

Review of constitutions

I attach under cover of this note the report of the group established by the Archbishops' Council to review the constitutions of bodies answerable to the General Synod through the Archbishops' Council.

The report, which makes recommendations for the better governance of the work undertaken by the Divisions of the Archbishops' Council, is circulated for consultation. Following the presentation at Synod, comments should be sent to David Williams, Clerk to the Synod either by post at Church House, Great Smith Street, London SW1P 3AZ or by email to david.williams@c-of-e.org.uk

The process outlined at paragraph 60 of the report has been endorsed by the Archbishops' Council.

Canon Dr Christina Baxter
Chair, Constitutions Review Group

Improving Governance

- a consultation paper on bodies answerable to the General Synod through the Archbishops' Council

Introduction

1. The Archbishops' Council is required under Standing Order 119(a) to review the constitutions of bodies answerable to the Synod through the Archbishops' Council once in every quinquennium.
2. This is the third time such a review has been undertaken since the Archbishops' Council met for the first time in 1999: previous reviews reported in 2000 (followed by the Guildford Review in 2001, which reviewed and to some extent reshaped the Council's committee structure) and 2005. The two previous reviews consolidated and rationalised the constitutions of the Boards, Councils and Committees. Neither of them took a radical approach to identifying the structures which were most suitable to support the Council's work.
3. When the Council initiated the current review in Spring 2007, it wished to go back to first principles and to use the review to conduct a rigorous assessment of the Council's future structural needs and how the Council might best be enabled to exercise oversight of each area of its activity. It established a sub-committee, chaired by Dr Christina Baxter and comprising Prebendary Kay Garlick, Professor Gillian Stamp, Andreas Whittam Smith and the Rt Revd Michael Perham, to undertake the review.
4. The Review Group's terms of reference have been:
 - to make an initial assessment of what the Council does and must reserve to itself (bearing in mind Charity Commission guidance);
 - to reflect on the relationship between the Council and the Synod and the Synodical means of scrutiny for the work carried out by the Council and its staff;
 - to revisit the question of the relative responsibilities of staff and members;
 - to consider in the light of that how the work carried out by Council's staff (which has already been subjected to the service review process) should best be overseen in future at member level, whether by members of the Council or others to whom the responsibility is delegated;
 - to produce proposals for the sub-structure (number of bodies, size, terms of reference, etc) that the Council will need in the quinquennium beginning November 2010; and
 - to look particularly at the need for ongoing bodies rather than more time-limited, task-based groups.
5. In this report the Review Group has analysed the present situation and offered proposals for change. We have tested out our initial thinking both with the Archbishops' Council itself and with the House of Bishops' Standing Committee. Both were largely supportive. At this stage no decisions have been taken. It seemed to us that the sensible next step was, with the Council's agreement, to offer our ideas for wider consultation so that we can reflect further on the reactions received before we make final recommendations to the Council.

Scope of proposals

6. The Group's overall conclusion is that the present arrangements for discharging the work of the Archbishops' Council are too complex, cumbersome, costly and confused. Just as many dioceses and parishes have moved away from over-elaborate committee arrangements in

recent years, so the time has come for refreshing and streamlining our national arrangements so that we can be better stewards of the time members and staff give for the work of the Kingdom.

7. Our proposals are limited in scope: they do not involve changes to the Synod, its Commissions (Crown Nominations, Liturgical, Legal Advisory and Doctrine) or the committees that support it in its legislative work and in the management of its business (Business, Appointments and Standing Orders). They do not involve changes to the functions or membership of the Archbishops' Council (which has a majority of members elected by the Synod). And they do not affect either the Council's Audit Committee or those bodies that are created by legislation (the Dioceses Commission, the Cathedral Fabric Commission for England and Wales and the Church Buildings Council). A table showing how each body will be affected is included at Annex 2.
8. If accepted, our proposals would, however, mark the end of the other Boards, Councils and Committees. These bodies have, since 1999, formally been sub-committees of the Council, though there can be misunderstanding about their role and purpose. In practice their chairs play a key role, supported by the relevant senior member of staff. We believe that the time has come to move to arrangements that build on and legitimise the way in which much of the work is already done rather than perpetuating over-heavy structures that were fashioned in an earlier age.

