeze in 2010, but stipend/salary increases of 2½% thereafter, 45% contribution to pension, maintaining the level of parochial clergy to the Sheffield formula plus 5%, replacing lost clergy with some lay posts, but continuing cuts to central services and housing support in 2010/2011.

Again there was considerable discussion around the area of pensions. There was some concern that 45% was not enough and if a 57% contribution

became a reality this could make a considerable difference. Malcolm Halliday suggested that, at the recent IDFF meeting in London, some dioceses had said they would not be able to cope with much more than 40% and 45% would be a problem, so he felt that perhaps benefits may have to be changed in line with this. Ian Fletcher said that as Bishop's Council had agreed to support our clergy and retain the defined benefits scheme then we must budget accordingly. Bishop David said that he felt that 57% was quite high and suggested that by 2011 we might get to 50% and maybe 55% in 2012. Stan Jenkins felt that we should look at the worst case scenario and make the necessary adjustments. Peter Mayo-Smith agreed that we ought to recalculate between 50% and 55%. Bishop David said we had budgeted conservatively in other areas, for example, we have budgeted for five vacancies, but from 2011 onwards there would be many retirements and, therefore likely more vacancies than planned and longer interregnums which might relieve the budget. Malcolm Halliday pointed out that our cash reserves would still be over a £1,000,000 by 2014 and, therefore, not insubstantial, so we must not panic.

Bishop David would like us to prepare two 2010 budgets - one with a 2½% increase and one with a 0% increase in stipends/salaries; he intends to meet with all paid clergy and lay employees to discuss a possible pay freeze in 2010.

There was a question about how to deal with any proposed cuts - how will these cuts be found? There must be a strategy, but what would it entail? Bishop David said it was likely to be on average one post per deanery. He had suggested a reduction of four posts from Craven and five from Bradford; however, that had not been agreed. David Mewis, speaking from a rural stand point, said that any further cuts in parochial clergy would push the existing clergy over the edge; there comes a point where you can reduce no more before it has a huge impact on delivering adequate ministry, on receiving Share, and on the health of those remaining. Peter Foskett felt that reducing parochial clergy was an easy way to make cuts and asked whether consideration had been given to the spend in other areas - however worthy or necessary they were, eg Links, which involves a lot of overseas visits.

Malcolm Halliday proposed that we did not decide on the detail of the budget at this stage but agree the maximum figure we expect to require and be able to raise in Share next year. Paul Slater and Geoff Garnett agreed, saying that we really must have more time to discuss this. David Ison thought that we had to be fiscally responsible and couple this with more radical thinking about ministry and mission. Denise felt that cuts in clergy were due to clergy retirements and not to do with money but she was contradicted by the suggestion that money featured quite firmly in these decisions.

There was no decision taken on where cuts would be made, but Synod would be asked to approve in June an increase in Share for 2010, to enable an expected receipt of at least £3,968,309 (1% above the expected receipt in 2009) to be attained. This would allow parishes to plan budgets for the consequent Share request for 2010 by mid-autumn.

A budget setting out the detail of the work that could be carried out within this figure would be discussed with relevant groups over the summer and within the I&E Group and presented to Synod for approval in November. It would be the

aim that there was no Operating Deficit over the two years 2010 and 2011 taken together.

243. Structures Review Report (BISCOU/09/15)

Malcolm Halliday said that Sallie Bassham had asked him to present the document. He pointed out the proposal relating to Bishop's Council on page 10 of the document:-

Elected - 2 clergy + 2 lay

Reduce by 1 the clerical and lay members from each archdeaconry

Co-opted - 4 clergy + 4 lay

Increase by 2 the clerical and lay co-opted members

This would hopefully ensure that the necessary skills be available to the Council to improve its governance. It was agreed that this change to Standing Orders be proposed.

It is now a statutory requirement for Synod to approve the budget as well as agree a figure to be raised and this is included in the revised Standing Order.

The Chair of the Capital Assets Advisory Committee should be appointed by the Bishop's Council and the Vice Chairman of the Board of Finance would become a member.

The Employment and Personnel Committee - it was proposed that the Chair of this Committee should have expertise in the area of employment of personnel. The Safeguarding Children & Vulnerable Adults Committee's work would be incorporated into this Committee's oversight.

The Parcevall Hall Management Council - it was suggested that this be abolished and that there should be a small advisory group to support the Warden. The Warden was in agreement with this, as was the Chair of the present Hall Management Council. The change would mean that the Warden would become accountable to the Diocesan Secretary.

