

**RESPONSIBLE REPRESENTATION: A REVIEW OF THE ELECTORAL
PROCESSES TO THE CROWN NOMINATIONS COMMISSION**

A report by the Crown Nominations Commission Election Process Review Group

April, 2021

CONTENTS

SECTION 1: INTRODUCTION 3

SECTION 2: REFLECTIONS ON REPRESENTATION..... 6

**SECTION 3: THE ELECTION OF CENTRAL MEMBERS BY GENERAL SYNOD TO THE
CROWN NOMINATIONS COMMISSION 17**

SECTION 4: THE VACANCY IN SEE COMMITTEE..... 31

SECTION 5: DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST 40

SECTION 6: A LIST OF RECOMMENDATIONS 44

Appendix 1 49

Appendix 2 51

Appendix 3 53

SECTION 1: INTRODUCTION

1. The report “Discerning in Obedience: a theological review of the Crown Nominations Commission” (GS Misc 1171) (“*Discerning in Obedience*”) was received by General Synod in February 2018. It identified a number of areas for future work including further reflections on various themes associated with representation and the electoral processes by which representatives are chosen to serve on the Crown Nominations Commission (CNC).
2. The Archbishops invited the Appointments Committee to establish a group to undertake this work and the following were invited to do so.

Mr Aiden Hargreaves-Smith (*Chair*)
 Canon Linda Ali
 The Revd Peter Breckwoldt
 Mrs Anne Foreman
 The Rt Revd Dr Jonathan Gibbs
 The Very Revd Jane Hedges
 The Revd Dr James Walters

The Group was staffed by

Ms Jenny Jacobs (*Secretary*)
 Canon Caroline Boddington
 Mr Brad Cook

Professor Iain McLean FBA, Professor of Politics and Official Fellow of Nuffield College, Oxford, acted as a consultant to the Group and brought a wealth of expertise, particularly in relation to electoral theory and practice. We are extremely grateful to him for his advice and support.

3. The Terms of Reference for the Group’s work were:
 - to review the process for the election of Central Members to the Crown Nominations Commission;
 - to consider whether the system for the election of diocesan representatives from the Vacancy in See Committee (ViSC) needs to be reviewed;
 - to look at the matter of disclosing declarations of interest in the wake of the judgement of the Appeal Panel concerning Miss Jane Patterson’s election to the CNC; and
 - to take a broader theologically informed view of representation in the Church, in the hope that the group’s findings might inform electoral processes for other bodies within the Church.
4. The Group had its first meeting in October 2018. It soon became evident that the task, which initially presented as a simple process review, required careful consideration of some complex issues. It became clear at an early stage that the 2019 deadline to report back to General Synod was unrealistic. In order to give

proper consideration to the matters before us, we rescheduled our work to report in July 2020.

5. Our reflections were very much aided by a consultation exercise which included a well-attended Synod fringe meeting in July 2019, and an online survey over the summer of 2019 which received 89 responses (Appendix 1). The responses came from a diverse field, including a healthy gender (54% m/46% f) and lay/clergy (58%/42%) balance. 5% of respondents identified that they were from a Black, Asian or other Minority Ethnic background and 10% indicated that they had a disability. We are grateful to all those who contributed to our work through the consultations.
6. As in any exploration of representation we have been conscious as a group of the way in which we name those groups and individuals and this is, of course a live debate in contemporary identity discourse. Here we have chosen to use the term Black, Asian or other Minority Ethnic background having taken advice as it is the prevalent terminology in current ecclesiological discourse. While this term is problematic, in the absence of a widely accepted and popularly recognisable alternative, we have adopted it advisedly.
7. We completed our substantive work during the COVID-19 lockdown period in line with our July 2020 synodical timeline. This period has led the group to reflect on the use of virtual technology and possible impact on our collective life together, including on commissions such as the CNC. Clearly it will be for others to ensure that the rules which provide the framework for our business are such that our recommendations can be given practical effect in either the virtual or the physical realms as appropriate.
8. It was only at the very end of our deliberations that the Black Lives Matter movement came to prominence, following the death of George Floyd. It nevertheless provides a particular context to the conclusion of our work and brings into sharp focus the issues of diversity highlighted throughout our report.
9. The structure of this report follows the Group's approach to the work committed to us. Having discussed the scope of the Terms of Reference, we formed the view that the first three issues could only be properly considered in the light of our deliberations on the fundamental issues arising from the fourth. Thus, this report sets out to examine issues associated with representation before turning to look at the matters of principle and the practical implications of this in relation to the election of Central Members and the operation of the ViSC. Finally, we looked at the matter of disclosing declarations of interest in elections.
10. Our sincere belief is that change is necessary and if aspects of this report do not make for uncomfortable reading, we shall have failed to convey the strength of our deliberations. That change cannot be merely change to the legal framework in which the CNC, the General Synod and ViSCs operate, or be limited to revised procedural rules (though they will, we hope, contribute to better processes and outcomes). The essential change needed is a change of culture, most notably in the General Synod, but more widely in the Church, so that our

primary concern – both individually and corporately – is the flourishing of others: putting their needs and well-being ahead of our own. This is clearly not a revolutionary suggestion, and it is intended neither to ignore conscientious convictions nor to detract from the selflessness which characterises the lives of many faithful people across the Church. Yet in the context of Synodical elections – from nominations, through voting, to the role of those chosen – too often it seems that partisan views may have weighed more heavily than genuine commitment to the vitality of the whole body of Christ, across its full breadth and legitimate diversity.

11. Ultimately, the challenge for all of us is so to fix our eyes on Jesus, the author and perfecter of our faith, that, having gazed on the beauty of Christ, we can begin to glimpse the possibilities for the re-ordering both of our own lives and of our common life rooted in Him. If all else in this report were to be stripped away, we would implore all members of Synod to join us in taking this opportunity to think afresh about how we each respond to our responsibility as electors, and about how we each faithfully fulfil our roles as representatives.

SECTION 2: REFLECTIONS ON REPRESENTATION

12. The rich theological reflections of *Discerning in Obedience* provide the context for this aspect of our work. “*Who*” it asks “*is called to exercise discernment over God’s anointing of a new bishop for a diocese? The first answer must be: the whole church, for the bishop holds an authority to which the whole church needs to be committed to recognising... But this decision, like all major decisions in a large community, has to be MADE representatively through delegated bodies*” (Para 2.8).
13. The report invited General Synod to reflect on how “*it could adapt its electoral procedures to allow for CNC members to command a broad range of necessary competences and interests, and so represent the Church more adequately*” (Para 5.10). It noted that “*the election of central members needs to ensure the representation of the wider church, not merely the synodical groups*” (Para 5.9), suggesting that “*to represent others is to be trusted by those who share an angle of vision and to commend that vision to those who have other angles*”. With regard to diocesan members, the report noted “*we strongly agree with the general view that the key to effective diocesan participation lies with the selection of the members and their careful preparation for the task*” (Para 5.11).
14. We would emphasise the importance of re-reading the [original report](#). The work of Professor Oliver O’Donovan and his colleagues brings a depth to the issues we explore in a way which we could never expect to match in this report.
15. What is representation? What does it mean to be a representative? In our own reflections on representation we have found ourselves working within a framework of three key themes which ultimately provide the foundational principles for our recommendations
 - the role of trust and accountability in the shaping of our common life and in creating confidence in a delegated body; and the understanding of those chosen as to their responsibilities as representatives;
 - the cultural context and the inclusion of different voices and perspectives; and
 - the discernment and responsibilities of the electorate as they cast their votes.
16. We are also mindful of inevitable political realities which must inform our consideration of representation. ‘Parties’ may form around dominant issues such as women’s leadership, and LGBTQI+ issues and political processes (in the sense of the process whereby we make collective decisions about the things that matter to us) will be at work to promote these. These should not necessarily be seen as working against the purposes of God. We feel that it is important to explore this in a little more detail.

17. We are acutely aware that we will never achieve the best representation until each of us is concerned more about the needs of the other, our neighbour, than our own. Our reflections on 'politics' within the Church represent our fallen reality; however any factionalism detracts from the harmonious working of the body of Christ and we should always challenge ourselves to resist it.

'POLITICS'

18. Politics becomes destructive when it becomes a factionalism that works to divide the Body. And so, one question to consider is the extent to which we should merely accept the reality of political manoeuvring or seek to work against its negative aspects, and if so, how? This matters particularly when the issues under discussion matter greatly to different people in different ways, and most of all when people believe that the issues touch on their sense of identity and the identity of the Church.
19. Where people believe that the issue in question fundamentally challenges their sense of what the Church is about or what it means for them and others to be members of the Church, then their sense of identity and belonging are placed under threat, and they will tend to react accordingly. In such circumstances, people are more likely, for instance, to stereotype those who do not support their views and to indulge in tactics such as attempting to manipulate the decision-making process rather than acting with transparency and integrity.
20. An alternative to accepting the inevitability of such behaviour would be to encourage greater awareness and open-ness about those issues of identity (and threats to that identity) which *underlie* the questions which, nominally at least, are the source of contention. In the context of the elections to the CNC (and indeed within the CNC itself) this might require some form of external facilitation, designed to help people recognise what is going on in themselves and in the wider group as they prepare to vote or make decisions. This would not necessarily change people's decisions or the way they voted, but it might help people to be more aware of their own and others' vulnerabilities, which could provide at least a basis for greater mutual understanding and respect within the wider group – and the Church as a whole.
21. Adopting such an approach could be seen as following the example of Christ, as depicted in Philippians 2. This is about genuinely humbling ourselves, rather than seeking to impose our will by the strength of our will, in order that the voice of the other can be heard and their concerns understood (as well as our own). Of course, decisions still have to be made and votes cast, which may well still result in significant disagreement, but the context and tenor of the discussions can be changed, and the mutual commitment and respect of participants can be enhanced. This could be part of what is needed to help create greater trust both of the CNC election processes and within the CNC itself.
22. Underlying these principles is the question of the ecclesiology, or theology of the Church, within which we are operating. The Church is both a divine institution and a human organisation. As such it is shaped by both theological principles and political processes. We need to step into decision making mindful of our

Christian calling to membership of an interdependent body (1 Corinthians 12) which means that we cannot simply pursue our own interests in isolation but bring the hopes and fears of all into consideration.

CALLED BY ELECTION - CREATING TRUST IN THE SHAPING OF OUR COMMON LIFE AND THE VOCATION TO REPRESENTATION

23. The purpose of any election is to assemble a group of people who will, usually for a certain period of time, deal with issues on behalf of those who have elected them. The electorate effectively places its trust in this group of people and as long as it is able to continue to have confidence in it, then that trust is maintained. It would appear that a number of the issues we have been asked to look at need to be examined in the context of a breakdown of trust. As a microcosm of the Church of England, the CNC itself embraces difference and diversity of perspective. The challenge with which we are presented is to explore how the wider Church might increase its trust and confidence in those elected to nominate diocesan bishops and whether and how changes in electoral processes might enable this trust.
24. The question of how an individual can be trusted to legitimately represent a wider community of interest is a vexed one in our society today. Electorates have high expectations of their representatives and electoral interests have diversified.
25. One respondent in the consultation process expressed frankly the view that *"nobody can represent me except myself"* and others suggested that they would find it very difficult to trust people who hold opposing theological convictions. Another individual noted that *"no amount of 'window dressing' is going to enable me to trust folk from certain wings of the Church"*. These responses set out quite starkly the challenge to any form of representation in decision making and underline the need for us to think carefully about what binds us in our common life as we seek to overcome such levels of mistrust and suspicion, and the causes of them.
26. Many of those consulted also identified the characteristics they valued in those who did hold different views and how they recognised that they might trust someone. Issues identified include *how* people listen and demonstrate that they can understand different perspectives and a desire for honesty and authenticity, e.g. *"I trust people who are being authentic with who they are, both to themselves and to others"*.
27. The metaphor of the Church as the body of Christ is classically explored in 1 Corinthians 12 – 14. In the context of the divided and fractious life of the Church in Corinth, Paul emphasises that the many parts of the Church are important and that our behaviour towards each other is to be characterised by the type of love outlined in 1 Corinthians 13.
28. *Discerning in Obedience* draws attention to the *"insight"* involved in discernment: (*"Discerning something is quite different from expressing a preference, discernments are things we start out not having, and have somehow to reach"* (Para 2.3)), to openness to be surprised through the *"dialogue with a God who is*

capable of doing what the Church cannot do" (Para 2.4), of not seeking to know the end from the beginning (Para 2.5), to understanding what has happened in the past (Para 2.6) and to stepping into God's grace with an active and thoughtful response (Para 2.7).