Outline of proposals

9. It is now a decade since the Archbishops' Council was established. The Review Group considers that the time has come to make a number of changes to the way in which much of the national work for which the Council is responsible is discharged. In certain respects the changes put in place in 1999 included some unfinished business in respect of the Council's supporting structure. It was understandable at the time that the Church wished to proceed one step at a time, but there is now an opportunity to complete the process of reform that the creation of the Council heralded.
10. The Review Group has considered the functions and working practices of the Boards, Councils and Committees which operate under the oversight of the Archbishops' Council and has developed proposals which it believes would better reflect the needs of the Council as it moves into the next quinquennium.
11. We propose that instead of delegating its powers to Boards, Councils and Committees the Archbishops' Council should in future delegate them for each particular policy area to an individual, at member level. He or she would be supported by a small reference group appointed by the Council, together with the relevant senior members of staff. The only exception to this manner of delegation would be in relation to investment issues where, as a matter of propriety, it would be right for authority to be vested in the Finance Group rather than solely in an individual.
12. Under these proposals, Synod would have an enhanced opportunity to engage with the issues through 'report and review groups', made up of elected Synod members. These would meet once a year in parallel sessions during the Synod's July Group of Sessions to review and contribute to the relevant area of activity. They would also receive briefings and bulletins on the relevant divisional. In addition, there would still be the opportunity for any member of Synod to ask questions at each Group of Sessions, to be answered by the lead person for that area.
13. The Group's view is that these proposals have the potential to clarify accountabilities, sharpen responsibilities for decision making and significantly reduce the amount of time that members and staff have to spend at committee meetings in London. They will align our national governance arrangements more closely with best practice in the charity sector. And

they will give dioceses and parishes fresh assurance that, in its work, the Church is as committed as they are to discharging its national work efficiently and cost-effectively. At the same time, they will continue to ensure that the whole people of God are engaged in issues that are important to the health of the whole body.

Legal framework

14. The way in which the Archbishops' Council itself relates structurally to the Synod is set out in the National Institutions Measure 1998. In summary, the Council is an independent statutory body established under the National Institutions Measure 1998, and a registered charity.
15. Aspects of the Council's relationship with the Synod are regulated expressly by the National Institutions Measure and the Synod's Standing Orders. It is required by the Measure, for example, to report on its business to the Synod, to lay its audited accounts before the Synod and to lay its budget before the Synod for approval.
16. The Synod's Standing Orders require the Chair of the Council (or another member authorised by him) to answer questions on any matter relating to the business of the Council and to review the constitutions of the bodies answerable through it to the Synod at least once in every quinquennium.
17. The Synod does not have a power to direct or set down a binding policy framework in relation to the Archbishops' Council, or indeed the Church Commissioners or the Church of England Pensions Board. Each is a corporate body administered by persons in the same position as trustees.
18. The Archbishops' Council consists of 19 members, of whom 10 are elected by the Synod, 3 are ex officio and 6 are appointed by the Archbishops with the approval of the Synod. Those whom the Synod elects to the Archbishops' Council cannot in any sense be mandated by the Synod or by the constituencies that elected them: once appointed, they are legally obliged to act in the best interests of the Council as they understand them.
19. This does not detract from the Synod's own ability, as the Church of England's national legislative and deliberative body, to declare the Church's mind on particular issues (e.g. climate change, euthanasia, marriage etc). All members of the Council are members of the Synod, so they hear and participate in the Synod's debates.
20. Once the Synod has come to a view on a particular issue, the Council and those who serve it are expected to respect that as representing the mind of the Church and to reflect it in, for example, submissions to Government or public statements. That is different from a power of direction. So, for example, the Synod cannot limit the discretion of the Council on matters for which, as a charitable corporation, it has fiduciary responsibilities – most notably in relation to investment decisions. The same is true of the Synod's relationship with the Commissioners and the Pensions Board.
21. The framework of Boards, Councils and Committees that currently exists derives from a time when the Synod, together with its Standing Committee, was the body responsible for the work which is now undertaken by staff in divisions under the oversight of the Archbishops' Council. Some are older than the Synod itself, having their origin in bodies dating back in some cases to before the Church Assembly was established.
22. When the legislation creating the Archbishops' Council was passed in 1998, responsibility for the existing bodies was effectively transferred to the Council. Section 15 of Schedule 1 of the National Institutions Measure 1998 provides that 'The Council may appoint such committees as it considers expedient and may delegate any of its functions to a committee'. The Boards, Councils and Committees answerable to the Synod through the Council represent such committees.

