# GENERAL SYNOD <br> GENERAL SYNOD ELECTIONS 2020: SEAT ALLOCATION 

Report by the Business Committee

## Summary

The Synod is invited to approve the allocation of places for the directly elected diocesan representatives to the Lower Houses of the Convocations and to the House of Laity for the quinquennium 2020-2025.
The calculations have been made in accordance with the provisions of paragraph 2 of Canon H 2 and Rule 49 of the Church Representation Rules. The Business Committee proposes that the apportionment of directly elected members of the House of Laity between the Provinces of Canterbury and York should be 70:30.

A summary of the proposed allocation of places and any change from the allocation in 2015 is set out, for clergy, at Appendix A and, for laity, at Appendix B. Appendix C sets out the overall position. The allocations of sixteen dioceses will be different under the proposed allocation from their allocation in the current quinquennium, eleven in the Province of Canterbury and five in the Province of York. These result from changes in the relative totals of numbers on rolls as between dioceses.

## Background

1. The Business Committee seeks the approval of the General Synod for the customary resolutions to allocate places for directly elected diocesan representatives to the Lower Houses of the Convocations and to the House of Laity for the quinquennium 2020-2025.
2. The legal requirements on which these resolutions are based are contained in paragraph 2 of Canon H 2 (in the case of the Lower Houses of the Convocations) and Rule 49 of the Church Representation Rules (in the case of the House of Laity).
3. While the principal reason for this report to the Synod is to provide the necessary background information to the resolutions before the Synod, we are also taking the opportunity to remind the Synod of the constitutional provisions affecting the timetable and to give notice of future plans for advising dioceses on the procedures to be followed.

## Allocation of places

4. The method used to make the calculations set out in the appendices first makes provision for the Diocese of Sodor and Man, which has a fixed allocation of one seat in both the House of Clergy and the House of Laity and then for those dioceses which might not otherwise be entitled to the minimum number of seats for directly elected diocesan proctors and directly elected lay members (3 in both cases). Finally, it allocates the remaining seats, calculated to 7 decimal places, using the divisor method adopted by the Business Committee ${ }^{1}$.

## Directly elected diocesan proctors

5. Canon H 2 sets out the requirements for elections to the Lower Houses of the Convocations of Canterbury and York.

[^0]6. For the purposes of these calculations we asked dioceses to provide us with the number of electors on the Register of Convocation Electors as at 31 July 2019, using the categories of electors set out in Canon H 2.4². The Dioceses of Derby, Gloucester, Norwich, Sodor and Man, and Southwell and Notts did not provide a number and the figures used have been derived from the data available from the Research \& Statistics Department for 2018.
7. The Canon provides for a maximum number of proctors to be specially and directly elected for each Province: 133 in the case of the Province of Canterbury; and 58 in the case of the Province of York. For the purposes of these calculations, there need to be subtracted from those totals the specially elected proctors, who are: the Deans (Canterbury - 3; York - 2); and the Dean of Jersey or the Dean of Guernsey (Canterbury - 1). This leaves maximum totals of 129 directly elected proctors in the Province of Canterbury and 56 in York to be divided amongst the dioceses of each Province (in effect the same 70/30 split as pertains by default to the House of Laity under Rule 49(4) of the Church Representation Rules - see below).
8. It is proposed that, as in the past, the maximum number of directly elected proctors permitted within the provisions of Canon H 2 be elected so that the total number of members of the House of Clergy is not reduced and so that the Lower House of the Convocation of York continues to have a viable number of members.
9. Canon H 2.2(b) provides that no diocese should have fewer than 3 directly elected proctors. The only exception to this is the Diocese of Sodor and Man, which has only 1 directly elected proctor.
10. The Synod is required under Canon H 2 to determine the proportion that the number of proctors to be elected for each diocese bears to the number of electors in the dioceses. On the basis that the total number of clergy to be elected by each Province is as set out in paragraph 7, it is proposed that the Synod determine the proportions as 129:8,885 in the case of the Province of Canterbury. The calculation for the Province of York excludes the 27 electors in the Diocese of Sodor and Man since that has a fixed allocation of 1 place and is, therefore, 55:2,886.
11. On the basis proposed above, Appendix A shows the number of directly elected diocesan proctors to be elected by the dioceses in each Province in 2020.
12. These recommendations mean that the average number of electors per directly elected proctor has reduced somewhat since 2015, as shown in the table below:
${ }^{2}$ They are:
(a) all clerks in holy orders exercising the office of Assistant Bishop in the electoral area;
(b) all archdeacons holding office in the area;
(c) all clerks in holy orders beneficed in the area;
(d) all clerks in holy orders holding office in a cathedral church in the area or, in the case of the Province of Canterbury, either of the two collegiate churches of St Peter, Westminster and St George, Windsor; and
(e) all clerks in holy orders licensed under seal by the bishop of the diocese and all clerks in holy orders who are members of a deanery synod in the area and have written permission from the bishop of the diocese to officiate within that diocese
but excluding members of the House of Bishops of the diocesan synod, deans, members of the religious communities and, in the case of the Province of Canterbury, the Armed Forces chaplains and the Chaplain General of Prisons.
In relation to category (e), the reference to a deanery synod is to be read, in relation to the Diocese in Europe, as including a reference to an archdeaconry synod and, in the case of the Diocese of Sodor and Man, as a reference to the diocesan synod.