29. Within this context, how individual members perceive their role will be significant. Some may perceive themselves to be *delegates* of the constituency that elected them (or which they perceive to have elected them) so that their role is primarily to reflect the concerns and interests of those who elected them whether that is the diocese or a General Synod group. Others may see themselves as a *representative* of those interests (i.e. making sure they are heard in the discussion) whilst also remaining open to receive and discern in the light of the input of others). And others may, whilst of course bringing with them particular interests and perspectives, see themselves as *trustees* whose duty is to act above all in the best interests of the Church as a whole.
30. Having considered a range of models of representation carefully, we are clear that we prefer the model which recognises that our identity is in Christ, and so it follows that our common identity is to be found in our membership of the body of Christ. From that, we conclude that our responsibility as representatives is to that same body, and that all members of that body should be equally able to represent the body without distinction.
31. We preferred this model over 'direct representation' models whereby representation is only considered acceptable if all the characteristics of those to be represented are present amongst those chosen as representatives. Impracticality aside, we concluded that the latter serve only to reinforce silos, reduce the vision of the Church, and risk subverting processes of discernment.
32. We would, however, wish to qualify our choice in two ways. First, it relies on the commitment of all members of the body to the flourishing of the whole body, and to be mindful of that commitment in decision-making, including voting in elections. Secondly, those chosen as representatives should be a *credible* representation carrying the confidence of the represented body as we explore later in the report.
33. The Seven Principles of Public Life, set out by Lord Nolan in 1995, provide a basis for creating this level of confidence in office holders and public representatives in wider public life. These are set out in Appendix 2 for reference alongside the adaptation of these by the Business Committee for the Church of England in "*The General Synod Code of Conduct*" (GS Misc 1175).
34. The General Synod Code of Conduct was provided to "*underpin our work as the General Synod of the Church of England*". We noted the aspiration that "*synod members have a duty to declare any private interests relating to their charitable and church duties*" and will explore this issue further in the chapter on Declaration of Interests. We found ourselves somewhat challenged by some of the statements and were concerned that the Church version might be perceived to be weaker than the original principles when we should in fact be aspiring to

higher standards. We note, for example, that “*Holders of public office should be truthful*” whilst we have a “*duty to declare private interests*”; that public leaders are called upon to “*take decisions in an open and public manner*” whereas we should be “*as open as possible*”. **We recommend that the Business Committee undertake a review of GS Misc 1175, mindful of the high expectations properly placed on those of us engaged in ordering the life of the Church, as it has the potential to play a fundamental part in helping to create a culture of trust in our common life together.**

35. This framework should provide reassurance within our own life. **We recommend that not only Synod, but its various commissions and committees might benefit from reviewing how they operate within this or any revised framework and how they hold these with the guidance provided to us in *Discerning in Obedience* about effective Christian discernment.**
36. The report identified several issues which might serve to increase a culture of trust within and in the Commission, including a more sensitive approach to balancing confidentiality and secrecy. A flourishing plant is also discernible by its fruit and the CNC is as responsible to the wider Church for its decisions as other groups. Under SO 136 (4) the Commission “*must report to the Synod from time to time as it deems expedient on matters of general concern within its area of responsibility*” and **it is recommended that the Central members of the CNC use this opportunity fully and creatively to make an annual report to General Synod.** We hope that a commitment to an annual report will enable General Synod to feel that they have more of an ongoing overview of, and engagement with, the work of the CNC, and, in consequence, also provide scope for better informed and more relevant questions. **We recommend that other Commissions and bodies may also wish to ensure that they take full advantage of similar opportunities.**
37. **We recommend that the CNC annual report would cover the following**
- **Reflections on the challenges faced during the year;**
 - **Pictures of members and pen portraits;**
 - **Reflections as to how they have worked to hear and represent the voices and cultures of those who are not in the room;**
 - **An outline of the process for the nomination of a Diocesan Bishop; and**
 - **A statistical report relating to the key appointment stages.**
38. General Synod chose not to support the recommendation that a more open culture might be encouraged by the removal of the secret ballot (Para 6.7). This has continued to cause some disquiet for some whilst providing others with confidence that CNC members are able to operate without undue influence and according to conscience in a Commission which is a demanding environment for some members. Whilst the proceedings of the CNC (other than elections to its membership) are beyond our remit, and members of the Group had different

views on this particular matter (as on many others), we are all clear that, whatever the method of voting in the CNC, it is vital that those elected as members are able to contribute frankly and constructively to the CNC's deliberations, and are committed to making such a contribution. In this way, the outcome of voting should be consistent with the discussions that precede it.

39. We were also conscious that the wider church may feel more able to trust in a delegated body when it reflects the Church's stated position, and Synodical aspirations more generally, in its decision making. In recent years the House of Bishops Declaration on the Ministry of Women as Bishops and Priests (GS Misc 1076), agreed by General Synod, set out Five Guiding Principles and a commitment to mutual flourishing which a significant number do not see reflected in nominations made by the CNC. The Implementation and Dialogue Group is currently conducting a review it will be interesting to consider its reflections. The February 2020 Synod also saw a re-stated commitment to improving Black, Asian and other Minority Ethnic participation and representation following the debate on the Church's response to the arrival of the Windrush generation. In addition, we are also alert to the need that people with disabilities should not be excluded from committee bodies and leadership roles. **We recommend that the CNC's engagement with these issues is reflected on in its annual report.**
40. Again, the concept of *representation* is integral to these questions and we have sought to ask what it means for both the composition of the CNC and the bishops they nominate to be truly representative of the wider Church. There is a range of constituencies within the Church who have felt the outcomes of the CNC have not reflected a fair consideration of their perspectives or interests. These include women, traditionalist catholics, conservative evangelicals, black, asian or other minority ethnic groups, people with disabilities and LGBTIQ+ groups. There is a perception that most diocesan bishops have tended to be "*somewhere in the broad middle*" of the liberal catholic to open evangelical spectrum, white, male and heterosexual. These concerns need to be taken seriously since some may decide they can no longer remain within the structures of the Church of England if they come to believe that their voice and concerns are no longer, or are still not, adequately represented within the Church. Some potential candidates in categories such as these may be excluded because they have been perceived by others as outside the parameters of *legitimate* diversity. Due attention may not have been given (for whatever reasons) to recognising the contribution their leadership would make to the whole Church.
41. Our proposals for changes to the process of election to the CNC aim to bring more of this diversity (theologically and in terms of previously excluded characteristics) into the makeup of the CNC. But simply changing the composition of the CNC membership, both central and diocesan, will not in itself guarantee a diversity of outcomes from the CNC, in terms of the bishops who are nominated. This will require the attitudinal shift described above as one of collective discernment for the good of the whole body, rather than just advancing any one group's agenda.

42. One way to do this would be to encourage CNC members to think more about the practical outworking of formal Church and Synodical commitments such as the Five Guiding Principles or the response to the Windrush debate, so that they become part of a culture of the CNC which embraces the promotion of genuine breadth and inclusion across the wide variety within the Church (not just theologically but in other dimensions as well). This would mean that the individual members of the CNC would need to be encouraged to reflect on and to take seriously the importance of the concept of *representation* (both in terms of their role and those whom they nominate as diocesan bishops) for the sake of the well-being of the Church as a whole and the flourishing of the different parts within it.
43. Of course, throughout the discernment process, both electors and elected representatives can and should exercise their judgement about which candidates would best serve the interests of the Church, but they would be explicitly encouraged to place those considerations within the broader vision of the good that increased diversity would bring to the life of the Church. In particular, in the light of our heightened awareness of our failure as a church on issues of racial justice, we would like to emphasise that we would have the most serious of questions if our electoral processes and the other recommendations we have made in this report resulted in a Crown Nominations Commission without a member from Black, Asian or other Minority Ethnic heritage. We considered that this would represent a collective failing of the whole Church and that is why we have endeavoured to widen the possibilities for a diverse CNC through revising the election process and in addition offering the possibility of co-option.
44. A flourishing commission, as a flourishing church and indeed a flourishing body, will pay attention to its own health. We can perhaps sometimes lose sight of this in our many committees and boards. The demands of our common life are such that Standing Orders, process and pressure to complete a task can mean that we fail to attend to group dynamics. We are aware that the central members of the CNC at the outset of their work together did spend time preparing for their service with an external facilitator who has also been invited back to share reflections. We understand that the Archbishops' Council follows a similar practice. **We would recommend that other groups reflect on the value of external facilitation for the health of their life as a group.**

INCLUSION OF DIFFERENT VOICES AND PERSPECTIVES

45. "*Affirming our Common Humanity; a theological statement by the House of Bishops*" (GS Misc 972) identifies the foundation for our pursuit of human flourishing for all as the "*universal bond that human beings are all made in the image of God, equal in dignity, sharing a common humanity in which God shows no partiality or favouritism*". We are reminded that "*differences of ethnicity, sex, or social standing cannot offer status in the Church... human diversity will, however, be a reality in the Church and should however be acknowledged, as people bring their gifts and cultures into the body of Christ...*" and that "*in the actions of Jesus we find a declaration of the inclusion of all people...*"

46. The key question in relation to healthy representation is how we seek to reflect this call to inclusion in those bodies that make decisions on our behalf. The response of our colleague who stated “*nobody can represent me but myself*” emphasises the difficulty we all may have if we cannot see ourselves in the group. However, by definition, any group with limited numbers, will be unable to contain all human diversity. In the context of a CNC limited to 12 elected members, the notion that **all** views and **all** characteristics can be directly represented by a “*qualified*” individual falls apart. So, our understanding of the representative function needs to be far less personalised. In the context of the CNC, this means that members need to represent not just their own views but the common good. For the sake of the CNC and the Church, those elected must be prepared to accept that as an expectation and duty of office.
47. Representation within the Church draws its logic from the person of Christ who, in his atoning sacrifice, was a representative of all (2 Corinthians 5.14). As noted in *Discerning in Obedience*, “*To represent a community is to share the representative service of Christ for all humankind before God*” (Para 5.7). This is, after all, the nature of episcopal representation which is to hold the diverse views and experiences of the whole Body of Christ within their body as the overseer. “*The unity fostered by the bishop, then, is not an erasure of differences of view, let alone a negotiation of expedient compromises, but a sign of the hope that all will share in Jesus’ call to mutual love and spiritual union.*” (Para 3.3). A Bishop cannot be rural and urban, male and female, Catholic and Evangelical because there is only one of him/her. Yet they still have this representative calling.
48. If we are to find a way to negotiate such issues in the future, then perhaps there needs to be more reflection across the whole Church on what it means for a Bishop to “*represent*” the whole Body of Christ in a Diocese, beyond sharing particular views or other characteristics. There might also need to be more education and training for Bishops to help them to build trust among all the constituencies within the Diocese that they serve, as well as in the wider Church. Neither of these steps will eliminate deep seated differences, but they may help to promote mutual understanding and respect.
49. Human beings are not bound by a single story; today’s world comprises many cultures and a cacophony of many stories and experiences. Whilst it may be an over-simplification, it seems to us that any representative group has a duty to ensure that the stories of those they represent are meaningfully understood. In the same way, those electing to representative bodies should seek to ensure that those they vote for are able to step into the stories of others. People need to be able to use the word “*we*” meaningfully.
50. These stories may have emerged from life experience linked to particular characteristics (age, gender, ethnic group, disability, sexuality), to educational, economic and social opportunities, or to faith heritage and practice amongst other factors. As Anglicans, we also need to recognise our vocation to bring the stories of the communities we serve to the table and our responsibility to voice wider hopes and concerns. As one of those consulted noted, “*Representation*

needs not only to reflect the Body of Christ in our churches currently but also the communities we are called to serve, which necessitates gender and economic diversity”.

51. We discerned that our challenge was to explore how a body such as the General Synod, which is overwhelmingly white, middle-class and able-bodied, might live out these principles and whether there are process recommendations we can make to bring them to life. However, at the same time if only those from the dominant culture are called to represent the church and the communities it serves, which are themselves far more diverse, we do need to examine how those electing representatives might be more open in discerning whom they wish to represent them.
52. Our reflections also caused us to question the existence of the lay/clergy divide in many of our electoral processes and specifically in elections to the CNC. This is explored further in Chapter 2, but it is arguable that a logical consequence of some of these reflections is that a more nuanced approach could be adopted towards this.
53. Unless some form of positive discrimination or quota system is adopted (which brings legal complexities explored later), then the promotion of diversity can only really be achieved through the education and co-operation of the electorates for the CNC (i.e. General Synod and Vacancy in See Committees (ViSCs)), and in particular by them recognising that such diversity in itself is an important and positive good for the life of the Church. In recent years, a good deal has been written about the value that diversity brings to the functioning of organisations, including examples such as “*Team of Rivals*” by Doris Kearns Goodwin, about Abraham Lincoln’s cabinet, and more recently Matthew Syed’s “*Rebel Ideas: The Power of Diverse Thinking*”, both of which see diversity as a vital and creative source of strength, rather than as a threat.
54. A central theme of Syed’s book is the significance of what he calls “*cognitive diversity*”, meaning the different perspectives that people bring to the life and decision-making of organisations, because of their differing backgrounds, life experiences and training. He contends that embracing this kind of diversity, alongside and in addition to “*demographic diversity*” (which he suggests is to do with different *characteristics* such as ethnicity, gender, race and disability), can enable organisations to frame issues in new ways and therefore to come up with new and perhaps unexpected solutions. In essence, Syed challenges us to recognise that the very people who take a different perspective from our own, and with whom we may fundamentally disagree, may in fact enable us to see things in new ways, and therefore perhaps enable us together to come up with new and surprising solutions to seemingly intractable issues.
55. Such a re-orientation, through affirming diversity as something valuable in its own right, might also help with addressing the broader issues of inclusion within the whole CNC process. These include the perception that it fails, in its membership and its outcomes, to reflect adequately the diversity of the Church, let alone that of the communities that the Church serves, in terms not only of

theological opinion, but also gender, ethnicity, sexual orientation, disability and social background. In this way, affirming the value of both cognitive and demographic diversity might strengthen confidence in the processes of the CNC as a whole.

56. Diversity within the broad parameters of the Church of England has, after all, been part of the Church's identity and particular charism since the time of the Elizabethan settlement. We have never been a monochrome Church and have rather found our character and strength as a diverse family, whose working together in creative tension has demonstrated the varied grace of God amongst us in our common life. Diversity and mutuality are at the heart of who we are as Anglicans, and we perhaps need to recover something of the importance and value of such diversity, for the sake both of the Church and of the divided world that we are called to serve.

THE ROLE OF VOTERS IN CHOOSING THOSE TO REPRESENT THEM

57. Elected members of the CNC are chosen by the clergy and laity of the Church in a secret ballot election process; we choose those who represent us and so the outcome of elections holds a mirror up to who we think we are and whose stories we wish to understand. So, for example, the outcome of the London Diocese elections to the CNC where no black, asian or other minority ethnic representatives were elected was a warning light for some about the reluctance of a number to step into a different story. Similar concerns might be expressed in relation to the overwhelmingly white, able-bodied and non-economically active membership of many of our bodies.
58. *Discerning in Obedience* set a challenge to ViSCs to ensure that they themselves were representative bodies i.e. ensuring that the electoral college itself has inclusion at its heart and to take care in the selection of members of the ViSC. They also suggested a more open approach to General Synod elections. As we have reflected on the theology of being open to surprise in discernment for the nomination of a bishop, we have tried to consider how that might also be brought to life as electors discern how they might cast their vote for the representatives who will have that responsibility.
59. We invite Synod to consider the distinctive vocation of an elector: in what ways should our Christian commitment, and our responsibilities in and for the life of the Church, influence our approach to nominating candidates and voting for them? Similarly, we invite the Synod to consider the distinctive vocation of a representative: in what ways should those same duties influence the way we act in a representative capacity. We believe that there is a compelling argument to recognise more fully the significance of the roles of electors and representatives, and the influence they have; and we believe that acknowledging our common identity as fellow members of the body of Christ, and accepting our responsibilities to that body, is the fundamental basis for any consideration of the role of elector or representative in this context. Ultimately, we need to see our behaviour as voters and representatives more clearly as part of our Christian

calling, and replace any sense of privilege, right or power with a deeper understanding of responsibility, duty and obligation.

