

GUILDFORD REVIEW

NOTE BY THE ARCHBISHOPS' COUNCIL

When the constitutions of the Boards and Councils were last amended, the Archbishops' Council gave notice that it intended to review the present arrangements during the current Quinquennium.

Review Process

2. The Guildford Review was set in hand in December 2000 under the chairmanship of the Bishop of Guildford with the following terms of reference:

“To recommend to the Archbishops' Council how the structures of the Church and World Division, the Boards and Councils and the Committee for Minority Ethnic Anglican Concerns may best be arranged to deliver their work, as shaped by future needs, priorities and resources; and to strengthen relationships (particularly with the Archbishops' Council); taking into account the experience and work of other Churches and the national institutions; and to report to the Archbishops' Council by the end of 2001.”

3. The Group consulted widely with the Boards and Councils and CMEAC; their Chairs and staff; the General Secretaries of CTE and CTBI; the House of Bishops Standing Committee; the Policy and Resources Co-ordinating Committee; the Finance Committee; and the Diocesan Secretaries' Liaison Group. The Group issued a consultation paper in October with outline proposals; made an interim report to the Archbishops' Council in January; and submitted its final Report (attached) in February. The process has been characterised by a high degree of consultation and the Group

refined its final proposals in the light of that consultation. The Archbishops' Council considered the Report at its March and April meetings and accepted the main recommendations summarised in para. 57 of the Group's report and in particular the recommendation (in para. 63) that the Church and World Division should be replaced by three new divisions: Education; the Church's Mission and Public Affairs; and Cathedral and Church Buildings; with the staff of CMEAC working out of the Church's Mission and Public Affairs division and the staff of the Council for Christian Unity working out of the Central Secretariat.

The Council's Proposals for the new Divisional Groups

4. The Review recommended that each new Division should have a formally constituted oversight Group which brings together the Chair and the chairs of any subsidiary bodies with the Synod members (who should be in the majority) who are elected to each division. Under SO 119, the constitutions of bodies answerable to the General Synod through the Archbishops' Council (the determination of which is settled by the Business Committee) fall to be determined by the Council after consultation with the General Synod. Before establishing the new divisions, the Council would like to take the mind of the General Synod on what is proposed and in particular on the way in which Synodical accountability and participation may best be expressed in the new arrangements.

Synodical Accountability and Participation

5. The Review Group's report sets out in para. 55 the different ways in which accountability is exercised and how Synod members (elected and appointed) contribute to the three elements of accountability, policy-formation and legitimacy. The Archbishops'

Council supports that analysis and has developed some proposals as to how that can be worked into the new arrangements.

Divisional “Groups” – function and composition

6. The suggestions below are designed to ensure adequate Synodical engagement at the divisional level whilst recognising that identical arrangements for each new division are not necessarily desirable.

Education

7. The current Board comprises 6 elected and 8 appointed GS members + 8 experts and 2 observers (i.e. 22 members + 2 observers). So Synod members are in the majority, although the elective element is only 25%. A number of panels support different areas of work, (including a Schools Panel); their major role is policy development. All Board members are on panels, which meet during the Board's residential.

8. In due course (e.g. for the next quinquennium) it would seem sensible to change the Board's constitution so that it is smaller and has a majority of elected GS members – e.g. a Board of 18 with 10 elected members. This would be consistent with the Review's recommendation of elective majorities. The Board's functions would remain unchanged.

Church's Mission and Public Affairs

9. This embraces the work of the Board of Mission (currently chaired by the Bishop of Liverpool), the Board for Social Responsibility (the Bishop of Southwark) and the Hospital Chaplaincies Council (the Bishop of St Albans). Like other bodies (listed in the Council's Annual Report) and the present Boards and

Councils, it will be accountable to the General Synod through the Archbishops' Council.

10. Under current arrangements the **Board of Mission** has 8 elected GS members on a Board of 22 (Chair + 8 elected + 5 appointed + 5 Mission Agency reps + 3 co-opted), supported by 5 Committees (Interfaith Consultative Group, Mission Evangelism and Renewal in England, Partnership for World Mission, Mission Theology Advisory Group and Rural Affairs) and a panel for the Children's Evangelism work. Two of those Committees (MTAG & PWM) are "self-standing" and will continue to be needed (unless the constituent bodies decide otherwise). The others could continue as panels.

11. The **Board for Social Responsibility** has 6 elected GS members and 9 appointed members (not exclusively from the GS). The BSR has recently abolished its Committees and replaced them with advice groups (each with a convenor) for each area of work. Experience had shown that it is better to invite in experts for particular pieces of work than to rely on Committees: it was impossible for Committees to be omni-competent, and many experts were unwilling to serve on Committees for long periods.