Changes to the Structure of the Pastoral Committee must be agreed by Synod in June to meet the timetable set down in the new Dioceses, Pastoral and Mission Measure. The Pastoral Committee would become the Diocesan Mission and Pastoral Committee. The latest terms proposed for the function and operation of this body was shown on BISCOU/09/16. The Committee would be required to have regard to the Bishop's Council's representations on behalf of Synod. The work of the present Redundant Churches Users Group will be taken over by this new Committee.

Property Committee - there would be a radical change in this work at committee level. A new Committee would consist of a chairperson appointed by the Bishop's Council, two Archdeacons, two clergy and two lay representatives from each Archdeaconry. They would meet once or twice each year to ensure that the standards were being met. The Archdeacon, one clergy

and one lay member from each Archdeaconry would attend with the Property Officer at the relevant ingoing works meetings.

Paul Ayers was concerned that the Chairman of this group was proposed to be a lay person and it was agreed that this would be amended to read that the "chairperson should be a person appointed by the Standing Committee" (ie, clergy or lay). This amendment was proposed by Paul Ayers and seconded by Mike Moss. It was CARRIED with three against.

The Archdeacon of Craven queried that Archdeacons had no voting rights on the Finance Committee and it was agreed that the phraseology seemed strange but was in the current constitution. There had always been an assumption that they were allowed to vote. It was agreed that they ought to have voting rights when they attended and this would be made explicit.

Page 18 - Employment and Personnel Committee - point (i) 'auditing and monitoring inclusivity of minority ethnic Christians', why were disabled people not included in this? It was agreed that we must meet the legal requirements for disabled people and this would be included in point (i).

Page 11, point 106 - 'the Standing Committee shall not later than the 31st of October in each year submit to the Synod a budget of expenditure'. Should this be 31st October, is this a statutory requirement or, if it isn't, then it should be November.

Ian Fletcher again raised the need for Bishop's Council to reduce in size to provide good governance. The Review Group had consulted about this and people wanted to have geographic representation on the Council and if we moved principally to appointment and co-option this would take away the right of deaneries.

Bishop David thought that there appeared to be some reservations about the decision not to make too many changes, due perhaps to the change in the not too distant future of the Bishop and the Diocesan Secretary, but he wondered if we could make decisions swiftly enough? There were lots of unfilled places on the present committees with the structures as they are. The Bishop's Council was not representative enough - there were no young people and the male/female balance was poor. He questioned the rejection of the idea of the Bishop's Council being both directors and members of the DBF, but this had been discussed at a previous meeting. He then wondered if the Bishop's Council might become the new Pastoral and Mission Committee, but this was unlikely to save any additional tiers of administration.

Bishop David pointed out that the present Vacancy in See Committee has unfilled places and should he give notice of his retirement on or before the 31st December 2009, the present membership with its unfilled places would stand for the ensuing vacancy. ie any vacancies could not be filled at that stage. It was necessary to ensure that the committee membership was up to date.

There was some general discussion around the Structures Review with some people feeling that the changes hadn't been radical enough; others were concerned that there was not enough time to discuss them properly at this

point in the afternoon; however, the Council was aware that it was necessary for the changes in the Pastoral Committee to go to Synod and, therefore, it was agreed to accept the paper with the amendment about the Chair to the Property Committee and to include disability along with minority ethnic Anglicans.

244. Other standing order amendments left from earlier Synod meeting (BISCOU/09/16)

Paper noted for reference to Synod.

245. Board of Education matters

Diana Chambers, due to the lateness in the day, did not give a report but would want to follow up comments made on Friday evening about the cost of running the Education team. She felt she would like to point out that this was all money well spent; that the amount of work produced was incredible and the team needed all of their budget and more to deliver this.

246. Church in the World matters

Ian Fletcher reported that Colin Chapman would be coming to St Augustines next Friday.

247. Ministry and Mission matters

Stan Jenkins briefly mentioned enhancing lay ministry and suggested that it would be useful to look at different forms of Readers, ie Readers who could undertake differing forms of ministry; however, this would need to go to the Readers Board before it could be taken forward in any way.

248. Communications matters

Mike Moss very briefly mentioned the deficit for Newsround. Although we had budgeted for around £8,000 deficit, there was a possibility it might increase to £10,000. He wondered in the present climate if Newsround continued to be viable.

249. Agenda for Diocesan Synod 20 June 2009

Janet Bower suggested that due to the extensiveness of the agenda and the complexity of it, the clergy and lay chairs would consider publishing that they would take no amendments from the floor on the day.

Peter Foskett felt that it would be sensible to move item 13 higher on the agenda as this was something that must go through. It was agreed to adjust this to item 9.

The meeting closed at 4.15pm.

**Date of next meeting:
Thursday 9 July 2009 at 7pm
Kadugli House, Board Room**