60. As the report reminds us “*Discerning something is quite different from expressing a preference. Preferences are things we bring with us; we express them, and then perhaps negotiate them in relation to others’ preferences. But discernments are things we start out not having and have somehow to reach*”. (Para 2.3)
61. We believe that it is vital that those entrusted with responsibility for discernment processes in the Church fully understand the distinctive nature of Christian discernment. It is not simply another decision-making process. Rather, it requires a genuine openness, a care to be attentive to the Spirit, a preparedness to listen and reflect, and to wait on God.
62. The freedom to express one’s will in a vote is a precious gift which we may sometimes undervalue. All of us might need to be mindful of the responsibility we are placing on our representatives and the skills they may need to discharge this responsibility. We might need to be alert to the variety of voices and stories in the room and wise to the role we have in placing them there.
63. The recommendations that follow have emerged from our careful consideration of all these issues. We seek to continue the challenge set to Synod in *Discerning in Obedience*, we aspire to open discussion about a culture change. There are some process changes which might catalyse this but at the end of the day we reap what we sow, our individual votes shape the nature of the group who are charged to discern those who might be called to the episcopal leadership of our Church.
64. Subsequent chapters set out our thoughts and recommendations on the election of central members by General Synod, elections from the ViSC and Declarations of Interests in the light of the reflections set out above.

SECTION 3: THE ELECTION OF CENTRAL MEMBERS BY GENERAL SYNOD TO THE CROWN NOMINATIONS COMMISSION

65. The members elected to the CNC by the Houses of Clergy and Laity are elected in accordance with Standing Orders 132 – 135 of the Standing Orders of General Synod. Elections are held in the middle of the quinquennium following the meeting of the General Synod in York (this provides the opportunity for the electorate to have a deeper knowledge of candidates) and members serve for five years and for no longer than two terms. The tenure of the current members will expire in the summer of 2022.
66. *Discerning in Obedience* recommended that the method used for the election of central members by General Synod should be reviewed (Para 5.10). [Section 5](#) of the report examines the role of elected representatives and drew out three key themes
- To represent others is to be trusted by those who share an angle of vision and to commend that vision to those who have other angles;
 - The election of central members needs to ensure the representation of the wider church, not merely synodical groups; and
 - General Synod needs to consider how it might adapt its electoral procedures to allow for CNC members to command a broad range of necessary competences and interests, and so to represent the Church more adequately.
67. In relation to the latter point, the report noted in paragraph 5.10.
- “Not to instruct the General Synod how to do its business, but merely to illustrate the kind of change that could be thought about, we would ask whether the election might be held in full synod rather than by post, and held in a context of prayer; whether a fuller description of the role could be agreed on and circulated to guide electors; whether, rather than standing for election singly, candidates might stand as pairs, a principal with an alternate who would serve in case of unavailability - which would also help reduce the great burden of the role. Pairings might be devised on a cross-party basis or angled to represent other leading concerns. But however those suggestions may be viewed, we feel strongly that the basis of election of central members needs more credibility if the process is to commend itself widely to the church, and we hope Synod may take an imaginative approach to redesigning it”.*
68. We approached this challenge by giving careful consideration to
- the role of a CNC central member;
 - a range of possible voting systems;
 - the context for the elections; and
 - the election process.

THE ROLE OF A CNC MEMBER

69. The role of a central member of the CNC is a complex one. As *Discerning in Obedience* notes

“The CNC is entrusted with reaching a common discernment on the nomination of a bishop and its discernment will have validity for the whole Church to the extent that it is reached by bringing together diverse perspectives representative of the life of the Church. The members not only bring different personal gifts, but also, as they belong to various communities within the church, different communal gifts of viewpoint and insight. And in the CNC process they play different parts.” (Para 5.1)

70. *Discerning in Obedience* draws out the critical roles of the central members in providing continuity to the CNC process over their five-year period of service and also to the oversight of the process of the Commission with the Archbishops (Para 5.8)

71. The report draws out the need for all elected members to have the following skills: they are people who should

- be capable of forming and expressing judgements conscientiously and clearly;
- be good co-operators who can work with others to forge a variety of views into a common mind;
- be representative of the church i.e. trusted by those who share an angle of vision and to commend that vision to those who have other angles;
- bring virtues of loyalty and imaginative flexibility; and
- be communicators who command the trust of those whose point of view is represented and the respect of those who do not share it.

72. The particular skills of central members are identified (Para 5.8-5.9) as being

- able to give the significant amount of time required;
- capable of relating cooperatively with one another;
- able to transcend the differences of viewpoint they might bring to seek a pattern of appointments that will reflect the authentic character of the Church of England and “*yield an effective and coherent episcopate*”; and
- able to exercise the power they have in a discreet way and with restraint.

73. The expectations placed on members of the CNC are rightly high, given the nature of their responsibilities. In considering possible improvements in the election process, we formed the view that it would be helpful if information about the role, its requirements and the range of skills required could be collated and made available generally well in advance of the election process.

74. We see this as having a number of potential benefits:

- clarity about the nature of the role and the extent of the commitment involved will help those considering standing for election to assess more accurately their suitability;
- the provision of a role description and related information will provide a helpful framework against which electors will be able to assess candidates before they decide on their voting preference; and
- the provision of appropriate explanatory material for members of General Synod to reflect on may also serve to encourage some who might not necessarily have considered themselves ‘in the frame’, but who believe they meet the requirements, to offer themselves as a candidate – or indeed to suggest the possibility of standing for election to another member of Synod they believe matches the criteria.

We hope that this would help to foster a more diverse and more ‘appropriately qualified’ pool of nominated candidates.

75. **We recommend that material is developed setting out the role of a central member of the Commission and identifying the skills needed. We would be happy to complete this task and recommend for simple practicality that this be undertaken by this current group following the General Synod debate.** We were impressed with the [Pension Board briefing documentation](#) for prospective Trustees and believe this could provide a helpful model.

76. **We further recommend that it be kept under review by the CNC Central Members and that significant changes are shared with General Synod in the Annual Report from the CNC.**

REVIEW OF POSSIBLE VOTING SYSTEMS

77. We have had the privilege of learning rather more than we had perhaps initially anticipated about voting systems and electoral theory. We are greatly indebted to Professor Iain McLean for sharing so generously his expertise, but also for helping us to understand the implications in our particular context. In Chapter 17 of “[Electing Popes: Approval Balloting and Qualified-Majority Rule](#)” [Josep M Colomer and Iain McLean, *The Journal of Interdisciplinary History* vol 29, No1 Summer 1998, pp 1 -22, MIT Press], he notes “*In general, there is no best electoral system, but some are worse than others. Each electoral system appeals openly or implicitly to a concept of representation... both are valid but are incompatible with one another. Therefore, electoral designers must choose a system appropriate for the context for which it is to be used*”.

78. On balance, we decided not to include in this report detailed reference to all the systems and theories we have learnt about, but for those interested in the intricacies of the theory underpinning elections, useful insights might be obtained from the work cited above; and more detailed reflections on representation by

Professor O'Donovan can be found in Studies in Christian Ethics 2016 Volume 29(2).

79. We are mindful that “*no choice system can satisfy all of the apparent minimal conditions of fairness and logicity*” and that “*every reasonable electoral system is manipulable*” (Colomer and McLean), and we are satisfied that Single Transferable Vote (STV) is the most appropriate method of election.
80. Under STV, fewer votes are “*wasted*” in that fewer votes are cast for losing candidates or unnecessarily cast for a run-away winner. As a result, most voters can identify a representative whom they helped to elect and, therefore, with whom they may feel more readily able to engage following the election. As candidates need to seek a breadth of support through attracting lower preference votes, we suggest that this system encourages positive rather than negative campaigning and it removes the need for tactical voting as preference is already reflected in the system. We are aware that it can seem confusing, that the count is complex and that ballot papers with a long list of names can be demanding and difficult where not all candidates are known. Election studies suggest there can be a tendency for some voters to complete their preferences simply following the order in which candidates appear on the ballot paper, rather than exercising genuine choice or discernment. However, we concluded that STV is ultimately the best (or least bad) system available for this purpose.
81. Professor McLean advised us that
- “The Victorian originators of STV aimed for ‘fair representation’ in one of its senses: the ‘microcosmic’ sense in which a smaller body proportionately represents the opinions (factions, interests, ideals) of the body from which it is elected. They knew that the magic number was $V/(m + 1)$, rounded up to the next whole number, where V is the number of votes cast and m is the number of places to be filled. This formula goes under the splendid name of the ‘Droop quota’. For $m = 6$, this means that any group of at least $1/7^{\text{th}}$ of the voters can secure ‘their’ representative, any group of at least $2/7^{\text{ths}}$ can secure two, and so on.*
- This is, as engineers like to say, not a bug but a feature of STV. It guarantees representativeness but does not encourage discernment. It may also be difficult to deliver representativeness against multiple criteria – for instance simultaneously representative of approaches to church tradition, gender, ethnic make-up, and other criteria that may matter to some electors.*
- Some organisations that use STV – for instance many trade unions – try to address this problem by reserving places for certain groups of their members – e.g., women, UKME people, or people working in a particular industry. The idea may be well-intentioned but these bolt-ons to STV never work well.”*
- He noted that our report aims “*to encourage both representativeness and discernment. STV secures representativeness, of at least some groups. Other provisions are needed to encourage discernment*”
82. Our aim is to encourage **both** representativeness and discernment. STV has the potential to secure representativeness across the groups of Synod *if* wise discernment is used in its application.

83. We also remain of the view that General Synod is the appropriate electorate. General Synod is itself a representative body of the whole Church. Synod perhaps needs to acknowledge that some of the same challenges that are levelled at the CNC about representation might be made against the Synod and we would once again draw attention to our focus on
- the role of trust and accountability in the shaping of our common life and in creating confidence in a delegated body; the understanding of those chosen as to their responsibilities as representatives;
 - the cultural context and the inclusion of different voices and perspectives; and
 - the discernment and responsibilities of the electorate as they cast their votes.

THE CONTEXT FOR ELECTIONS

84. The outcome of an election depends not only on the system used. We agree with Professor O'Donovan and his group that the way in which the elections to the CNC are conducted is key and we note the potential for significant impact on the themes of trust, inclusion and electorate responsibility that we identified in the chapter on representation. The proposals we have made will require greater investment of time by synod members and candidates, and although we are wary of special pleading for this Commission, we suggest that the "*decisive contribution*" (Para 2.2 of *Discerning in Obedience*) of the CNC to the election of a Diocesan Bishop deserves this since the foundational structures of the Church abide in this leadership.
85. The most profound encounter our own group experienced, as part of our work together, was in responding to an invitation to participate in the type of decision-making process used by the Quakers. Although only a brief example, as we sat silently seeking God's will, we had deep insights into our own responses in a group decision-making situation. Those who sometimes find it hard to speak out found the silence permission giving, those whose natural instinct was to get the last word felt the concern of the group that the agreed norms of working had not been followed. We were also reminded that our ultimate trust is in the Lord our God and that as a group of fallible human beings, the CNC, as the rest of us, is seeking to discern God's will for the Church, the diocese and candidate at that particular time and in that particular place. The group found that this way of working enabled members both to hear everyone's voice and to achieve a greater degree of consensus. It seemed to change the dynamics of our discussion, leading perhaps to a deeper sense of shared discernment and openness to God in our decision-making. Our thoughts about the arrangements for CNC elections were very much influenced by our experience of discernment emerging from the prayerful stillness rather than discussion and noise.
86. In summary, **we recommend that the Officers of General Synod and the Business Committee make arrangements for elections to the CNC to be held as follows**

- i. Elections of central members to the CNC continue to be held mid-way in the life of a Synod;
- ii. A fringe meeting on the work of the CNC is held at the relevant February meeting of the General Synod to inform both those who are considering standing and the electorate about the work of the CNC and the role of an elected central member;
- iii. Nominations for the election and accompanying paperwork are received and issued by central secretariat prior to the relevant July meeting of the General Synod in York;
- iv. Candidates are asked to produce a statement of up to 1000 words which would be made available prior to Synod (electronically to be more easily accessible to the visually impaired) and which would include reflections on
 - v. The mission and ministry of the Church of England;
 - vi. Their hopes for the ministry of Bishops and their leadership;
 - vii. What they (the candidate) would bring to the group of people charged with making this discernment;
 - viii. Details of any directorship and trustee roles held; and
 - ix. How they envisage their partnership/pairing working.
- v. Members of Synod should seek out those who are standing to explore these further and, in addition the Officers of General Synod and the Business Committee arrange a gathering prior to the election to enable such conversations;
- vi. An evening (or other appropriate session) of the relevant July meeting of General Synod is set aside as a prayerful space for the elections. The Archbishops as the Chairs of the CNC will hold this within a simple liturgical framework which will remind people of some of the profound themes they will need to ponder as they cast their vote;
- vii. The vote is held in a period of silence;
- viii. Only those present will be able to vote; and
- ix. The count should be held the next day and before the end of Synod to enable the possibility of a simple form of commissioning of the elected representatives by the Archbishops.

We offer below some observations on these recommendations.