12. The **Hospital Chaplaincies Council** has 5 elected GS members and 10 others (appointed and co-opted to represent particular constituencies and provide particular expertise). The HCC expects to continue in its current form with its existing remit.

13. The key functions of the Divisional Group should, in the Council's view, be as follows:

- a. To provide a focus of **Synodical accountability** through the provision of a divisional Group of which at least half is elected by the General Synod.

- b. To stand back from the work and assess the **bigger picture**; to help provide foresight and plan medium term work (and/or agree criteria for staff judgements) about such work.
- c. To provide an **interface with the Archbishops' Council** (through the Chair – and through the respective Vice Chairs for Public Affairs and Mission when key issues in those areas are discussed by the Council).
- d. To **provide guidance** on the development of sensitive pieces of work & **authorise** major policy positions (e.g. for publication/presentation to wider audiences) or commend such positions to the Archbishops' Council and/or House of Bishops and/or General Synod when appropriate.
- e. To determine major issues of **resourcing** (e.g. budgets and staffing).

The integrated approach

14. The Council's preferred model is for a Divisional Group which largely absorbs the functions of the existing Boards (and of the PRCC in respect of HCC) and which relates directly to the HCC and Committees and panels (as may be retained). On that basis, a possible model could be:

Chair & Vice-Chair(s) (with complementary experience)
 Chairs of HCC & PWM
 Up to 11 elected GS members*
 Up to 7 appointed/ co-options.

15. The figure of 11 would absorb most of the existing elected GS quotient of the BSR & BoM (10 out of 14), + 1 elected member of the HCC - reflecting the fact that HCC is likely to carry on substantially unchanged. The Divisional Group would be 22 strong - no bigger than the existing Board of Mission. The position of Vice-Chairs would be substantial in several respects: to fulfil the roles of "lead Bishops" (i.e. as public spokespersons in key fora); to relate directly to the House of Bishops and the House of Lords; and to help ensure balance, mutual support and complementarity between the interests of Mission and Social Responsibility. In order to secure a reasonable balance among the 11 elected GS members (and within the Group as a whole), the Council suggests that of the 11 a minimum number should be from each House, e.g. 2 per House.

Alternative approach

16. An alternative model for the oversight of this Division would be to retain bodies like the existing Boards of Mission and Social Responsibility (with some streamlining) and co-ordinate them and the Hospital Chaplains Council through a light Co-ordinating Group which might bring together the three Chairs and 3-4 elected members. The function of the Divisional Group would be correspondingly lighter (and more akin to the Group which was established to co-ordinate the work of the different Ministry Division committees). This would be a more evolutionary approach but would be contrary to the rationale of the division and would create one more layer than the integrated approach. The Council does not favour it.

17. Under either model, HCC would continue as a "permanent" body, as would PWM and MTAG (with their existing authority to dispose of issues). Other areas of work could continue to be supported by panels which could mutate according to the needs of the work. It would seem sensible for support panels to include at least one GS member, bearing in mind the proper desire of GS members to be engaged in policy development and for such work to be

Synodically “earthed”; indeed some might argue for a higher minimum. The number of such panels and their remits might well be expected to change over time to reflect the development of teams within an overall approach which places less of a premium on permanent and formal bodies and more of a premium on fluid task or support groups which can change as the demands of the work change. In any event they should be set up in ways which make it easy to change their memberships and to close them down (as others are set up).

18. All Chairs of subsidiary bodies (i.e. below the divisional Groups) could have a right to attend meetings of the Divisional Group but the expectation would be that they would only normally do so if they had a specific interest in an agenda item.

19. The structural arrangements would be complemented by a sensible lead Bishop system to provide public spokesmen - which would naturally include the episcopal Chairs (and/or Vice Chairs) of divisions and other key bodies.

Cathedrals and Church Buildings

20. Under current arrangements the **Cathedrals Fabric Commission for England** (CFCE, whose constitution is statutory) has 5 elected GS members (and a Bishop) within a membership of 23. The **Council for the Care of Churches** (CCC, which is not statutory) has 6 appointed members who must be on the GS, out of a membership of 21. Both bodies have statutory functions (including regulatory powers in respect of the CFCE) and both will need to carry on under the new arrangements. That being the case, the most sensible solution for a Divisional Group is to construct it as a light co-ordinating body which could comprise the Chairs of CCC and CFCE, the Chair of the Heritage Forum (who would chair the Group) and (say) 4 other members appointed by the Appointments Committee from within the Synodical membership of the CCC and

CFCE providing always that one of those members should be a Dean or Provost. The Chair of the CCC or CFCE would deputise for or accompany the Chair of the Heritage Forum at meetings of the Archbishops' Council where substantial items of heritage policy were on the agenda.