23. At the same time, the Synod's Standing Order 119 provides that 'The constitutions of bodies answerable to the Synod through the Archbishops' Council [...] shall be determined by the Council after consultation with the General Synod'. The same Standing Order requires the Council to review the constitutions once every five years and report on that review. This recognises that the Boards, Councils and Committees derive their legal authority from the Council rather than from the Synod.
24. As committees of the Archbishops' Council, the Boards, Councils and Committees act under delegated authority from the Council via the constitutions it has approved. They must act (if so required) in accordance with any directions given by the Council. The Synod cannot direct those committees any more than it can direct the Archbishops' Council itself.
25. This is something that may not be fully appreciated, but it is one of the big changes brought about by the creation of the Archbishops' Council. In other words, when the Synod passes a motion requesting one of the Boards, Councils or Committees to undertake work on its behalf, this request must be considered by the Archbishops' Council in the context of its overall commitments and responsibilities.
26. There are two ways in which the Synod can probe the work undertaken by the Boards, Councils and Committees:
 - by asking questions of them at Question Time under the Synod's Standing Orders; and
 - by considering (and in the case of the budget, approving) the budget, report and accounts of the Archbishops' Council – which also cover the finances and activities of the Boards, Councils and Committees, as committees of the Council.
27. Under our proposals, the Synod's ability to engage in these ways with work undertaken on behalf of the Council would remain (indeed it would in some respects be enhanced). There would simply be the need for some consequential changes to the Synod's Standing Orders, particularly SO 119 (which deals with bodies 'answerable to the Synod through the Archbishops' Council') and SO 105(a) (which deals with Questions) to reflect the new terminology. Those would be brought to the Synod at a later Group of Sessions.

Underlying principles

28. The Review Group has focussed on what the Council is likely to need from 2010 onwards to carry out most effectively and efficiently the work entrusted to it. The Council cannot do everything itself: the Archbishops' Council works in collaboration with the House of Bishops, the General Synod and the other National Church Institutions. The model under consideration has been developed with that as an underlying principle.
29. In addition, it is important in a voluntary organisation to have processes that maximise the chances of buy-in to decisions. The networks supported by the Divisions of the Archbishops' Council are and will remain an important contributor to that process. The Review Group has also borne these factors in mind in developing its proposals.
30. The proposals also recognise that the Archbishops' Council is established as a statutory body and a registered charity which must keep under review the effectiveness of its governance arrangements, including exercising clear oversight over all the areas of the work for which it is responsible. This oversight has previously been exercised through the Boards, Councils and Committees, but such large member-level bodies are expensive to resource, lack flexibility and perpetuate a lack of clarity in the area of accountability.
31. The Church needs to be a good steward, not least of the time of those who are willing to make themselves available to serve the Church nationally. Many people give very generously of their time to serve the Church locally, at diocesan level and nationally. Very often it is the same people who are bearing the heaviest burdens at each level. It is incumbent on the Church to ensure that their time and talents are deployed most effectively.

32. The Group has, therefore, tried to build on those aspects of the present arrangements that work very well – for example, the productive relationship between Chairs and senior staff – and, beyond that, to ensure that structures are made as light as possible. This is a process that many dioceses and parishes have gone through in reviewing and reducing their own committee structures.