87. We have thought carefully about the proposal that members need to be present to vote. It is consistent with arrangements for the election of the Diocesan members by the Vacancy in See Committee (ViSC) which does not permit any

form of postal or absentee ballot. The reasoning behind this is that we believe members need to be part of the encounter and in the prayerful space alongside colleagues with whom they are seeking to discern those who would best represent the Church on the CNC. Our thoughts are set within the expectation that Synod is normally a physical gathering of people. If there is a broader review of synodical arrangements following COVID-19 then this arrangement might form part of that.

88. Our thoughts about the commissioning of the elected representatives are informed by the positive experience of the commissioning that is now conducted at the beginning of each CNC. Elected members would be reminded by the Archbishops, as Presidents of Synod, of the hopes and expectations that the Synod is placing with them. This would emphatically *not* be a ‘coronation’, but a reminder of the responsibilities and duties of the representative role in which they have been called to serve. It will also serve to raise the visibility of central members. *Discerning in Obedience* reminds us (Para 2.13) that “*the CNC (and candidates) thus form a little representation of the church, delegated for their task and working together to make a unified discernment out of the variety of gifts and perspectives that each brings*”.
89. We have tried to ensure an appropriate balance between ensuring that those who stand share sufficient information and that those who cast their votes feel empowered to engage candidates in informal conversation. We are reminded of the challenge in *Discerning in Obedience* (Para 2.5): “*In order to reach a discernment, then, it is essential not to try to know the end from the beginning*” noting that if “*preferred candidates are already fixed in their minds, they are likely to miss seeing what God intends them to see. Their horizon will be determined by their pre-judgements*”. We hope that candidates will also put themselves forward in a similar spirit of openness and willingness to engage.

THE ELECTION PROCESS

Clergy and Laity

90. The General Synod elects three members of the House of Clergy and three members of the House of Laity to the CNC. In addition to their “*decisive contribution*” to the election of a Diocesan Bishop (Para 2.2), they also have a responsibility with the Archbishop and the non-voting members (The Prime Minister’s and Archbishops’ Appointments Secretaries) for aspects of process and policy relating to the operation of the Commission. For example, General Synod charged the central members with deciding whether to introduce interviews to the process. *Discerning in Obedience* notes their role in looking to the longer term in relation to possible candidates for senior sees (Para 5.22), and other areas such as the introduction and use of psychometric testing, the role of the members in living out the Five Guiding Principles and Mutual Flourishing are explored at regular meetings.
91. The elections are currently held by houses and we would like to challenge Synod as to whether this really needs to be the case. The idea that only clergy can speak for clergy or only laity for laity seems to us to be counter to our

understanding of representation. If CNC representatives have a trustee role to act in the best interests of the Church as a whole, if we are seeking those who seek to understand that cacophony of stories and that in our “*common humanity...God shows no partiality or favouritism*” we feel that this distinction is unnecessary in this context. As we seek to build up trust across the whole body of Christ and to live out our mutual vocations to discipleship, service and witness we concluded that elections across both Houses would be a positive expression of this aspiration. **We recommend that members of the House of Clergy and members of the House of Laity are elected across both Houses.**

92. We explored two options for the election. First, two separate elections – one for the clerical representatives and one for the lay representatives – in which members of both houses vote for candidates according to the STV system. Secondly, one election in which members of both houses vote across the entire pool of clerical and lay candidates and the well-established use of a constraint in the STV system allows the first three clergy representatives and the first three lay representatives to be identified.
93. In working through the implications of each we were alert to the fact that each method has different attractions – this is a reminder of the comment that different electoral methods are appropriate to different contexts. Whilst the former might avoid concerns about apparent “*leap frogging*” (the six successful candidates would be the top three successful laity and the top three successful clergy, which might not be the same as the top six ranked candidates), the latter would maximise the possibility of the election of a more diverse group because of fact that the election is from a bigger pool of candidates. Given the significance of the method of election, we sought advice on this point specifically, and Professor McLean confirmed that the second option – a single election across both houses – would be more consistent with our aspirations in relation to representation.
94. As a result, **we recommend that one election is held in which members of both houses vote across the pool of clerical and lay candidates and that constraints are applied to the STV system such that the first three clergy representatives and the first three lay representatives are elected.**

Diversity in the central membership of the CNC

95. In considering the arrangements for electing central members to the CNC, we also spent a considerable time exploring a significant number of possibilities in relation to the number and composition of the central members.
96. The key principles outlined in Chapter 1 under-pinned our deliberations, namely trust, the inclusion of different voices and perspectives and the underlying theme that we must each be responsible for the votes we cast. We were eager to explore whether we could find a way to increase the range of voices and perspectives around the table in the belief that such diversity will enrich discussion and lead to a fuller appreciation of a breadth of view and of different cultural and life stories. We were also mindful that questions have been raised about how those elected might represent the wider Church of England as well as the spectrum of views within General Synod itself.

97. In setting out our deliberations we hope that those reading this report will be sensitive to the complexity of the threads we are trying to weave together. Each possible system we explored had pros and cons and this aspect of our work took far longer than we had envisaged it would do. However, we were committed to considering each option carefully, both from a perspective of theological and electoral principle and of practical electoral reality. Our final recommendations are as follows - our workings are set out in subsequent paragraphs.
98. **We recommend that General Synod elect across both houses three pairs of clergy and three pairs of laity to the CNC**
- i. **Members to stand for CNC in pairs from within the same House. They will stand together i.e. one electoral statement and will manage their own pairing. They will be able to share confidential CNC information within the pairing;**
 - ii. **They will be nominated and seconded as a pair;**
 - iii. **All 12 members will be central members of the CNC for the purposes of central members meetings but one of each pairing will serve (throughout) on a particular vacancy;**
 - iv. **The pairing will determine who serves on which CNC either by agreement or by lot if they cannot agree;**
 - v. **If, in exceptional circumstances, neither of the pairing can attend, the Chair of the CNC will select someone from another pairing and within the same House to replace them having consulted the 12 central members;**
 - vi. **If this is not possible, the Prolocutors and the Chair of the House of Laity (as the case may be) will ultimately nominate a deputy as currently; and**
 - vii. **If one member of the pairing resigns, loses their seat on Synod or the pairing breaks down, then the entire pair will be replaced under normal synodical rules for by-elections.**
99. Members will note that *Discerning in Obedience* itself suggested that Synod might explore election in pairs (para 5.10). We must emphasise that before ourselves returning to that option and reaching a conclusion, we explored a number of different possibilities.
100. Diversity is in itself a diverse concept. Within Church circles the focus of some would be on the different church traditions held within the breadth of Anglicanism. The recent and powerful General Synod debate on the Windrush Generation reminded us of the urgent and specific responsibilities to Black, Asian or other Minority Ethnic Anglicans; we acknowledge the lack of visible evidence of colleagues with disabilities being involved in the CNC; we are also alert to others who might be included in the categories embraced by the Equality Act who may not be as fully included in our life as they should be, as the recent work of *Living in Love and Faith* has encouraged us to consider. We continue to work to reach out beyond our standard Church of England communities in mission and ministry through work in Estates and lower income communities. It

is interesting to note that there is no formal monitoring of the diversity of CNC members, diocesan or central, although anecdotally and in humility we note that, in general, members of CNCs are not as diverse as the Church aspires to be. Our first recommendation is **that statistical monitoring processes for CNC members are developed and that the annual report includes this data.**

101. Hopes of widening the range of experiences, understandings and insights amongst those who make decisions rightly continue to be expressed. But efforts to improve the diversity of voices, perspectives and cultural stories of those who emerge from elections are not best realised by process change. Voter behaviour is key. Only by the grace of God and a fundamental change of culture – of hearts and minds – can we hope to become the Church we aspire to be. We need to recognise that each one of us has a weighty responsibility to hold that vision of the Church, and to respond with commitment and humility in approaching any election, whether as elector or candidate. However, we did explore various options and again we share our reflections.

Reserved space

102. One proposal we considered to increase the breadth of voices and perspectives was that of reserving a space within an election process for a defined under-represented group (although as will be noted from the recommendation above this was not pursued). Whilst it might be argued that the Synod was, in the exercise of a public function, discriminating against those who did not possess that characteristic, it is possible that we could turn to the concept of positive action. Section 158 of the Equality Act might enable us to argue that, for example, designating a space for Black, Asian and other Minority Ethnic representatives is a proportionate means of enabling Black, Asian and other Minority Ethnic participation in the nomination process given that current involvement is disproportionately low.
103. A worked example of this might be as follows.
- 20 members of General Synod stand for election to the CNC and the vote is conducted across both Houses;
 - The actual preferences result in 4 lay people coming in the top 4 (a, b, c and d);
 - 2 clergy as 5 and 6 (e and f); and
 - g, a lay person from the designated category, emerges at 7.
104. If a reserved place concept were introduced,
- g would be elected;
 - a and b would be elected; and
 - e and f would be elected and whichever clergy person is next in the preference votes.
105. The attractions of this approach are that it is within the framework of a vote and that the person elected would have a democratic mandate to take on

representative functions in the CNC. More difficult is the need for the nature of the designated space to be determined by someone or a body, and for that body/person to point to evidence that demonstrates that participation by the designated group is disproportionately low, and that there were not other ways of addressing the balance which would result in less discrimination against those not in the designated category. Furthermore, the designation would be a single, identifiable characteristic and remain the same in all elections. At a deeper level, it seemed to us that this approach risked being perceived as arising out of a model (of 'direct representation') that we had firmly rejected.

Co-option

106. We also explored the principle of co-option. This would ensure a voice around the table and the possibility to make a full contribution to the full CNC process. However, in view of the strong feeling expressed to us that an entitlement to vote should result from a democratic mandate, and bring with it a degree of accountability, we concluded that it would not be appropriate for a co-opted member to have the full voting rights of an elected member. We suggest that the closest parallel might be the role of the Secretary General of the Anglican Communion in the nomination of the Archbishop of Canterbury. (We would envisage that this provision would, for example, have enabled the Archbishop and the CNC for London to invite a Black, Asian or other Minority Ethnic heritage representative to serve on the Commission.) We recognise that some will be unhappy with a proposal for a non-voting co-opted member, notwithstanding the representations made to us mentioned above. We believe, however, that there is a challenge here for the CNC itself. Ultimately, working as one Commission, the CNC's voting should simply reflect the frank and careful deliberations that have preceded it. It must surely be a laudable aspiration for the CNC that no member need cast a vote as the consensus reached through discussion and prayerful discernment revealed the candidate to be nominated.
107. In exploring the nature of the co-option we discussed whether, in view of the wider community and civic aspects of a Diocesan Bishop's ministry, this should be opened up to those who are not members of the Church of England but who may represent some form of wider community interest. The fact that we are recommending that any co-opted member would not have a vote might have provided an opportunity for this. However, we concluded that, given their responsibilities and the emphasis we would place on prayerful discernment, it was important for all members of the Crown Nominations Commission to be communicant members of the Church of England. **Therefore, we recommend that co-option should be made from within the group of people qualified for election to the General Synod i.e. as specified in the Church Representation Rules (Rule 50).** We were fully alert to the value of the external voice but felt that the right time to ensure this was included was during the consultation period **and we recommend that the Appointment Secretaries ensure that relevant voices are included as they conduct the consultations.** We also note the role of the Prime Minister's Appointments Secretary (PMAS) in representing wider national, civic and community interests on the CNC.

108. **In the event that the Archbishop in the chair considers the elected members are not fully able to represent the perspectives, cultures and stories signalled in the Diocesan Statement of Needs and the Secretaries memorandum, the Archbishop may co-opt a non-voting member to the CNC. This should be done in consultation with the central and diocesan representatives and in the light of the documentation supporting the nomination process.**

Increasing the pool of central members

109. A further proposal to increase the voices and perspectives was to look at the possibility of increasing the pool of central members elected by General Synod i.e. the pool from which six members might be selected to serve on each particular Commission. The whole pool would hold the responsibility for the ongoing life of the Commission within the framework provided by Standing Orders and participate in the meetings of central members. We explored a number of alternative proposals for identifying those from the pool who might serve on a particular Commission and these are explored in more detail below.
- N (which might be, say, 8 or 10 or 12 members) are elected by STV by General Synod of whom the first six are regular central members and the others a pool of replacements from whom the Prolocutors or Chair of the House of Laity will identify replacements;
 - 6 candidates are elected by STV by General Synod. In the light of the results a follow-up election is held for a pool of replacements from whom the Prolocutors or Chair of the House of Laity identify replacements for individual CNCs;
 - N are elected by STV by General Synod and the 6 who will serve on a Commission are identified by discussion and agreement either i) amongst themselves ii) by an external body or person iii) by lot; and
 - 12 members are elected in pairs (Para 5.10 of *Discerning in Obedience*).
110. Each of the models has pros and cons. One of the possible downsides of a bigger pool of members is that the responsibility for overseeing the ongoing work of the CNC rests with a group of people who have not developed the same sense of working closely together over a number of vacancies and indeed may have served on very few Commissions. Forward planning and holding the bigger picture could become more complex if there is no continuity of membership. In connection with arrangements for replacements, we felt that reducing the pool to six people as in the first two bullets in fact restricts the possibilities to diversify CNC membership. Indeed, we noted that recently this power of replacement has been used to good effect in relation to ensuring Black, Asian and other Minority Ethnic membership of the CNC.
111. We explored the possibilities of the third bullet point in great detail as the possibility of having an election for, say, 12 places brought with it the promise of

greater diversity. The challenge came in seeking to identify an appropriate mechanism for the fair selection of the six members to act in respect of a particular vacancy. Whilst there is some merit in enabling those elected to the pool to determine who would serve on which CNC, we felt that this might increase some of the concerns expressed in the report *Discerning in Obedience* about lack of clarity in the process. How would members account for who had been chosen for which CNC and to whom? Should there be an expectation that each member would serve on the same number of vacancies? Appointment by an external body or person raised for us the spectre of accountability by the appointed people to that person or body which was not comfortable. Identifying candidates by sortition, or lots is something which has a biblical precedent, is not manipulable and there are reasonable precedents (it is used, though not without qualification, to select juries). However, we are left with the challenge that it may or may not increase the diversity of any one CNC and the question as to whether, for example, an all-white and male CNC membership would be fit for purpose. This could be dealt with by introducing rules around the election and introducing factors which must be taken into account as the lots are drawn but could lead to an even more complex system. Introducing this degree of chance in the representation process would seem without precedent in Anglican ecclesiology.