|  | Canterbury | York <br> (excluding Sodor \& Man) | Both Provinces <br> (including Sodor \& Man) |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Number of Convocation Electors <br> (2015 figures in brackets) | 8,885 <br> $(9,200)$ | 2,886 <br> $(3,142)$ | 11,798 <br> $(12,366)$ |
| Average number of electors to be <br> represented by one directly elected <br> proctor (2015 figures in brackets) | 69 <br> $(71)$ | 52 | 64 |

## Directly elected diocesan lay representatives

13. Rule 49 of the Church Representation Rules sets out the requirements in respect of elections to the House of Laity.
14. For the purposes of these calculations, we have used the numbers on electoral rolls of parishes as at 31 July 2019 provided to us by the dioceses. For six dioceses, however, the figures provided to the Research and Statistics Department for 2018 (Coventry, Europe, Gloucester, Leicester, Peterborough and Sodor and Man) were used.
15. In addition, Rule 49(5b) now requires the number of names on the mission initiative rolls for a diocese to be included in the calculations. Nine dioceses provided the numbers on their mission initiative rolls. These were Birmingham, Coventry, Exeter, Guildford, Leeds, London, Sheffield, Truro and York.
16. Rule 49(1) sets the maximum numbers for directly and specially elected members of the House of Laity at 195. Two specially elected members need to be deducted from the total for the Province of Canterbury (i.e. those to be elected from the Channel Islands under the provisions of the Channel Islands (Representation) Measure 1931).
17. Rule 49(4) provides that the proportion of the directly elected members is, as nearly as possible, to be 70 to 30 between the Province of Canterbury and the Province of York; or, if the Synod resolves otherwise, in some other proportion specified by that resolution.
18. Rule 49(5) requires that the number of directly elected members to be elected for each diocese be as nearly as possible proportionate to the total of (a) the number of names on the electoral rolls in that diocese and (b) the number of names on the mission initiative rolls for mission initiatives in that diocese.
19. If the proportion of the directly elected members continues, as nearly as possible, to be divided 70 to 30 between the Province of Canterbury and the Province of York (with the maximum total number of directly elected lay members permitted within the provisions of Rule 49 (i.e. 193) being elected) the apportionment would be 135 directly elected members for the Province of Canterbury and 58 for the Province of York.
20. Rule 49(2) provides that no diocese shall have fewer than 3 directly elected members. The only exception to this provision is the Diocese of Sodor and Man, which has a fixed allocation of 1 place.
21. Appendix B shows the number of directly elected lay members that would be elected by the dioceses in each Province in 2020 based on a 70:30 apportionment between the Provinces.
22. In Appendix B, the total number of seats allocated to each Province has been divided between the dioceses of the province as nearly as possible in proportion to the number of names on the electoral and mission initiative rolls of each diocese. (The number for the diocese of Winchester has been calculated without reference to the electors in the deaneries of Jersey and Guernsey as the representatives of the Channel Islands are elected separately.)
23. The impact of these recommendations upon the average number of persons to be represented by one member is set out in the following table:

|  | Canterbury | York (excluding Sodor \& Man) | Both Provinces (including Sodor \& Man) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Number of persons on Church Electoral Rolls and Mission Initiative Rolls (2015 figures - for Church Electoral Rolls only - in brackets) | $\begin{gathered} 689,763 \\ (773,022) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 224,951 \\ (270,776) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 916,714 \\ (1,046,007) \end{gathered}$ |
| Average number of such persons to be represented by one member, allocated at 70:30 | $\begin{gathered} 5,109 \\ (5,769) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3,947 \\ (4,669) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 4,750 \\ (5,419) \end{gathered}$ |

24. The Diocese of Sodor and Man is excluded from this calculation due to its fixed allocation.
25. The present and proposed future representation of each diocese in both the House of Clergy and the House of Laity is shown in Appendix C and the proposed total composition of the Synod is shown in Appendix D.
26. Appendix E shows the number of directly elected lay members that would be elected by the dioceses in each Province in 2020 based on a 75:25 apportionment between the Provinces, should Synod so resolve. The alternative of $75: 25$ has been identified as it reflects the respective numbers on the rolls for the Provinces of Canterbury and York.

## Timetable and conduct of elections

27. The timetable for the elections to the Convocations will ultimately depend on the contents of the Royal Writs dissolving the present Convocations and summoning new ones. The General Synod is automatically dissolved when the Convocations are dissolved. Therefore, the expectation is that the same timetable will apply to both the elections to the new Convocations and the elections to the House of Laity.
28. Rule 52 of the Church Representation Rules provides that, subject to any directions of the General Synod or the Presidents, elections to the House of Laity shall be held during the three months immediately following the dissolution of the General Synod. We would expect dissolution of the Synod to take place on or very shortly after Tuesday 14 July 2020.
29. The Clerk to the Synod will circulate a provisional timetable to dioceses on this basis and this is included at Appendix $\mathbf{F}$.
30. Updated versions of the guidance booklets Election Rules of the Three Houses; General Synod Elections 2020; and Guide to the Single Transferable Vote Regulations will be published shortly. A conference for presiding officers, diocesan registrars and others will take place on $2^{\text {nd }}$ March 2020 at Church House.

## Recommendations

31. It is recommended that the Synod pass the following resolutions.
i. The total number of proctors in Convocation to be directly elected from the dioceses in each Province in 2020 is 129 for the Province of Canterbury and 56 for the Province of York with the proportion of directly elected proctors to the number of qualified electors in the dioceses being determined as $129: 8,885$ in the case of the Province of Canterbury and $55: 2,886$ in the case of the Province of York, the numbers to be elected for each diocese being those set out at Appendix A of GS 2162.
ii. The total number of members of the House of Laity to be directly elected in 2020 is 193, apportioned between the Provinces in the proportion that is as close as possible to 70 to 30 , so that 135 members are to be elected in the Province of Canterbury and 58 members elected in the Province of York, the numbers to be elected for each diocese being those set out at Appendix B of GS 2162.