The proposals

33. The Review Group's proposals are two-fold: namely that a named person ('the lead person'), supported by a reference group, will have delegated responsibility for a specific area of the Council's work and will be accountable to the Council for the work undertaken in that area; and the Synod will elect 'report and review' groups to engage with the work of the lead people and reference groups (see paragraphs 52-59).

Lead person

34. The lead person, who would in many cases be a member of the Archbishops' Council itself or the House of Bishops, will be supported by a 'reference group' of people who may, but need not, be members of Synod, with a special interest and/or expertise in that area of work. The reference group will additionally be able to call on other expert advice for discrete, time-limited projects as required and key in to networks associated with their area or areas of work. The lead person (and the reference group) will be supported by the relevant senior member(s) of the Council's staff.
35. There is no intention that the new arrangements should lead to any significant change in the balance of those who currently lead particular areas of work as chairs of the existing Boards, Councils and Committees. This means, in some cases, that the lead person will be a member of the Archbishops' Council; in others, the lead person will be a member of the House of Bishops who is not a member of the Council (in some cases it would, additionally, be sensible for that bishop to be one of the Lords Spiritual); in others there may be another Synod member who is pre-eminently suited to the task. In all cases, the lead person will be a member of Synod.
36. In cases where the lead person is not a member of the Archbishops' Council, the Group considers that the reference group should either include a member of the Archbishops' Council in order to make a specific connection and channel of communication with the Council, or that a nominated member of the Council should act as a point of contact between the reference group and the Council.
37. The Review Group would not wish to be too prescriptive over which areas should be led by a member of the Council since a certain amount turns on the experience of those on the Council at any particular time. However, it believes that the pattern that has developed in which the lead people on Finance, Ministry and Mission and Public Affairs are always members of the Council should be maintained, given the centrality of those three areas for the Council's own strategic responsibilities. With other areas it should be sufficient for those concerned to have the right to attend when they are bringing business to the Council.
38. The Review Group notes that the present staffing structures that support the Council have developed well over recent years with the establishment of a Senior Management Group consisting of the Secretary General and the Directors who report to him. The Group does not believe that it would be helpful to make changes that would necessitate any changes to those structures. The new arrangements that we propose respect the way in which areas are currently divided up and avoid the need for further reorganisation of the kind that the Guildford Review necessarily had to propose in 2001.
39. The Group's view is that the concept of delegation to a single lead person, supported by a reference group, is valid in all areas save two: for reasons of good governance there will be a continuing need for the Audit Committee; and in relation to any investment decisions that the

Council is willing to delegate, that delegation should be to a group of people rather than to an individual.