112. As *Discerning in Obedience* suggested that we explore the concept of pairings we did so and began to see riches in this idea (noting as ever that every election method has downsides as well as upsides). We agreed the principles
- that we felt that a group larger than 6 would have a better chance of “representing” (both in the sense of understanding the “cacophony of voices and stories” and in terms of diversity);
 - that every member of this central group should share the responsibility for oversight of the life of the CNC;
 - that there should not be a concept of main members and replacements (which we concluded would lead to an undesirable sense of first- and second-class CNC members); and
 - we were eager to explore the possibility of an electoral incentive to encourage diversity. In the light of these principles, it became clear to us that there was much to commend this option.
113. The concept of electoral incentive is one which means that candidates might see that they can strengthen their candidacy by reaching out to someone who brings different stories and experience as a partner candidate. We did initially struggle to see how this might relate to the challenge from *Discerning in Obedience* to the perceived tendency to vote within synodical grouping. The positive welcome given to the appointments of the Bishops of Horsham and Lewes by the Bishop of Chichester in May 2020 however gave us hope that the value of breadth of tradition might be something that voters might recognise. It will provide an opportunity for different characteristics to feature as inevitably two can embrace more than one. This model includes a clear mechanism for substitution, keeps a

continuity of perspective through the recognised sharing of information within the partnership, means that individuals who cannot currently serve due to time commitments might be able to do so and critically widens the experience and views available to the CNC and thus the wider church in Episcopal appointments. We see the possibilities for some really creative partnerships and hope that the electorate will see these too.

114. One practical issue connected with this approach is that of the implications of one of the pair stepping back from General Synod. We concluded that General Synod has arrangements in place for such circumstances and that this should come into play as with any other election.
115. There are significant scriptural resonances for this – Lk10:1 “*He sent them on ahead of him in pairs*”. Acts1:26 – lots are used to choose between the two. The 12 disciples are perhaps too obvious a resonance to point out.
116. Whilst we hope that Synod will respond to our proposal for pairings imaginatively and in that spirit of genuine care for the well-being of the whole body of Christ that we referred to earlier, we nevertheless believe that the best way forward will be to combine it with our proposal for co-option.

SECTION 4: THE VACANCY IN SEE COMMITTEE

The members of a Vacancy in See Committee (ViSC) should be “prayerful, competent, articulate and capable of thinking for themselves, and also representative of the variety of communities and ministries within the diocese.” (Para 5.17 Discerning in Obedience GS Misc 1171)

117. The role of the ViSC is to

- prepare the Diocesan Statement of Needs – a description of the life of the diocese and the desired profile of the next bishop; and
- elect the diocesan representatives to the Crown Nominations Commission.

118. Its business and operation are covered by a [Guidance Note and Code of Practice](#) issued under the Vacancy in See Committees Regulation 1993 as amended by various Vacancy in See Committees (Amendment) Regulations (2003, 2007, 2008 and 2013).

119. *Discerning in Obedience* reiterated the general view of '[Working with the Spirit: Choosing Diocesan Bishops](#)', a review of the operation of the Crown Appointments Commission and related matters (GS 1405) that “*the key to effective diocesan participation lies in the selection of the members (of the CNC) and their careful preparation for the task*” (Para 5.11). Our challenge has been to identify how we might enliven what, in many dioceses, is seen to be a moribund committee only worth joining if there appears to be a serious possibility the Diocesan Bishop might retire within the forthcoming term of the Committee.

120. Our reflections and recommendations are set out below as follows

- Formation of the ViSC;
- Membership of the Committee;
- The role of the Chair of the ViSC;
- Operation of the Committee; and
- Nomination of candidates and elections to the CNC.

FORMATION OF THE VACANCY IN SEE COMMITTEE

121. The ViSC is a standing committee of the Diocesan Synod. Under the current regulation, the term of office of elected members commences on the 1st January following the election of a new Diocesan Synod and ends on the 31st December following the election of the next synod. We have concerns with the current timing of the election of the ViSC for two reasons: First, there is a risk that the elections to this committee ‘get lost’ in the range of other Diocesan Synod committee elections being held around the same time, and thus may not attract the interest of the strongest and broadest field of candidates. Secondly, in line with our three themes – trust and confidence, the inclusion of different voices and stories, and the responsibility of the electorate – we think it would be beneficial for Diocesan Synod members to have more time to get to know each

other, and to consider the needs of the ViSC. We hope that this will increase the likelihood that well-qualified newer members of diocesan synods will consider standing. More significantly, we hope it will provide an opportunity for diocesan synods to develop a strategy for encouraging those who are not members of the Diocesan Synod but are eligible for election to the ViSC to stand for election; and for potential members from across the full length and breadth (and height and depth!) of the diocese to develop a sense of interest in, and consider how they might contribute to, the significant work of the ViSC.

MEMBERSHIP OF THE COMMITTEE

122. There are three categories of membership of the ViSC: ex officio, elected and nominated. The ViSC regulations stipulate a minimum of 21 members, and we considered it beyond our remit to debate whether or not this was an appropriate number. We would however suggest that the membership of the ViSC needs to be large enough to give true understanding and representation of Diocesan life.
123. Ex-officio members provide a valuable role connecting the work of the ViSC to the wider church and to leadership of Diocesan life. The context and insights that they bring to the Diocesan Statement of Needs are significant, although as we will explore later, we do wonder whether the voice of some of those directly associated with the vision and strategies of the previous bishop can be somewhat over-represented in the Crown Nominations Commission itself.
124. With regard to elected representatives, we feel that we need to correct a common misunderstanding that only the members of a Diocesan Synod are eligible for election to the ViSC. This is not the case. As set out in paragraph 1 (a) (vii) and (viii) of the Vacancy in See Committees Regulation, the elected members of the ViSC comprise
- “Not fewer than two Clerks in Holy Orders being clerks beneficed in the diocese or licensed under seal by the bishop of the diocese, elected by the House of Clergy of the Diocesan Synod except that no archdeacon and no person in episcopal orders shall be eligible for election under this paragraph”.*
- “Not fewer than two actual communicant lay persons whose names are on the electoral roll of a parish in the diocese elected by the House of Laity of the Diocesan Synod”.*
- (In practice, the number of elected clergy and of elected laity on the ViSC is considerably greater than two.)
125. **We recommend that those charged with establishing ViSCs explore ways of reaching out across the whole diocese to encourage people to stand for election to this Committee and that appropriate arrangements are made to ensure that they have the opportunity to share their views and to be known by those who are electing them.**
126. Given the need to link effectively to wider diocesan life, we did wonder whether the provisions set out above were unnecessarily restrictive. As an example, Bishops Mission Orders and other new ecclesial communities might find it difficult to step into this space given that elected lay members need to be *“actual communicant lay persons whose names are on the electoral roll of a parish”*.

Under the Church Representation Rules, lay worshippers in mission initiatives are eligible for election to Diocesan and General Synod if they are an actual communicant aged over 16 and are declared by the leader of the mission initiative to be part of the worshipping community. **We recommend that the qualifications for election of a lay person to a ViSC are revised to be brought in line with Rule 36(3) of the Church Representation Rules**

127. Earlier in the report we set out our rationale for recommending that the election of the Central Members to the Crown Nominations Commission no longer takes place by Houses, but that the members of the Houses of Clergy and Laity jointly form the electorate. Continuing the theme of consistency, **we also recommend that the members of the House of Clergy and Laity of the Diocesan Synod jointly form the electorate for the election of members to the ViSC.**
128. As emphasised in the previous chapter, the “*decisive contribution*” made by the CNC to the election of a bishop is critical and setting the election in a liturgical context serves to underline its significance both to churches across the diocese and the communities served. **We recommend that each diocese consider how the proposed process of election for Central Members of the Crown Nominations Commission might be mirrored in the election of members of the ViSC.**
129. The Bishop’s Council has the power to nominate not more than four additional persons “*who reflect a special interest in the diocese or whose nomination is ... appropriate in order to secure a better reflection of the diocese as a whole*”. In the context of a committee which is made up predominantly of those who are currently part of the ongoing life of the diocese, the role of the Bishop’s Council nomination arguably becomes even more important as a means of including those with different voices and different stories, and of bringing a valuable diversity of experience and thinking.
130. **It is recommended that, following the nomination of the Chair of the ViSC by the Bishop’s Council and at its first meeting, the ViSC itself review whether it considers itself to be representative of the whole diocese. It is recommended that the Chair of the ViSC is invited to share this review with the Bishop’s Council as they determine how to allocate their four additional places.** This process would also help to develop an early and increased awareness of the importance of representation not only for this stage but also in prospective CNC members (Para 5.12). As *Discerning in Obedience* notes “*given the great variety in the character of dioceses (we) would resist any attempt to bind its judgement by any universal dictation of what good representation should look like*”.
131. **We would further recommend that the Bishop’s Council is alert to any significant educational establishment that might need to be embraced as it reviews the “character” of the diocese.** Indeed para 2.3.1 of the current Guidance Notes and Code of Practice for Vacancy in See Committees notes “*The provision for the nomination of additional persons reflecting special interests in the diocese was originally included in the Regulation so that, for example, the two ancient universities could be given a say in discussions concerning the appointment of the Bishops of Ely and Oxford*”. We would like to reinforce this sentiment but clearly widen the context.

132. In February 2019, the General Synod decided that a central member of the Commission who represents the universities and theological education institutions on the Synod is disqualified from serving on the Commission for a vacancy in their 'home' diocese, in the same way that a proctor or lay representative from the relevant diocese would be. We were asked, in the light of that decision, to review whether Universities and TEI representatives might be ex officio members of the ViSC of their 'home' diocese. The Church Representation Rules (Rule 31(1)(c)) provide that each proctor elected to the Lower House of Convocation (and thus to the General Synod) from a university or TEI is an ex officio member of the Diocesan Synod of the diocese in which the institution (or the main site of the institution) is based. We understand that there may be instances where such Synod members have little connection to the wider life of the Diocese, but we believe the very nature of that small Synodical constituency is to bring a different and important perspective which would clearly be relevant to the ViSC's deliberations. **We therefore recommend that the regulations are amended to include proctors elected from a university or theological education institution in the ex officio membership of the ViSC consistent with Rule 31(1)(c) of the Church Representation Rules.** We would wish to be clear that this is not, in any way, to suggest that a distinctive contribution could not be made by those elected by the other special constituencies, but we recognise a logic in adopting a more consistent approach across the regulatory framework.

THE ROLE OF THE CHAIR

133. The Chair of the ViSC is elected by the Bishop's Council from among the members of the ViSC. The Deputy Chair is elected by the ViSC itself. We consider the role of the Chair to be key in creating the culture and modus operandi of the ViSC and would draw attention to our recommendations in Chapter 1 in relation to the Nolan Principles and the attention to group dynamics. *Discerning in Obedience* notes the importance of orienting the Committee for its task before it is called into operation and suggests using the "*dormant*" period for briefing and study. Members of the ViSC may wish to reflect on the Ordinal as they consider the role of episcopal ministry. Our view is that the Chair should be well placed to arrange relevant and stimulating events, and that this will be important to animate the life of the ViSC. This will be for the Chair to determine, but, the Archbishops' Secretary for Appointments might provide a natural entry point in the wider church to put ViSC Chairs in contact with possible speakers - perhaps on theological, ecclesiological, mission-focussed, strategic or process-related themes that will enable members to engage more readily, fully and openly with the issues they need to address once a vacancy arises. There may be particular challenges (e.g. financial, safeguarding, etc) that members should be alert to, so that their understanding of the needs of the diocese is both better informed and more deeply grounded than has often been the case hitherto.
134. **We would specifically recommend that all ViSCs give serious consideration to questions of inclusion early in their life together.**
135. We understand that the Appointments Secretaries are already engaging with Dioceses earlier in the process as recommended by *Discerning in Obedience*,

and indeed the content of that report itself is providing a refreshing and theological entry point into the work that ViSCs are being called to undertake.

136. It is important that the Chair is well connected into the ongoing life of the diocese and **we recommend that the Chair of the ViSC becomes an ex-officio member of the Bishop's Council and of the Diocesan Synod if they are not already.** This may be a way of opening up the role of Chair beyond those who are so often called upon to take up such roles.
137. It is important that the Chair of the Committee is able to hold the work and life of the committee as objectively as possible. We feel it is important that they are not therefore concerned with their own possible election to the CNC and **we recommend that the Chair of the ViSC is not eligible to stand for election to the CNC.**

OPERATION OF THE VACANCY IN SEE COMMITTEE

138. In reading the ViSC Guidance Notes and Regulations it is very clear that they were written before the advent of email and digital/electronic forms of communication and in a different legal framework. As examples, reference is made to booklets, to announcing the addresses of members elected to the CNC, to having a convenor of the six (which was needed by the Appointments Secretaries when phone calls were the main means of communication), to announcements in the national church press, and there is an interesting emphasis on people being physically present at meetings. **We recommend that the material sent to ViSCs following this review be revised to reflect current means of communication and avoid references which might unintentionally restrict possibilities for ways of working, whilst recognising both the benefits and the limitations of the various means of communicating, deliberating and meeting.**
139. We have a number of specific recommendations in relation to the operation of the Committee.
- Number of meetings – the current regulations (see paragraph 5(a) of the ViSC Regulation) are unnecessarily prescriptive on the number of meetings and the decisions required at the various stages. We support the need for at least two meetings, but **we recommend that the Chair, the Secretary to the ViSC and the Archbishops' Secretary for Appointments develop a workable framework (including appropriate use of electronic communication) relevant to the diocesan context which will be shared and agreed with the Committee as it starts its work.**
 - Material provided to members – (see paragraph 4 g i – iv) – mindful of the drive for simplification in legislation, we do not consider it necessary to specify what material is sent to members. The clear emphasis is that members must be appropriately briefed and prepared for their task, and the Chair and staff supporting the committee need to ensure that this is the case. **We recommend that the Archbishops' Secretary for Appointments prepare and keep**

under regular review a briefing document to support members of ViSCs.