The Revd Canon Sue Booys
Chair, Business Committee

| Proctorial elections 2020 <br> Number of proctors to be elected for each diocese <br> Province of Canterbury |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Diocese | Number of electors 2014 | Number of elected proctors 2015 | Number of electors 2019 | Number of proctors to be elected 2020 | Change |
| Bath \& Wells | 336 | 4 | 299 | 4 |  |
| Birmingham | 212 | 3 | 141 | 3 |  |
| Bristol | 220 | 3 | 206 | 3 |  |
| Canterbury | 217 | 3 | 175 | 3 |  |
| Chelmsford | 518 | 7 | 481 | 7 |  |
| Chichester | 407 | 5 | 405 | 6 | +1 |
| Coventry | 190 | 3 | 187 | 3 |  |
| Derby | 254 | 3 | 219 | 3 |  |
| Ely | 279 | 4 | 303 | 4 |  |
| Europe | 144 | 3 | 144 | 3 |  |
| Exeter | 326 | 4 | 332 | 5 | +1 |
| Gloucester | 231 | 3 | 205 | 3 |  |
| Guildford | 324 | 4 | 305 | 4 |  |
| Hereford | 171 | 3 | 166 | 3 |  |
| Leicester | 193 | 3 | 185 | 3 |  |
| Lichfield | 428 | 6 | 434 | 6 |  |
| Lincoln | 276 | 4 | 264 | 3 | -1 |
| London | 785 | 11 | 839 | 12 | +1 |
| Norwich | 287 | 4 | 263 | 3 | -1 |
| Oxford | 670 | 9 | 769 | 11 | +2 |
| Peterborough | 219 | 3 | 193 | 3 |  |
| Portsmouth | 167 | 3 | 163 | 3 |  |
| Rochester | 266 | 4 | 263 | 3 | -1 |
| St Albans | 366 | 5 | 350 | 5 |  |
| St Eds \& Ips | 200 | 3 | 221 | 3 |  |
| Salisbury | 372 | 5 | 321 | 4 | -1 |
| Southwark | 538 | 7 | 531 | 7 |  |
| Truro | 148 | 3 | 135 | 3 |  |
| Winchester ${ }^{1}$ | 291 | 4 | 243 | 3 | -1 |
| Worcester | 165 | 3 | 143 | 3 |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 9,200 | 129 | 8,885 | 129 | 0 |

[^1]Province of York

| Diocese | Number of <br> electors <br> $\mathbf{2 0 1 4}$ | Number of <br> elected <br> proctors <br> $\mathbf{2 0 1 5}$ | Number of <br> electors <br> $\mathbf{2 0 1 9}$ | Number of <br> proctors to <br> be elected <br> $\mathbf{2 0 2 0}$ | Change |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Blackburn | 270 | 5 |  |  |  |
| Carlisle | 180 | 3 | 128 | $\mathbf{5}$ |  |
| Chester | 353 | 6 | 325 | $\mathbf{3}$ |  |
| Durham | 252 | 5 | 247 | $\mathbf{5}$ |  |
| Leeds | 563 | 10 | 456 | $\mathbf{9}$ | -1 |
| Liverpool | 289 | 5 | 267 | $\mathbf{5}$ |  |
| Manchester | 365 | 7 | 381 | $\mathbf{7}$ |  |
| Newcastle | 186 | 3 | 155 | $\mathbf{3}$ |  |
| Sheffield | 190 | 3 | 186 | $\mathbf{3}$ |  |
| Sodor \& Man | 24 | 1 | 27 | $\mathbf{1}$ |  |
| Southwell \& Nottingham | 194 | 3 | 167 | $\mathbf{3}$ |  |
| York | 300 | 5 | 325 | $\mathbf{6}$ | $+\mathbf{+ 1}$ |
|  |  |  | 56 | 2,913 | $\mathbf{5 6}$ |

House of Laity elections 2020
Number of members to be elected by each diocese
Province of Canterbury