21. The Divisional Group (effectively a Co-ordinating Committee) would handle budgetary, staffing and resourcing issues and any matters requiring a divisional response. Broader policy issues would be handled within the subsidiary bodies (i.e. the CCC and CFCE) or the Heritage Forum and Archbishops' Council as appropriate, although in time it might be logical to move to a situation where the Divisional Group becomes the natural locus of policy issues and the CCC and CFCE focus on the statutory casework.

Christian Unity

22. Under the Review Group's recommendation (endorsed by the Archbishops' Council), the staff of the Council for Christian Unity would come into the Central Secretariat. The CCU would operate with its existing accountabilities to the Archbishops' Council and the House of Bishops – akin to other bodies staffed out of the Secretariat (e.g. the Liturgical Commission etc.). As with the Board of Education, some streamlining and re-balancing of membership (to reflect the “majority elected” principle) might be sensible by the end of the Quinquennium.

23. The Archbishops' Council supports the Review Group's recommendation that the Chair of the Council should have a right of attendance at meetings of the Archbishops' Council because of the special nature of the ecumenical brief (i.e. its need to shape and pervade policy and its delivery) and the current weight of issues in that area; this can be reviewed at the end of the quinquennium in the light of experience. A similar arrangement could be adopted as

regards the attendance of the Secretary of the CCU at meetings of the new Senior Management Team (paras. 102-108) where major matters of Church policy are to be discussed, although ultimately the arrangements for the Senior Management Team are a matter for the new Secretary-General to settle.

Relations between the Group Chairs and Archbishops' Council

24. The Council has considered how best to implement the Guildford Review recommendation that the divisional Group Chairs should have an "open right of attendance" at meetings of the Archbishops' Council in order to build stronger relationships between the Council and the main policy areas covered by the Review. The Archbishops' Council would prefer that over time all three Chairs should be members of the Council itself (in common with other divisional Chairs) providing this can be handled in a way which is within the Council's existing constitution (i.e. rather than increasing the size of the Council itself). The Council's provisional plan is to use one of the forthcoming vacancies in the appointed places for a Divisional Chair; and to accommodate the other two Divisions by inviting an existing member of the Council to chair the CMPA division (with two episcopal Vice Chairs); and for the Chair of the Cathedral and Church Buildings division to have an open right of attendance (to be exercised at his discretion).

Reporting to the General Synod on structural matters

25. Under the new arrangements, the Archbishops' Council would propose to report regularly (and in any event at least once in every Quinquennium) to the General Synod on how the new structures were working; any changes which had been made; and any changes which the Council had it in mind to make. The Council would also authorise permanent bodies below the Divisional Group (whether existing or new) and keep their number and functions under

regular review with the intention of ensuring that the sub-structures are as simple and serviceable as possible.

Summary of main proposals

26. The Archbishops' Council proposes:
- a. A Divisional Group for **Education** in line with the existing Board (*paras. 7-8*); a Divisional Group for the **Church's Mission and Public Affairs** Division comprising a Chair and Vice-Chairs, the Chairs of the Hospital Chaplaincies Council and Partnership for World Mission, up to 11 members elected by the General Synod (with a minimum of 2 from each House) and up to 7 appointed/co-opted members (*paras. 13-15*); and a Divisional Group for **Cathedral and Church Buildings** comprising the Chairs of the Council for the Care of Churches and the Cathedrals Fabric Commission for England, the Chair of the Heritage Forum (to chair the Group) and up to 4 members appointed by the Appointments Committee from within the Synodical membership of the CCC and CFCE providing always that one of those members should be a Dean or Provost (*paras. 20-21*).
 - b. The Council for Christian Unity to operate within its existing accountabilities to the Archbishops' Council and the House of Bishops; and its Chair to have a right of attendance at meetings of the Archbishops' Council (*paras. 22-23*);
 - c. For the divisional Group Chairs in the longer term to be members of the Archbishops' Council providing this can be arranged within the Council's existing constitution (*para. 24*)

Recommendations

27. The Council invites the General Synod:
- a. To take note of this report;
 - b. To indicate its support for the composition and functions of the new divisional Groups as summarised in paragraph 26 a;
 - c. To indicate its support for the relationship between the new Divisional Chairs and the Chair of CCU and the Archbishops' Council as set out in paragraph 26 b and c.

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

£2