- Timing of the election of members – paragraph 5(b) of the Regulation specifies that this needs to be at the end second meeting. We believe this to be unnecessarily prescriptive. We would envisage the framework referred to above including provision for the election. **We recommend that the election of diocesan representatives to the CNC should be at such a point in the ViSC’s proceedings as the ViSC considers appropriate (subject to proper advance notice being given to all its members).**
- Present and voting – (paragraph 5(b)). Producing this report during the Coronavirus pandemic has helped shape our thinking with regard to what being “*present*” means. We have considered differences between mode of engagement, and the depth to which a person can be present even if not physically in the same space. We recognise that physical encounter and dialogue in person are likely to remain the best ways of deepening relationships and so engaging most fruitfully with each other, and we hope that, in ‘normal’ times, members of a ViSC will prioritise meeting together in person, including in order to conduct the elections of diocesan representatives to the Crown Nominations Commission. Consistent with the recommendations for electing Central Members of the CNC (paragraph 85), the election of Diocesan members should be “*by those present and voting at a meeting of the Committee*” (The Vacancy in See Regulation para 5b). Nevertheless, we are of the view that there needs to be an element of flexibility to deal with unforeseen circumstances whether national or personal. **We therefore recommend that the Regulations be amended to permit ViSCs to meet virtually by electronic means, and that where a meeting is held via this medium, members are considered present and permitted to vote.** We should stress that we are not recommending hybrid meetings of the committee (i.e. a meeting at which some members are physically present and others connect electronically).
- Incapable of acting – (paragraph 5(c)). Under the current regulations, a member of the ViSC elected to the CNC cannot be replaced if they withdraw from the process unless they die or are “*incapable of acting*”. Whilst we hope that those elected will have every intention to complete the task, and will not be prevented from doing so, there may be situations (e.g. a bereavement or serious illness of a family member) which do not render them legally incapable, but where there would be a compassionate and pastoral understanding for withdrawal. **We recommend that the Regulation is amended to allow a replacement member of the CNC to be appointed in situations where the member is incapable or unwilling to act.**

- Replacement of a Diocesan CNC member – (paragraph 5(c)). The current regulations specify that the Chair and Deputy Chair of the ViSC should appoint a replacement member, with regard to maintaining “*a similar balance of opinion and of the interests*” represented by the member being replaced. We have considered whether this requirement is an over-politicisation of the process, and reflected on alternative options, such as a fresh vote of the whole ViSC or taking the next person from the initial election. We concluded that it would be consistent with established Synodical practice to fill the vacancy by using the voting papers of the original election in line with the provisions of General Synod Standing Order 134(7). **We therefore recommend that the Regulation is amended to provide for any vacancy to be filled by use of the original voting papers following the approach set out in GS S.O. 134(7).**

NOMINATION OF CANDIDATES AND ELECTION TO THE CNC

140. *Discerning in Obedience* sets out three specific recommendations in relation to those who might be nominated as candidates to serve on the CNC. Namely that
- suffragan or area bishops should not serve on the CNC;
 - there should be an equal balance of lay and clergy members; and
 - the provision that only one member of the Bishop’s Staff might serve be broadened to include “*all who are both appointed directly by the bishop and report to the bishop directly*”.
141. Having consulted the central members of the CNC, we are aware that the voice of someone who has been involved in strategic leadership of the diocese is very valuable to their discussion. Whilst they would not wish to designate a space for such a person, they would not wish to rule out the possibility that someone with such experience is elected. Currently not more than one member of the Bishop’s senior staff might be elected to the CNC (ViSC Regulations 5b).
142. We are alert to the fact that the membership of a Bishop’s staff team varies from diocese to diocese, hence the current specific definition in paragraph 5(b) of the Regulation, which specifies “*the suffragan and assistant bishops, the archdeacons and the dean*”) as comprising, for this purpose, “*the bishop’s senior staff*”. The legal advice we have received is that it would be problematic to leave it to individual dioceses to determine who counts as a member of the Bishop’s staff and who does not. It has been suggested that an alternative approach would be for the ViSC Regulations to disqualify from election the office holders already named with the addition of any direct employee of the Diocesan Bishop, the DBF or the DBE. We feel that this should include the Bishop’s office staff who may be Church Commissioner employees as well as other national or diocesan Church employees. **Our recommendation is therefore that no more than one of the members elected by the ViSC shall be a direct employee of any of the National Church Institutions, the DBF, or DBE of the relevant diocese, or a Dean or an Archdeacon**

143. **We also recommend that anyone in episcopal orders is not eligible to stand for election to the CNC.**
144. We have been made aware that the provision that each member of the ViSC may only nominate or second one candidate is possibly restricting the diversity of those who stand. It makes it harder for those who have been nominated on to the Committee or who are not well-known members of Diocesan Synod to stand for election as by the time they have worked out who might nominate them, other members may have used their allocated nomination. **We recommend that the provision that “no members shall propose or second a candidate if he or she has proposed or seconded another candidate” (Para 5(b)) be rescinded.**
145. **We would also recommend that the Chair of the Committee consider carefully the context of the election and how the process for election is held prayerfully and liturgically.**
146. A specific issue arose out of the Summer 2019 consultation process relating to a lack of clarity in the existing regulations. It is stated that any ex-officio members should cease to be a member of the ViSC when he or she ceases to hold the office by which he or she was eligible for membership (Para 3(d)). Whilst an elected member might remain on the Committee until a vacancy is completed (4), the implication is that an ex-officio member will stand down. The Standing Orders for the CNC have a similar provision that members elected by the diocese will hold office until such time as the appointment to the vacant see is announced (SO 140(11)(a)).
147. In the vast majority of vacancies this will not present an issue but there could be circumstances (e.g. if the CNC is not able to make a nomination and its work therefore continues for a longer period than initially expected) which result in someone who no longer holds office in the diocese still representing that diocese as a member of the CNC.
148. In considering the impact of this on the basis of our work exploring representation, our starting point and default position is that the members of the ViSC and Crown Nominations Commission who begin work on a vacancy should normally continue until a nomination is made. There may be instances where a vacancy being considered by the Commission is spread over either a Diocesan or General Synod election period and it would be too disruptive to hold by-elections or otherwise change the membership of the ViSC or Commission if members were for example not re-elected to the Synodical body which gave them eligibility for membership of the ViSC or CNC. Generally speaking, it is unlikely that a new member joining the CNC at an advanced stage of its deliberations in relation to a particular vacancy could have the same depth of knowledge or understanding in relation to the appointment as those members who have played a full part from the start of the process.
149. However, in order to provide some flexibility and consistency **we recommend that should a CNC not make a nomination to a See and the timing of the process is extended, the Chair of the Commission can decide, in**

consultation with the members of the Commission, to take the consideration of the vacancy back to an earlier stage in the process which may include re-electing the Diocesan members of the Commission from the ViSC. In such circumstances, we would suggest that there should be no bar preventing the Diocesan members originally elected by the ViSC to the CNC from standing for re-election, providing that they remain eligible for membership of the ViSC at the time of the new election.

SECTION 5: DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

INTRODUCTION

150. The Group was originally formed to consider the process for the election of Central Members to the CNC and the election of diocesan representatives from the Vacancy in See Committee (ViSC).
151. Subsequently, the Group was asked to consider the question of declarations of interest. This issue was highlighted following an appeal in relation to the House of Laity election to the CNC in July 2017. The basis of the appeal related to the alleged failure of a candidate to declare an interest which another member of Synod felt could have an impact. The appeal panel rejected the appeal, but noted as follows: *“We have no doubt that it is theoretically possible for the General Synod to amend its Standing Orders and impose a more onerous Code of Conduct than that which currently exists, for example by requiring candidates to make express disclosure of all organisations of which they are directors or trustees, but in our judgment it is a matter for General Synod, and not this appeal panel, to determine whether such is appropriate.”*
152. The Group considered examples of different approaches to the disclosure of interests in the public, charity, and private sector, and how these might inform our reflections on the most appropriate way forward in the particular context of the General Synod.

DISCLOSURE OF INTERESTS

153. A fundamental building block in promoting trust is a proper degree of openness and honesty. In any organisation, a lack of appropriate transparency risks damaging confidence in the conduct of its activities. Conflicts of interest and conflicts of loyalty arise in a wide range of contexts, and are not in themselves necessarily harmful. It is often the way in which such potential conflicts are identified and handled that is critical to maintaining trust and confidence, not least by demonstrating that inappropriate considerations are not affecting decision making.
154. It is common practice for organisations to ask those in particular roles to declare any interests which they have. The expectations as to disclosure vary according to the organisation, the nature of its activities and the particular role of the individual. In many instances, disclosure relates to fiduciary duties (such as directorships and trusteeships); but in others it relates to a wider range of roles and relationships.
155. Charity trustees are under a duty to identify, deal with and record any conflicts of interest (which may include any direct financial or non-financial interests or loyalties they may have). This is to enable free discussion, ensure that decisions are taken in the best interests of the organisation and give stakeholders confidence that trustees are acting properly.
156. However, the General Synod is not a charity, and so the legal and regulatory framework that applies to charity trustees does not apply to its members.
157. Nevertheless, the context in which charities and the public sector operate has changed recently following the public scandals relating to a number of well-known and highly regarded charities, and there is now a greater focus on the

conduct of those engaged in public life and a consequent trend to impose greater demands on them from the point of view of transparency. The Church is not immune to such pressures and expectations.

158. Against that background it would not be surprising if at least some members and commentators assume that the General Synod, as a legislative body, would conform to the expectations embodied in the 'Seven Principles of Public Life', promoted by the Committee on Standards in Public Life. The sixth of those principles ('Honesty') is to the effect that: "*Holders of public office have a duty to declare any private interests relating to their public duties and to take steps to resolve any conflicts arising in a way that protects the public interest.*"
159. The Business Committee of the General Synod has developed a Code of Conduct to which members are expected to conform. It requires members to make an oral declaration of any financial or non-financial direct or indirect interests which could materially affect the decisions being made before contributing to any debate or other business before Synod.
160. The Business Committee requests that "*Members who contribute to debates or other Synod business should therefore declare any interest which could reveal a conflict of loyalty, or which could otherwise affect other members' ability to form a balanced judgement of their arguments*".
161. Members should always, therefore, declare an interest which might reasonably be thought to influence what they say and do, and which is relevant to the issue under debate.
162. The Group considered whether there should be declaration of the interests of close family members, as is commonly required for charitable entities. However, as General Synod is not a charitable body, and the members are not charity trustees or have financial control, it was not felt appropriate to request this of General Synod members.
163. The practice described above is normal good practice for many organisations. The question of declaring an interest in advance of being elected is more difficult. It would appear to be relatively unusual for candidates to be *required* to disclose their interests in advance of being elected to a position. In November 2009, the Committee on Standards in Public Life recommended that "*all candidates at parliamentary elections should publish, at nomination, a register of interests including the existence of other paid jobs and whether they intend to continue to hold them, if elected*". The Government and political parties accepted the recommendation, but it was noted that candidates are under no legal obligation to publish details of their interests.
164. Declarations of Interests by candidates prior to an election did not form part of the review of this issue carried out by the Business Committee.

QUESTIONS CONSIDERED

165. The Group considered a wide range of questions in reflecting on this issue.
- What is the purpose of declaration pre-election?;
 - What should the parameters of declaration be?;
 - What reassurance will there be that all interests are declared?;

- What interests should be declared?;
- How does disclosure impact on privacy?;
- Should declaration be mandatory or optional? And is formal regulation the only or best approach?;
- How should declarations be monitored?;
- Should there be consequences for failure to declare an interest?;
- What would the impact of those be?;
- Would declaration increase the number of appeals?;
- Will declaration reinforce perceptions of members from different backgrounds, positions or traditions?; and
- Will declaration reinforce silos and undermine mutual flourishing?

166. The Group felt that there should be some form of basic register for the declaration of interests, noting that there would need to be engagement with other committees to enable this. It was felt that, as a practical, workable minimum, there should be the declaration of trusteeships and directorships. Such appointments bring with them fiduciary duties and a clear legal status that distinguishes them from other roles.
167. After careful consideration, the Group came to the view that a formal requirement to declare membership of Synodical and other groups relating to church tradition or advocating particular causes would be undesirable. We considered that it would be likely that entries in such a register would likely serve only to compound stereotypes and the 'labelling' of members, and in any event risk being misleading across the Synod as a whole. The Group encourages all members to be open about their Synodical affiliations but resists the suggestion that those affiliations are necessarily, in themselves, in conflict with Synod membership. Specifically in the Synodical context, we are concerned at the risk that members become perceived as the sum of their declared/registered 'labels', with the consequent undermining of mutual flourishing. We would prefer to encourage the Synod in a spirit of voluntary openness and in a commitment to engage constructively with each other, mindful that we are all called to recognise in each other the unique manifestation of the image of God.
168. Whilst the Group endorsed the laudable objectives of full and frank disclosure, it did not consider it appropriate to create a distinct regulatory framework for members of the General Synod going beyond current legal requirements. Reflecting on what such a regulatory framework might look like, it quickly became clear to us that the opportunity for complication was significant. If such a framework were to be effective, there would need to be a clear definition and understanding of precisely what interests would need to be disclosed. Determining such a definition would be far from simple. If such a definition were narrow, the objective might largely be lost; if it were wide, the expectation of disclosure might appear unreasonably invasive in the context of membership of the General Synod and the responsibilities exercised by its members.
169. We were concerned at the potential for minor breaches of a wider new registration requirement to become significant issues, and the 'policing' of a

more comprehensive register becoming a weapon. Indeed, the more we considered what the consequences of a failure promptly to register an interest might be, the less attractive we believed a formal enforcement mechanism to be.