| Diocese | Number on electoral rolls 2014 | Number of elected members 2015 | Number on electoral rolls 2019 | Number to be elected 2020 | Change |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Bath \& Wells | 31,028 | 5 | 24,823 | 5 |  |
| Birmingham | 15,143 | 3 | 13,646 | 3 |  |
| Bristol | 14,291 | 3 | 12,220 | 3 |  |
| Canterbury | 17,337 | 3 | 16,263 | 3 |  |
| Chelmsford | 43,398 | 7 | 39,934 | 8 | +1 |
| Chichester | 45,098 | 8 | 40,169 | 8 |  |
| Coventry | 15,131 | 3 | 15,310 | 3 |  |
| Derby | 15,814 | 3 | 12,673 | 3 |  |
| Ely | 16,774 | 3 | 14,922 | 3 |  |
| Europe | 10,096 | 3 | 11,400 | 3 |  |
| Exeter | 27,029 | 4 | 23,272 | 4 |  |
| Gloucester | 21,234 | 4 | 20,800 | 3 | -1 |
| Guildford | 26,071 | 4 | 21,791 | 4 |  |
| Hereford | 15,146 | 3 | 12,606 | 3 |  |
| Leicester | 15,695 | 3 | 15,300 | 3 |  |
| Lichfield | 37,546 | 6 | 37,013 | 7 | +1 |
| Lincoln | 22,299 | 4 | 23,618 | 5 | +1 |
| London | 68,484 | 11 | 59,665 | 11 |  |
| Norwich | 16,555 | 3 | 17,033 | 3 |  |
| Oxford | 51,048 | 8 | 48,385 | 9 | +1 |
| Peterborough | 19,143 | 3 | 17,700 | 3 |  |
| Portsmouth | 14,547 | 3 | 12,273 | 3 |  |
| Rochester | 27,079 | 5 | 21,525 | 4 | -1 |
| St Albans | 32,730 | 5 | 27,070 | 5 |  |
| St Edmundsbury \& Ipswich | 20,053 | 3 | 17,027 | 3 |  |
| Salisbury | 35,246 | 6 | 30,857 | 6 |  |
| Southwark | 42,304 | 7 | 36,724 | 7 |  |
| Truro | 13,727 | 3 | 11,041 | 3 |  |
| Winchester ${ }^{2}$ | 28,180 | 5 | 22,799 | 4 | -1 |
| Worcester | 14,796 | 3 | 11,914 | 3 |  |
|  | 773,022 | 134 | 689,763 | 135 | +1 |

[^2]
## Province of York

| Diocese | Number on <br> electoral rolls <br> $\mathbf{2 0 1 4}$ | Number of <br> elected <br> members <br> $\mathbf{2 0 1 5}$ | Number on <br> electoral rolls <br> $\mathbf{2 0 1 9}$ | Number to <br> be elected <br> $\mathbf{2 0 2 0}$ | Change |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Blackburn | 29,025 | 6 | 24,581 | $\mathbf{6}$ |  |
| Carlisle | 17,674 | 4 | 13,676 | $\mathbf{3}$ | -1 |
| Chester | 37,787 | 8 | 30,140 | $\mathbf{8}$ |  |
| Durham | 18,537 | 4 | 16,494 | $\mathbf{4}$ |  |
| Leeds | 39,064 | 9 | 32,320 | $\mathbf{9}$ |  |
| Liverpool | 23,131 | 5 | 18,289 | $\mathbf{5}$ |  |
| Manchester | 27,735 | 6 | 21,404 | $\mathbf{6}$ |  |
| Newcastle | 15,240 | 3 | 13,064 | $\mathbf{3}$ |  |
| Sheffield | 15,344 | 3 | 14,769 | $\mathbf{3}$ |  |
| Sodor \& Man | 2,209 | 1 | 2,000 | $\mathbf{1}$ |  |
| Southwell \& | 19,300 | 4 | 16,136 | $\mathbf{4}$ |  |
| Nottingham | 27,939 | 6 | 24,078 | $\mathbf{6}$ |  |
| York | 272,985 | 59 | 226,951 | $\mathbf{5 8}$ | $\mathbf{- 1}$ |