40. The Group thinks that the reference groups should in general be kept small – the lead person plus up to four, supported by the senior members of staff. Given the breadth of activity they will be asked to cover, the Ministry, Mission & Public Affairs and Finance reference groups, for example, may need to be a little larger.
41. It will be for the Council to determine the extent of the delegation to the lead person, who will be directly accountable to the Archbishops' Council for decisions taken and will take counsel with the reference group where necessary. Clearly, the nature of 'decisions' varies considerably from area to area. What was striking from the analysis that was done for the Review Group is how relatively few decisions the Boards, Councils and Committees had themselves taken. Almost invariably decisions were taken either by the Director, or by the Chair on the advice of the Director, or by the Archbishops' Council on the recommendation of the body in question.
42. Since so much of the activity of the Boards, Councils and Committees appears to consist of ground-clearing, consensus-building and information-sharing, it seems to the Review Group that it ought to be possible for these important objectives to be achieved with much lighter structures than we have now.
43. As regards the specific areas currently covered by the Boards, Councils and Committees, the Review Group recognises a number of other elements in the landscape:
 - (i) *Education*: the National Society, which is an independent charitable body, will be a significant and continuing presence in the schools area; and the Education Division has small, focused panels in the areas of children, young people, adult education, higher education and schools
 - (ii) *Cathedral and Church Buildings*: the Church Buildings Council and the Cathedrals Fabric Commission for England will continue as statutory bodies. There will continue to be a need for the role that the Bishop of London currently plays as the person with responsibility for overseeing the work of the Division.
 - (iii) *Ministry*: the Ministry Division is likely to continue to need panels and working groups on particular issues – such as quality and formation, finance, candidates and research. The lead member, supported by the Ministry reference panel will be concerned with broad issues concerned with vocation, selection, and theological education and training.
 - (iv) *Ministry: Deployment, Recruitment and Conditions of Service*: since all key policy decisions come to the Council itself (and in some cases the Synod) we see no reason why the model of lead member and small reference panel cannot work well in this area. Many issues will of course still need to be discussed, as now, with the Pensions Board, the Church Commissioners, the Finance reference group and the Inter-diocesan Finance Forum, before the Archbishops' Council is able to take decisions.
 - (v) *Ministry: Ministry of and among Deaf and Disabled People*: it will be necessary through the lead member and reference panel to sustain the diocesan network of advisers, and to maintain contact with bodies such as Deaf Anglicans Together.
 - (vi) *Mission and Public Affairs*: the Mission and Public Affairs Division covers a wide area. There are specialist groupings within the Division covering mission theology, world mission, hospital chaplaincies (which has had its own Council), mental health, inter-faith issues, rural and urban affairs. Divisional staff also service bishops' groups concerned with urban and rural issues, the environment and Europe and brief bishops in the Lords..

- (vii) *Committee for Minority Ethnic Anglican Concerns*: CMEAC maintains an important network with the diocesan minority ethnic concerns groups, and links with the Association of Black Clergy. There is manifestly a continuing need to have a lead person at member level for this area of work and for the network to be sustained.
- (viii) *Council for Christian Unity*: much of CCU's work is carried out through a series of groups and panels, including the Faith and Order Advisory Group and specialist panels concerned with local unity and ecumenical relations.
- (ix) *Finance*: the Division will continue to service the Inter-diocesan Finance Forum; and specialist committees will continue to oversee investments and the Church and Community Fund. A group may be needed to take forward the work of the current Stewardship Committee.

44. In the spirit of these proposals and in the interests of budgetary control, the Archbishops' Council will expect the number and scope of specialist groups, panels and networks to be reviewed by the lead member for the relevant area, in consultation with the director from time to time. Any body which is intended to have a *decision-making* rather than a purely *advisory* function would first need the approval of the Archbishops' Council before it could be established, since it would be exercising delegated powers on behalf of the Council. The Archbishops' Council would need to consider not only the need for any body with decision-making powers but also its proposed size, membership, and terms of reference. As a general rule the presumption should be that all bodies, whether advisory or with decision-making powers, should be strictly time-limited.

Appointments

- 45. Key to the success of the proposal is identifying the right lead person and preparing and resourcing that person for the task entrusted to him or her. In many respects that is not so very different from the challenge of finding the right people now to act as Chairs, though the Review Group recognises that they will in future carry greater personal responsibility.
- 46. The Review Group does not think that it would be prudent to limit the Council to identifying all the lead people from amongst its own membership or to try to find a way of getting all the lead people round the Council table, though they should of course have the right to attend when business in the area for which they are responsible is to be discussed). The Council is not like a Government Cabinet with all portfolio holders round the table, even though, as noted above, the centrality of Ministry, Finance, and Mission and Public Affairs to the Council's work means that it should be the aim to continue to draw their lead person from among Council members.
- 47. The proposal is that each lead person will be appointed by the Archbishops (as Presidents of the Archbishops' Council). This replicates the present arrangements under which the appointment of Chairs rests with the Archbishops.
- 48. There are, some proposed changes in the process for making appointments to reflect more accurately where responsibility lies. Since the lead people will be exercising delegated powers from the Council, it seems right that the Council's consent to these appointments should be necessary. The Archbishops may also wish to consult their fellow bishops through the Standing Committee of the House (since, as now with Chairs, a number of the lead people are likely to be diocesan bishops).
- 49. Our view is that involving the Appointments Committee in these appointments (particularly as we are proposing additional work for it in relation to the report and review groups) would make the process unnecessarily cumbersome and also risk introducing an element of confusion over accountabilities. But we should like to hear further views on this before coming to a final recommendation.