170. For this reason, the **Group recommends that any failure to declare an interest when completing the proposed basic register would be communicated to all General Synod members.**
171. Mindful of the resource implications of the establishment of a members' register of interests, the Group considered whether there was a need to create a separate register of interests or whether public records could be used. The Group had hoped that the online resources provided by the Charity Commission and Companies House would suffice for our purposes. However, we discovered that the tools available are not yet sufficiently accurate or easily interrogable, and so would not always be an immediate and reliable record.
172. **We recommend, therefore, that it would be desirable for a General Synod register of directorships and trusteeships to be established and maintained and that the Business Committee should consider how this might be progressed.** The purpose of this would be purely as a record of directorships and trusteeships. Individual members would be responsible for the accuracy of their entries, and would be requested to review it annually, as well as updating it whenever there were any changes to their trusteeships or directorships. The purpose for this register would be to improve credibility and create a culture of accountability.
173. The register of interest would be used by Synod Members when considering the elections for Synodical bodies, including the Crown Nominations Committee. This would enable the electorate to ensure that the candidates declared all interests as necessary.
174. The Group is clear that conflicts should be disclosed. However, we believe the Synod would be better served by fostering amongst its members such a sense of mutual responsibility and accountability that disclosure of relevant information becomes a natural part of any candidate's statement prior to an election. (It is partly to that end that we have recommended that the word limit for a candidate's statement in CNC elections is substantially extended to 1,000 words.) We are clear that a basic requirement for the disclosure of directorships and trusteeships is consistent with the work of members of Synod and that the Business Committee explore how to progress this. Beyond that, we hope that the 'Seven Principles of Public Life' reframed for the Synodical context will provide a foundation on which greater openness and frank engagement may be built. Some may consider us naively optimistic, or even unrealistic, in this respect; but we hold to the belief that, if, as a Synod, we can respond willingly and with genuine commitment to a call to a refreshed understanding of our responsibilities as candidates, as voters and as elected representatives, we shall have achieved far more than any register ever could.

SECTION 6: A LIST OF RECOMMENDATIONS

RECOMMENDATIONS

SECTION 2: Reflections on representation

1. We recommend that the Business Committee undertake a review of GS Misc 1175, mindful of the high expectations properly placed on those of us engaged in ordering the life of the Church, as it has the potential to play a fundamental part in helping to create a culture of trust in our common life together. (Para 34)
2. We recommend that not only Synod, but its various commissions and committees might benefit from reviewing how they operate within this or any revised framework and how they hold these with the guidance provided to us in Discerning In Obedience about effective Christian discernment. (Para 35)
3. We recommend that the Central Members of the CNC use Standing Order 136 (4) fully and creatively to make an annual report to General Synod. (Para 36)
 - i. We recommend that other Commissions and bodies may also wish to ensure that they take full advantage of similar opportunities.
4. We recommend that the CNC annual report would cover the following (Para 37)
 - i. Reflections on the challenges faced during the year;
 - ii. Pictures of members and pen portraits;
 - iii. Reflections as to how they have worked to hear and represent the voices and cultures of those who are not in the room;
 - iv. An outline of the process for the nomination of a Diocesan Bishop; and
 - v. A statistical report relating to the key appointment stages.
5. We recommend that the CNC's engagement with issues relating to the Five Guiding Principles and Black, Asian and other Minority Ethnic participation and representation be reflected in its annual report. (Para 39)
6. We recommend that other groups reflect on the value of external facilitation for the health of their life as a group. (Para 44)

SECTION 3: Election of Central Members

7. We recommend that material is developed setting out the role of a central member of the Commission and identifying the skills needed. We would be happy to complete this task and recommend for simple practicality that this be undertaken by this current group following the General Synod debate. (Para 75)
 - i. We recommend that it be kept under review by the CNC Central Members and that significant changes are shared with General Synod in the Annual Report from the CNC. (Para 76)

8. We recommend that the Officers of General Synod and the Business Committee make arrangements for elections to the CNC to be held as follows: (Para 86)
 - i. Elections of central members to the CNC continue to be held mid-way in the life of a Synod;
 - ii. A fringe meeting on the work of the CNC is held at the relevant February meeting of the General Synod to inform both those who are considering standing and the electorate about the work of the CNC and the role of an elected central member;
 - iii. Nominations for the election and accompanying paperwork are received and issued by central secretariat prior to the relevant July meeting of the General Synod in York;
 - iv. Candidates are asked to produce a statement of up to 1000 words which would be made available prior to Synod (electronically to be accessible to the visually impaired) and which would include reflections on:
 - i. The mission and ministry of the Church of England;
 - ii. Their hopes for the ministry of Bishops and their leadership;
 - iii. What they (the candidate) would bring to the group of people charged with making this discernment;
 - iv. Details of any directorship and trustee roles held; and
 - v. How they envisage their partnership/pairing working
 - v. Members of Synod should seek out those who are standing to explore candidate statements further and, in addition, the Officers of General Synod and the Business Committee arrange a gathering prior to the election to enable such conversations;
 - vi. An evening (or other appropriate session) of the relevant July meeting of General Synod is set aside as a prayerful space for the elections. The Archbishops as the Chairs of the CNC will hold this within a simple liturgical framework which will remind people of some of the profound themes they will need to ponder as they cast their vote;
 - vii. The vote is held in within a period of silence;
 - viii. Only those present will be able to vote; and
 - ix. The count should be held the next day and before the end of Synod to enable a commissioning of the elected representatives by the Archbishops.
9. We recommend that members of the House of Clergy and members of the House of Laity are elected across both Houses. (Para 91)
10. We recommend that one election is held in which members of both houses vote across the pool of clerical and lay candidates and that constraints are applied to the STV system such that the first three clergy representatives and the first three lay representatives are elected. (Para 94)

11. We recommend that General Synod elect across both houses three pairs of clergy and three pairs of laity to the CNC (Para 98)
 - i. Members to stand for CNC in pairs from within the same House. They will stand together i.e. one electoral statement and will manage their own pairing. They will be able to share confidential CNC information within the pairing;
 - ii. They will be nominated and seconded as a pair;
 - iii. All 12 members will be central members of the CNC for the purposes of central members meetings but one of each pairing will serve (throughout) on a particular CNC;
 - iv. The pairing will determine who serves on which CNC either by agreement or by lot if they cannot agree;
 - v. If, in exceptional circumstances, neither of the pairing can attend, the Chair of the CNC will select someone from another pairing and within the same House to replace them having consulted the 12 central members;
 - vi. If this is not possible, the Prolocutors and the Chair of the House of Laity (as the case may be) will ultimately nominate a deputy as currently: and
 - vii. If one member of the pairing resigns, loses their seat on Synod or the pairing breaks down, then the entire pair will be replaced under normal synodical rules for by-elections.
12. We recommend that statistical monitoring processes for CNC members are developed and that the annual report includes this data. (Para 100)
13. We recommend that co-option should be made from within the group of people qualified for election to the General Synod, as specified in the Church Representation Rules (Rule 50) and that the Appointment Secretaries ensure that relevant voices are included as they conduct the consultations. (Para 107)
14. We recommend that in the event that the Archbishop in the chair considers the elected members are not fully able to represent the perspectives, cultures and stories signalled in the Diocesan Statement of Needs and the Secretaries Memorandum, the Archbishop may co-opt a non-voting member to the CNC. This should be done in consultation with the central and diocesan representatives and in the light of the documentation supporting the nomination process. (Para 108)

SECTION 4: The Vacancy in See Committee

15. We recommend that those charged with establishing ViSCs explore ways of reaching out across the whole diocese to encourage people to stand for election to this Committee and that appropriate arrangements are made to ensure that they have the opportunity to share their views and to be known by those who are electing them. (Para 125)
16. We recommend that the qualifications for election of a lay person to a ViSC are revised to be brought in line with Rule 36(3) of the Church Representation Rules. (Para 126)

17. We recommend that the members of the House of Clergy and Laity of the Diocesan Synod jointly form the electorate for the election of members to the ViSC. (Para 127)
18. We recommend that each diocese consider how the proposed process of election for Central Members of the Crown Nominations Commission might be mirrored in the election of members of the ViSC. (Para 128)
19. We recommend that following the nomination of the Chair of the ViSC by the Bishop's Council and at its first meeting, the ViSC itself review whether it considers itself to be representative of the whole diocese. It is recommended that the Chair of the ViSC is invited to share this review with the Bishop's Council as they determine how to allocate their four additional places. (Para 130)
20. We recommend that the Bishop's Council is alert to any significant educational establishment that might need to be embraced as it reviews the "*character*" of the diocese. (Para 131)
21. We recommend that the regulations are amended to include proctors elected from a university or theological education institution in the ex officio membership of the ViSC consistent with Rule 31(1)(c) of the Church Representation Rules. (Para 132)
22. We recommend that all ViSCs should give serious consideration to questions of inclusion early in their life together. (Para 134)
23. We recommend that the Chair of the ViSC becomes an ex officio member of the Bishop's Council and of the Diocesan Synod if they are not already. (Para 136)
24. We recommend that the Chair of the ViSC is not eligible to stand for election to the CNC. (Para 137)
25. We recommend that the material sent to ViSCs following this review be revised to reflect current means of communication and avoids references which might unintentionally restrict possibilities for ways of working, whilst recognising both the benefits and the limitations of the various means of communicating, deliberating and meeting. (Para 138)
26. We recommend that the Chair, the Secretary to the ViSC and the Archbishops Secretary for Appointments develop a workable framework (including appropriate use of electronic communication) relevant to the diocesan context which will be shared and agreed with the Committee as it starts its work. (Para 139)
27. We recommend that the Archbishops' Secretary for Appointments prepare and keeps under regular review a briefing document to support members of ViSCs. (Para 139)
28. We recommend that the election of diocesan representatives to the CNC should be at such a point in the ViSC's proceedings as the ViSC considers appropriate (subject to proper advance notice being given to all its members). (Para 139)

29. We recommend that the regulations be amended to permit ViSCs to meet virtually by electronic means, and that where a meeting is held via this medium, members are considered present and permitted to vote. (Para 139)
30. We recommend that the regulation is amended to allow a replacement member of the CNC to be appointed in situations where the member is incapable or unwilling to act. (Para 139)
31. We recommend that the Regulation is amended to provide for any vacancy to be filled by use of the original voting papers following the approach set out in GS S.O. 134(7). (Para 139)
32. We recommend that no more than one of the members elected by the ViSC shall be a direct employee of the National Church Institutions, the DBF or DBE of the relevant diocese or a Dean, or an Archdeacon. (Para 142)
33. We recommend that anyone in episcopal orders is not eligible to stand for election to the CNC. (Para 143)
34. We recommend that the provision that “*no members shall propose or second a candidate if he or she has proposed or seconded another candidate*” (5 (b)) be rescinded. (Para 144)
35. We recommend that the Chair of the Committee considers carefully the context of the election and how the process for election is held prayerfully and liturgically. (Para 145)
36. We recommend that should a CNC not make a nomination to a See and the timing of the process is extended, the Chair of the Commission can decide, in consultation with the members of the Commission, to take the consideration of the vacancy back to an earlier stage in the process which may include re-electing the Diocesan members of the Commission from the ViSC. (Para 149)

SECTION 5: Declarations of Interest

37. We recommend that any failure to declare an interest when completing the proposed basic register would be communicated to all General Synod members. (*Para 170*)
38. We recommend that it would be desirable for a General Synod register of directorships and trusteeships to be established and maintained and that the Business Committee should consider how this might be progressed. (Para 172)

Appendix 1

Crown Nominations Commission Election Process Review Group Consultation Survey

The CNCEPRG held a Fringe Meeting at General Synod in July 2019. To help the group with their process of discernment, they asked to hear views on the aims of the group. What follows below are the questions that were asked.

1. What are the themes or issues relating to representation that you would like the review group to consider?
2. What would enable you to trust someone else to represent you?
3. What suggestions or comments do you have on the process for electing Central Members to the CNC?
4. What suggestions or comments do you have on the process for electing the Diocesan Members from the Vacancy-in-See Committees to the CNC?
5. What requirements do you think there should be for those standing for election to the Crown Nominations Commission to declare potential conflicts of interest?
6. Do you have any other comments to make in relation to the work of the CNC Election Process Review Group?
7. Is your response
 - a) An individual contribution?
 - b) Submitted on behalf of a group or organisation?

If the response is on behalf of a group or organisation...

8. What is the name of the group or organisation?
9. Are you content for the name of your organisation to be identified as a contributor to this consultation in the review group's report to General Synod?
10. Are you content for us to contact you for further information about your response if required?

For individual responses...

11. What age bracket do you fall within?
12. What is your gender?
13. Are you:
 1. Lay?
 2. Ordained?
 3. Prefer not to say
14. Church Tradition
15. Are you member of General Synod?

If yes...

16. Are you a member of any of the following synodical groups?
 - a) Affirming Catholicism
 - b) Catholic Group
 - c) Open Synod Group
 - d) Evangelical Group
17. What is your ethnic origin?
 - a) Mixed / multiple ethnic group
 - b) Asian / Asian British
 - c) Black / African / Caribbean / Black British
 - d) Other ethnic group
 - e) Prefer not to say
 - f) Other
18. Do you have a disability as defined by the Equality Act 2010?
19. Which Diocese are you from?
20. Are you content for your name to be published as a contributor to this consultation in the review group's report to General Synod?
21. Are you content for us to contact you further information about your responses if required?
22. Name
23. Email address

Appendix 2

THE SEVEN PRINCIPLES OF PUBLIC LIFE – The “*Nolan Principles*”

Selflessness – Holders of public office should act solely in terms of the public interest.

Integrity – Holders of public office must avoid placing themselves under any obligation to people or organisations that might try inappropriately to influence them in their work. They should not act or take decisions in order to gain financial or other material benefits for themselves, their family, or their friends. They must declare and resolve any interests and relationships.

Objectivity – Holders of public office must act and take decisions impartially, fairly and on merit, using the best evidence and without discrimination or bias.

Accountability – Holders of public office are accountable to the public for their decisions and actions and must submit themselves to the scrutiny necessary to ensure this.