## Province of Canterbury

| Diocese | Elected Proctors  <br> 2015 2020 |  | Elected Laity |  | Total Elected |  | Change |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | 2015 | 2020 | 2015 | 2020 |  |
| Bath \& Wells | 4 | 4 | 5 | 5 | 9 | 9 |  |
| Birmingham | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 6 | 6 |  |
| Bristol | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 6 | 6 |  |
| Canterbury | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 6 | 6 |  |
| Chelmsford | 7 | 7 | 7 | 8 | 14 | 15 | +1 |
| Chichester | 5 | 6 | 8 | 8 | 13 | 14 | +1 |
| Coventry | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 6 | 6 |  |
| Derby | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 6 | 6 |  |
| Ely | 4 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 7 | 7 |  |
| Europe | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 6 | 6 |  |
| Exeter | 4 | 5 | 4 | 4 | 8 | 9 | +1 |
| Gloucester | 3 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 7 | 6 | -1 |
| Guildford | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 8 | 8 |  |
| Hereford | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 6 | 6 |  |
| Leicester | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 6 | 6 |  |
| Lichfield | 6 | 6 | 6 | 7 | 12 | 13 | +1 |
| Lincoln | 4 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 8 | 8 |  |
| London | 11 | 12 | 11 | 11 | 22 | 23 | +1 |
| Norwich | 4 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 7 | 6 | -1 |
| Oxford | 9 | 11 | 8 | 9 | 17 | 20 | +3 |
| Peterborough | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 6 | 6 |  |
| Portsmouth | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 6 | 6 |  |
| Rochester | 4 | 3 | 5 | 4 | 9 | 7 | -2 |
| St Albans | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 10 | 10 |  |
| St Eds \& Ips | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 6 | 6 |  |
| Salisbury | 5 | 4 | 6 | 6 | 11 | 10 | -1 |
| Southwark | 7 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 14 | 14 |  |
| Truro | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 6 | 6 |  |
| Winchester ${ }^{3}$ | 4 | 3 | 5 | 4 | 9 | 7 | -2 |
| Worcester | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 6 | 6 |  |
|  | 129 | 129 | 134 | 135 | 263 | 264 | +1 |

[^3]Province of York

| Diocese | $$ |  | $$ |  | Total Elected |  | Change |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | 2015 | 2020 |  |
| Blackburn | 5 | 5 |  |  | 6 | 6 | 11 | 11 |  |
| Carlisle | 3 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 7 | 6 | -1 |
| Chester | 6 | 6 | 8 | 8 | 14 | 14 |  |
| Durham | 5 | 5 | 4 | 4 | 9 | 9 |  |
| Leeds | 10 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 19 | 18 | -1 |
| Liverpool | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 10 | 10 |  |
| Manchester | 7 | 7 | 6 | 6 | 13 | 13 |  |
| Newcastle | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 6 | 6 |  |
| Sheffield | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 6 | 6 |  |
| Sodor \& Man | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 |  |
| Southwell \& Nottingham | 3 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 7 | 7 |  |
| York | 5 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 11 | 12 | +1 |
|  | 56 | 56 | 59 | 58 | 115 | 114 | -1 |

Proposed composition of the General Synod 2020-2025

|  | Canterbury | York | Either Province | Totals |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| House of Bishops Diocesan Bishops Suffragan Bishops | $\begin{gathered} 30 \\ 6 \\ 36 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 12 \\ 4 \\ 16 \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & 42 \\ & 10 \\ & 52 \end{aligned}$ |
| House of Clergy <br> Deans <br> Diocesan Proctors <br> University Proctors <br> Religious <br> Chaplain General <br> Service Chaplains <br> Channel Islands Dean <br> Co-opted <br> (not necessarily filled) | 3 <br> 129 <br> 1 <br> 3 <br> 1 <br> 3 <br> 140 | 2 56 <br> 2 <br> 60 | $\begin{aligned} & 4 \\ & 2 \end{aligned}$ <br> 6 | $\begin{gathered} 5 \\ 185 \\ 4 \\ 2 \\ 1 \\ 3 \\ 1 \\ 5 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| House of Laity <br> Elected Laity <br> Channel Islands <br> Religious <br> Lay Armed Forces <br> ex officio <br> Co-opted (not necessarily filled) | $\begin{gathered} 135 \\ 2 \end{gathered}$ <br> 3 $140$ | 58 <br> 2 <br> 60 | $\begin{aligned} & 2 \\ & 3 \\ & 2 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 193 \\ 2 \\ 2 \\ 3 \\ 2 \\ 5 \\ 207 \end{gathered}$ |
| House not specific <br> Armed Services <br> Legal Officers <br> ex officio <br> Appointed members <br> (Archbishops' Council) |  |  | $\begin{gathered} 1 \\ 3 \\ 2 \\ 6 \\ 12 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1 \\ 3 \\ 2 \\ 6 \\ 12 \end{gathered}$ |
| Totals | 316 | 136 | 24 | 476 |

Number of members to be elected by each diocese based on a 75:25 proportion between the Province of Canterbury and Province of York