50. The Appointments Committee will in any event remain responsible for a wide range of other appointments – for example, membership of legislative Steering and Revision Committees, of other bodies (such as the Liturgical and Dioceses Commissions) that are not accountable to the Council, and of representative delegations. In addition we propose that it should acquire sole responsibility (i.e. not the merely advisory role it currently has in respect of the appointment of Chairs of Boards and Councils) for the appointment of the chairs of the ‘report and review’ groups of Synod members elected to review each area of the Council’s work (see below).

Potential savings

51. We estimate that direct net savings on expenses associated with members’ attendance at meetings (travel, subsistence, room hire, etc) should alone amount to at least £20K across the seven bodies which will be affected by these proposals. This is only a small part of the potential saving, in terms both of the actual cost of staff time and the opportunity costs of staff and member time that we believe will be achieved through what we propose.

Engagement with Synod

52. As noted in paragraph 33 the second key proposal is the establishment of ‘report and review groups’.
53. The constitutions of the present Boards, Councils and Committees have traditionally established a degree of engagement with Synod by providing for both the election and appointment of members of Synod. The Review Group recognises the importance of the Synod’s engagement in the Council’s work.
54. The Review Group therefore proposes that for each of the areas for which a lead person is to be appointed, a ‘report and review’ group of up to fourteen people should be elected by and from the membership of the Synod. The report and review groups will be elected, using STV, for the term of the quinquennium (in practice, from 1 June in the year immediately following the election of the new Synod until 31 May in the year immediately following its dissolution) and will meet once a year at the July Group of Sessions to learn about the work of the reference group for their area of interest and ask questions of the lead person and members of the reference group. All of the report and review groups will meet at the same time.
55. In this way, the number of the Synod’s membership actively – though more cost-effectively – engaged in detailed examination of different areas of the Council’s work will increase from the present constitutional minimum of around 50 to around a third of the Synod’s membership. Those who have not been elected to one of the report and review groups will be entitled to attend and listen to the proceedings.
56. Chairs of the report and review groups (who will be in addition to the fourteen elected members) will be appointed by the Appointments Committee from amongst the membership of the Synod.
57. It is the intention that the report and review groups should be the focus of a two-way exchange of information and views. These groups will not be able to direct the lead people and reference groups (or the Council) to take a particular course of action. However, the lead people and reference groups will be expected to take into account the views expressed by members of their respective report and review groups. The lead people and reference groups will prepare a report on their activities for their elected groups and the elected groups, in turn, will be able to learn from the reports and be able to explore their content.
58. The report and review groups need to be bodies which engage constructively and positively with the different areas of the Council’s work. The role of the groups needs therefore to be carefully delineated and the Chairs chosen with care and properly briefed for the task entrusted to them. On the assumption that all are working towards the same goal, the emphasis should be on ‘critical solidarity’ and support.

59. Although it is proposed that the report and review groups should meet once a year, it would be good practice and a step towards a better exchange of information if the reference groups were to produce an e-newsletter, say each quarter, and invite views and questions from their respective elected groups throughout the year. It would also be desirable for networks in the relevant areas to be copied into such communications and their views sought as at present. The Review Group commends this approach.

Timetable

60. The Review Group proposes the following process:

9 February – General Synod: presentation of the review group’s report to Synod to prepare for period of consultation.

30 April – consultation period ends.

May – review group makes final recommendations.

11 June – Archbishops’ Council: consideration of final proposals from the review group in the light of the consultation process.

10-14 July – General Synod: ‘take note’ debate of the report from the Council.

22 September – Archbishops’ Council: decision in the light of the Synod debate.

8-12 February 2010 – General Synod: approval of any necessary consequential changes to the Synod’s Standing Orders.

November 2010 – New Synod meets. Process for populating new structures begins.