Province of Canterbury

| Diocese | Number on electoral rolls 2014 | Number of elected members 2015 | Number on electoral rolls 2019 | Number to be elected 2020 75\% | Change |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Bath \& Wells | 31,028 | 5 | 24,823 | 5 |  |
| Birmingham | 15,143 | 3 | 13,646 | 3 |  |
| Bristol | 14,291 | 3 | 12,220 | 3 |  |
| Canterbury | 17,337 | 3 | 16,263 | 3 |  |
| Chelmsford | 43,398 | 7 | 39,934 | 8 | +1 |
| Chichester | 45,098 | 8 | 40,169 | 8 |  |
| Coventry | 15,131 | 3 | 15,310 | 3 |  |
| Derby | 15,814 | 3 | 12,673 | 3 |  |
| Ely | 16,774 | 3 | 14,922 | 3 |  |
| Europe | 10,096 | 3 | 11,400 | 3 |  |
| Exeter | 27,029 | 4 | 23,272 | 5 | +1 |
| Gloucester | 21,234 | 4 | 20,800 | 4 |  |
| Guildford | 26,071 | 4 | 21,791 | 5 | +1 |
| Hereford | 15,146 | 3 | 12,606 | 3 |  |
| Leicester | 15,695 | 3 | 15,300 | 3 |  |
| Lichfield | 37,546 | 6 | 37,013 | 8 | +2 |
| Lincoln | 22,299 | 4 | 23,618 | 5 | +1 |
| London | 68,484 | 11 | 59,665 | 12 | +1 |
| Norwich | 16,555 | 3 | 17,033 | 3 |  |
| Oxford | 51,048 | 8 | 48,385 | 10 | +2 |
| Peterborough | 19,143 | 3 | 17,700 | 3 |  |
| Portsmouth | 14,547 | 3 | 12,273 | 3 |  |
| Rochester | 27,079 | 5 | 21,525 | 5 |  |
| St Albans | 32,730 | 5 | 27,070 | 6 | +1 |
| St Eds \& lps | 20,053 | 3 | 17,027 | 3 |  |
| Salisbury | 35,246 | 6 | 30,857 | 6 |  |
| Southwark | 42,304 | 7 | 36,724 | 8 | +1 |
| Truro | 13,727 | 3 | 11,041 | 3 |  |
| Winchester ${ }^{1}$ | 28,180 | 5 | 22,799 | 5 |  |
| Worcester | 14,796 | 3 | 11,914 | 3 |  |
|  | 773,022 | 134 | 689,763 | 145 | 11 |

[^4]
## Province of York

| Diocese | Number on <br> electoral rolls <br> $\mathbf{2 0 1 4}$ | Number of <br> elected <br> members 2015 | Number on <br> electoral <br> rolls 2019 | Number to be <br> elected 2020 <br> $\mathbf{2 5 \%}$ | Change |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Blackburn | 29,025 | 6 | 24,581 | $\mathbf{5}$ | -1 |
| Carlisle | 17,674 | 4 | 13,676 | $\mathbf{3}$ | -1 |
| Chester | 37,787 | 8 | 30,140 | $\mathbf{7}$ | -1 |
| Durham | 18,537 | 4 | 16,494 | $\mathbf{3}$ | -1 |
| Leeds | 39,064 | 9 | 32,320 | $\mathbf{7}$ | -2 |
| Liverpool | 23,131 | 5 | 18,289 | $\mathbf{3}$ | -2 |
| Manchester | 27,735 | 6 | 21,404 | $\mathbf{5}$ | -1 |
| Newcastle | 15,240 | 3 | 13,064 | $\mathbf{3}$ |  |
| Sheffield | 15,344 | 3 | 14,769 | $\mathbf{3}$ |  |
| Sodor \& Man | 2,209 | 1 | 2,000 | $\mathbf{1}$ |  |
| Southwell \& | 19,300 | 4 | 16,136 | $\mathbf{3}$ | $-\mathbf{- 1}$ |
| Nottingham | 27,939 | 6 | 24,078 | $\mathbf{5}$ | $\mathbf{- 1}$ |
| York |  |  | 59 | 226,951 | $\mathbf{4 8}$ |