Responses to the consultation

61. Comments on these proposals are invited and should be sent to David Williams, Clerk to the Synod, by 30 April 2009.

Church House
Westminster SW1P 3AZ

January 2009

Canon Dr Christina Baxter
on behalf of the Review Group

Archbishops' Council and its substructure

1. The current Boards, Councils and Committees of the Archbishops' Council should cease to exist, with the exception of the Audit Committee.
2. Work in each area overseen by the Archbishops' Council should be delegated to a 'lead person' supported by a 'reference group', normally of four other people.
3. The reference groups for Mission & Public Affairs, Finance and Ministry may need to be a little larger – perhaps the lead member plus up to eight people.
4. Responsibility for investment decisions should be delegated to an investment committee.
5. Existing networks, panels and groups should continue to the extent that they are required, and the need for their continuation reviewed regularly.
6. The creation of any new bodies which are intended to have a decision-making function must remain a matter for the Archbishops' Council to determine, since any decision-making would be under powers delegated by the Council.
7. The lead persons should be appointed by the Archbishops with the approval of the Archbishops' Council. In cases where it is proposed that the lead person be a bishop, the Archbishops may wish to consult fellow bishops through the Standing Committee of the House of Bishops.
8. The Synod's Standing Orders Committee should be invited to prepare the necessary consequential changes to the Standing Orders to reflect the new arrangements.

Engagement with General Synod

9. The Synod should elect 'report and review' groups of up to fourteen members from amongst its own membership for each area overseen by the Archbishops' Council to review and discuss the work undertaken by the lead persons and reference groups.
10. Chairs of the 'report and review' groups should be appointed by the Appointments Committee.
11. The 'report and review' groups should meet annually at the Synod's July Group of Sessions to learn about the work of the relevant reference group and to ask questions of the lead person and members of the reference group. They should also be kept updated on a regular basis throughout the year.
12. Other members of Synod should be entitled to attend any of the 'report and review' group meetings.

Bodies unaffected by the proposals***Commissions of the General Synod***

- Crown Nominations Commission
- Doctrine Commission
- Legal Advisory Commission
- Liturgical Commission

Committees of the General Synod

- Appointments Committee
- Business Committee
- Legislative Committee
- Standing Orders Committee
- Legislative and Liturgical Steering and Revision Committees

Committees of the Archbishops' Council

- Audit Committee

Independent charitable body

- The National Society

Statutory bodies

- Cathedrals Fabric Commission for England
- Church Buildings Council
- Clergy Discipline Commission
- Dioceses Commission
- Fees Advisory Commission
- Legal Aid Commission

Bodies affected by the proposals

The bodies listed below will cease to exist and be replaced by the model of lead person and reference group. Each of them maintains networks which contribute to and inform their work and these will be maintained to the extent that they continue to be required.

Any new bodies which are intended to have a decision-making function will need the approval of the Archbishops' Council, which will consider the size, membership, and terms of reference of the body proposed. It is expected that any new bodies will be strictly time-limited.

- **Board of Education**
- **Committee for Minority Ethnic Anglican Concerns**
- **Council for Christian Unity**

The *Faith and Order Advisory Group* (FOAG) is a body established under the present constitution of the CCU. The lead person for Christian Unity will be invited to consider, in consultation with the House of Bishops, how the work undertaken by this body can be taken forward.

- **Finance Committee**

NB: Delegation will be made to a committee rather than the lead member for investment matters.

The *Stewardship Committee* is established under the present constitution of the Finance Committee. The lead person for Finance will be invited to consider how the work currently undertaken by the Stewardship Committee can be taken forward.

- **Committee for Ministry of and among Deaf and Disabled People**
- **Deployment, Remuneration and Conditions of Service Committee**
- **Ministry Council**
- **Mission and Public Affairs Council**

**Published by the General Synod of the Church of England
and on sale at the Church House Bookshop,
31 Great Smith Street, London SW1P 3BN**

Copyright © The Archbishops' Council 2009

£3