## Provisional timetable for elections to General Synod in 2020

The present General Synod will be dissolved when the Convocations are dissolved by Royal Writs. This is expected to be on or very shortly after Tuesday 14 July 2020 following the July group of sessions. The following provisional timetable is provided on that basis:


The 'nomination period' must not be less than $\mathbf{2 8}$ days


The 'voting period' must not be less than 21 days

| 1 | Notification to electors of the election timetable <br> to be followed in the diocese and issue of <br> invitation to nominate | Not later than Tuesday 21 July |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2 | Notification of the validity of any nomination | As soon as any nomination is |
| received |  |  |

## Extract from GS 1484-7Y

## Appendix VII Divisor Methods

1. Church Representation Rule 49(4) spells out the procedure for allocating the number of members to be elected by each diocese.
2. In practice, the first step is the allocation to the Diocese of Sodor and Man, which elects a fixed number of members.
3. The next step is the provisional allocation to the other dioceses of the number of members to be elected by each.
4. The provisional allocation to some of the dioceses may be less than the prescribed minimum of three. These dioceses are then "topped up" so as to ensure that each has the minimum allocation of three.
5. As the "topping up" procedure is at the expense of other dioceses, a new provisional allocation to these other dioceses is calculated.
6. The integer part of the figure calculated in paragraph 5 is the new provisional allocation for these dioceses.
7. The total sum of the provisional allocations is always less than the total number to be elected.
8. Church Representation Rule 49(5) says that the final allocation shall be as nearly as possible proportionate to the number of names certified for each diocese, but subject to the minimum of three and the fixed number for one diocese.
9. The natural expectation is that the remaining seats will be allocated to the dioceses with the largest decimal remainder at the end of paragraph 6 . Unfortunately, this is not satisfactory and, arguably, does not meet the requirement stated in paragraph 8.
10. The problem is that allocating in accordance with the largest decimal remainders is nonmonotonic, that is, an increase in the total number to be elected in a province may result in a decreased representation in one or more dioceses, and vice versa.
11. A divisor method must be used to overcome this problem. There are five divisor methods available, any one of which comply with the "as nearly as possible proportionate" requirement.
12. The Largest Divisor Method tends to favour those dioceses with the larger certified numbers.
13. The Smallest Divisor Method tends to favour those dioceses with the smaller certified numbers, not including those that had to be topped-up.
14. In between come the Harmonic Mean and Geometric Mean. In practice, these rapidly converge on the Arithmetic Mean.
15. All elections, except one, to the General Synod have been based on the Arithmetic Mean Divisor Method. The one exception was the subject of a successful appeal.
16. The Arithmetic Mean is calculated by dividing the number of licensed clergy or church electoral roll numbers in each continuing diocese by ( $n+1 / 2$ ), where $n$ is the integer number calculated in paragraph 6.
17. The Arithmetic Mean numbers are arranged in numerical order, and the remaining places (paragraph 7) are allocated in order.
18. In the Largest Divisor Method, the division is by $(\mathrm{n}+1)$. In the Smallest Divisor method, the division is by ( n ).

[^0]:    ${ }^{1}$ Pursuant to paragraph 2(c) of Canon H 2 and Rule 36(2) of the Church Representation Rules, the Business Committee has determined that the arithmetic mean divisor method should be used for these purposes. For further information about that method, see Appendix G.

[^1]:    ${ }^{1}$ This figure excludes the Dean of Jersey or Guernsey (as the case may be), who is not elected.

[^2]:    ${ }^{2}$ This figure excludes the 2 lay members elected by the deaneries of Jersey and Guernsey under the provisions of the Channel Islands (Representation) Measure 1931

[^3]:    ${ }^{3}$ The figures for the diocese of Winchester exclude the 2 lay members elected by the deaneries of Jersey and Guernsey under the provisions of the Channel Islands (Representation) Measure and the appropriate Dean, who is not elected.

[^4]:    ${ }^{1}$ This figure excludes the 2 lay members elected by the deaneries of Jersey and Guernsey under the provisions of the Channel Islands (Representation) Measure 1931