Openness – Holders of public office should act and take decisions in an open and transparent manner. Information should not be withheld from the public unless there are clear and lawful reasons for so doing.

Honesty – Holders of public office should be truthful.

Leadership – Holders of public office should exhibit these principles in their own behaviour. They should actively promote and robustly support the principles and be willing to challenge poor behaviour wherever it occurs.

GS Misc 1175 “*The General Synod Code of Conduct*” (December 2017)

Christian Values – Synod members will be prayerful and seek to model and espouse Christlikeness and servanthood, with a commitment to support the Church of England.

Selflessness – Synod members should take decisions solely in the interest of the Church, as the body of Christ and the wider public. They should not do so in order to gain financial or other benefits for themselves, their family or their friends.

Integrity – Synod members should not place themselves under any financial or other obligation to outside individuals or organisations that might seek to influence them in the performance of their official duties.

Objectivity – In carrying out their Synodical role, including making public appointments, or recommending individuals for Boards or Committees, Synod members should make choices on merit.

Accountability – Synod members are accountable for their decisions and actions to the public and must submit themselves to whatever scrutiny is appropriate to their role.

Openness – Synod members should be as open as possible about all the decisions and actions that they take. They should give reasons for their decisions and restrict information only when the wider public interest clearly demands.

Honesty – Synod members have a duty to declare any private interests relating to their charitable and other church duties and to take steps to resolve any conflicts arising in a way that protects the General Synod and the Church of England.

Leadership – Synod members should promote and support these principles by leadership and example.

Appendix 3

PROPOSED FRAMEWORK FOR IMPLEMENTATION

SECTION 2: Reflections on Representation			
Recommendation Number	Recommendation	Mode of Implementation	Responsibility for Implementation
1	We recommend that the Business Committee undertake a review of GS Misc 1175, mindful of the high expectations properly placed on those of us engaged in ordering the life of the Church, as it has the potential to play a fundamental part in helping to create a culture of trust in our common life together. <i>(Para 34)</i>		Business Committee
2	We recommend that not only Synod, but its various commissions and committees might benefit from reviewing how they operate within this or any revised framework and how they hold these with the guidance provided to us in Discerning In Obedience about effective Christian discernment. <i>(Para 35)</i>		Business Committee
3	We recommend that the Central Members of the CNC use Standing Order 136 (4) fully and creatively to make an annual report to General Synod.		CNC Central Members
3 (i)	We recommend that other Commissions and bodies may also wish to ensure that they take full advantage of similar opportunities. <i>(Para 36)</i>		Committee Chairs
4 (i)	We recommend that the CNC annual report would cover reflections on the challenges faced during the year. <i>(Para 37)</i>		CNC Central Members
4 (ii)	We recommend that the CNC annual report would cover pictures of members and pen portraits. <i>(Para 37)</i>		CNC Central Members

4 (iii)	We recommend that the CNC annual report would cover reflections as to how they have worked to hear and represent the voices and cultures of those who are not in the room. <i>(Para 37)</i>		CNC Central Members
4 (iv)	We recommend that the CNC annual report would cover an outline of the process for the nomination of a Diocesan Bishop. <i>(Para 37)</i>		CNC Central Members
4 (v)	We recommend that the CNC annual report would cover a statistical report relating to the key appointment stages. <i>(Para 37)</i>		CNC Central Members
5	We recommend that the CNC's engagement with issues relating to the Five Guiding Principles and Black, Asian and Minority Ethnic participation and representation be reflected in its annual report. <i>(Para 39)</i>		CNC Central Members
6	We recommend that other groups reflect on the value of external facilitation for the health of their life as a group. <i>(Para 44)</i>		Committee Chairs

SECTION 3: Election of Central Members			
Recommendation Number	Recommendation	Mode of Implementation	Responsibility for Implementation
7	We recommend that material is developed setting out the role of a central member of the Commission and identifying the skills needed. We would be happy to complete this task and recommend for simple practicality that this be undertaken by this current group following the General Synod debate. <i>(Para 75)</i>		CNC Election processes review group
7 (i)	We recommend that it be kept under review by the CNC Central Members and that significant changes are shared with General Synod in the Annual Report from the CNC. <i>(Para 76)</i>		CNC Central Members
8 (i)	We recommend that the Officers of General Synod and the Business Committee make arrangements for the elections of central members to the CNC continue to be held mid-way in the life of a Synod. <i>(Para 86)</i>		Officers of Synod and the Business Committee
8 (ii)	We recommend that the Officers of General Synod and the Business Committee make arrangements for a fringe meeting on the work of the CNC to be held at the relevant February meeting of the General Synod to inform both those who are considering standing and the electorate about the work of the CNC and the role of an elected central member. <i>(Para 86)</i>		Officers of Synod and the Business Committee
8 (iii)	We recommend that the Officers of General Synod and the Business Committee make arrangements for nominations for the election and accompanying paperwork are received and issued by central secretariat prior to the relevant July meeting of the General Synod in York. <i>(Para 86)</i>		Officers of Synod and the Business Committee

8 (iv)	<p>We recommend that the Officers of General Synod and the Business Committee make arrangements for candidates to be asked to produce a statement of up to 1,000 words which would be made available prior to Synod (electronically to be accessible to the visually impaired) and which would include reflections on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) the mission and ministry of the Church of England; (ii) their hopes for the ministry of Bishops and their leadership; (iii) what they (the candidate) would bring to the group of people charged with making this discernment; (iv) details of any directorship and trustee roles held; and (v) how they envisage their partnership/pairing working. <i>(Para 86)</i> 		Officers of Synod and the Business Committee
8 (v)	<p>We recommend that members of Synod should seek out those who are standing to explore candidate statements further and, in addition, the Officers of General Synod and the Business Committee arrange a gathering prior to the election to enable such conversations <i>(Para 86)</i></p>		Individual Synod members and Officers of Synod and the Business Committee
8 (vi)	<p>We recommend that the Officers of General Synod and the Business Committee make arrangements that an evening (or other appropriate session) of the relevant July meeting of General Synod is set aside as a prayerful space for the elections. The Archbishops as the Chairs of the CNC will hold this within a simple liturgical framework which will remind people of some of the profound themes they will need to ponder as they cast their vote. <i>(Para 86)</i></p>		Officers of Synod and the Business Committee and Archbishops
8 (vii)	<p>We recommend that the Officers of General Synod and the Business Committee make arrangements that</p>		Officers of Synod and the Business Committee

	the vote is held within a period of silence. <i>(Para 86)</i>		
8 (viii)	We recommend that the Officers of General Synod and the Business Committee make arrangements that only those present will be able to vote. <i>(Para 86)</i>	Standing Order Change	Officers of Synod and the Business Committee. CNC
8 (ix)	We recommend that the Officers of General Synod and the Business Committee make arrangements that the count should be held the next day and before the end of Synod to enable a commission of the elected representatives by the Archbishops. <i>(Para 86)</i>		
9	We recommend that members of the House of Clergy and members of the House of Laity are elected across both Houses. <i>(Para 91)</i>	Standing Order Change	
10	We recommend that one election is held in which members of both houses vote across the pool of clerical and lay candidates and that constraints are applied to the STV system such that the first three clergy representatives and the first three lay representatives are elected. <i>(Para 94)</i>	Standing Order Change	
11	We recommend that General Synod elect across both houses three pairs of clergy and three pairs of laity to the CNC. <i>(Para 98)</i>	Standing Order Change	
11 (i)	We recommend that members standing for CNC will be in pairs from within the same House. They will stand together i.e. one electoral statement and they will manage their own pairing. They will be able to share confidential CNC information within the pairing. (ii) they will be nominated and seconded as a pair. (iii) all 12 members will be central members of the CNC for the purposes of central members	Standing Order Change	

	<p>meetings but one of each pairing will serve (throughout) on a particular CNC.</p> <p>(iv) the pairing will determine who serves on which CNC either by agreement or by lot if they cannot agree.</p> <p>(v) if, in exceptional circumstances, neither of the pairing can attend, the Chair of the CNC will select someone from another pairing and within the same House to replace them having consulted the 12 central members.</p> <p>(vi) if this is not possible, the Prolocutors and the Chair of the House of Laity (as the case may be) will ultimately nominate a deputy as currently.</p> <p>(vii) if one member of the pairing resigns, loses their seat on Synod or the pairing breaks down, then the entire pair will be replaced under normal synodical rules for by-elections. <i>(Para 98)</i></p>		
12	<p>We recommend that statistical monitoring processes for CNC members are developed and that the annual report includes this data. <i>(Para 100)</i></p>		
13	<p>We recommend that co-option should be made from within the group of people qualified for election to the General Synod, as specified in the Church Representation Rules (Rule 50) and that the Appointment Secretaries ensure that relevant voices are included as they conduct the consultations. <i>(Para 107)</i></p>	Standing Order Change	
14	<p>We recommend that in the event that the Archbishop in the chair, considers the elected members are not fully able to represent the perspectives, cultures and stories signalled in the Diocesan Statement of Needs and the Secretaries Memorandum, he may co-opt a non-voting member to the CNC. This</p>	Standing Order Change	

	should be done in consultation with the central and diocesan representatives and in the light of the documentation supporting the nomination process. (Para 108)		
--	--	--	--

SECTION 4: The Vacancy in See Committee			
Recommendation Number	Recommendation	Mode of Implementation	Responsibility for Implementation
15	We recommend that those charged with establishing ViSCs explore ways of reaching out across the whole diocese to encourage people to stand for election to this Committee and that appropriate arrangements are made to ensure that they have the opportunity to share their views and to be known by those who are electing them. (Para 125)	ViSC Guidelines	Archbishops' Sec for Appts and ViSC Chair
16	We recommend that the qualifications for election of a lay person to a ViSC are revised to be brought in line with Rule 36(3) of the Church Representation Rules. (Para 126)	ViSC Regulation	CNC
17	We recommend that the members of the House of Clergy and Laity of the Diocesan Synod jointly form the electorate for the election of members to the ViSC. (Para 127)	ViSC Regulation	CNC
18	We recommend that each diocese consider how the proposed process of election for Central Members of the Crown Nominations Commission might be mirrored in the election of members of the ViSC. (Para 128)	ViSC Guidelines	Archbishops' Sec for Appts and ViSC Chair
19	We recommend that following the nomination of the Chair of the ViSC by the Bishop's Council and at its first meeting, the ViSC itself review whether it considers itself to be representative of the whole	ViSC Guidelines	Archbishops' Sec for Appts and ViSC Chair

	diocese. It is recommended that the Chair of the ViSC is invited to share this review with the Bishop's Council as they determine how to allocate their four additional places. <i>(Para 130)</i>		
20	We recommend that the Bishop's Council is alert to any significant educational establishment that might need to be embraced as it reviews the "character" of the diocese. <i>(Para 131)</i>	VISC Guidelines	Archbishops' Sec for Appts and VISC Chair
21	We recommend that the regulations are amended to include proctors elected from a university or theological education institution in the ex officio membership of the ViSC consistent with Rule 31(1)(c) of the Church Representation Rules. <i>(Para 132)</i>	VISC Regulations	CNC
22	We recommend that all ViSCs should give serious consideration to questions of inclusion early in their life together. <i>(Para 134)</i>	VISC Guidelines	Archbishops' Sec for Appts and VISC Chair
23	We recommend that the Chair of the ViSC becomes an ex officio member of the Bishop's Council and of the Diocesan Synod if they are not already. <i>(Para 136)</i>	Church Representation Rules amendment	Business Committee
24	We recommend that the Chair of the ViSC is not eligible to stand for election to the CNC. <i>(Para 137)</i>	VISC Regulation	CNC
25	We recommend that the material sent to ViSCs following this review be revised to reflect current means of communication and avoids references which might unintentionally restrict possibilities for ways of working, whilst recognising both the benefits and the limitations of the various means of communicating, deliberating and meeting. <i>(Para 138)</i>	VISC Guidelines	Archbishops Sec for Appts

26	We recommend that the Chair, the Secretary to the ViSC and the Archbishops Secretary for Appointments develop a workable framework (including appropriate use of electronic communication) relevant to the diocesan context which will be shared and agreed with the Committee as it starts its work. <i>(Para 139)</i>		Archbishops' Sec for Appts and VISC Chair
27	We recommend that the Archbishops' Secretary for Appointments prepare and keeps under regular review a briefing document to support members of ViSCs. <i>(Para 139)</i>		Archbishops' Sec for Appts
28	We recommend that the election of diocesan representatives to the CNC should be at such a point in the ViSC's proceedings as the ViSC considers appropriate (subject to proper advance notice being given to all its members). <i>(Para 139)</i>	VISC Regulation	Archbishops' Sec for Appts and VISC Chair
29	We recommend that the regulations be amended to permit ViSCs to meet virtually by electronic means, and that where a meeting is held via this medium, members are considered present and permitted to vote. <i>(Para 139)</i>	VISC Regulations	CNC
30	We recommend that the regulation is amended to allow a replacement member of the CNC to be appointed in situations where the member is incapable or unwilling to act. <i>(Para 139)</i>	VISC Regulations	CNC
31	We recommend that the Regulation is amended to provide for any vacancy to be filled by use of the original voting papers following the approach set out in GS S.O. 134(7). <i>(Para 139)</i>	VISC Regulations	CNC

32	We recommend that no more than one of the members elected by the ViSC shall be a direct employee of the National Church Institutions, the DBF or DBE of the relevant diocese or a Dean, or an Archdeacon. <i>(Para 142)</i>	ViSC Regulations	CNC
33	We recommend that anyone in episcopal orders is not eligible to stand for election to the CNC. <i>(Para 143)</i>	ViSC Regulations	CNC
34	We recommend that the provision that “no members shall propose or second a candidate if he or she has proposed or seconded another candidate” (5 (b)) be rescinded. <i>(Para 144)</i>	ViSC Regulations	CNC
35	We recommend that the Chair of the Committee considers carefully the context of the election and how the process for election is held prayerfully and liturgically. <i>(Para 145)</i>	ViSC Guidelines	Archbishops' Sec for Appts and ViSC Chair
36	We recommend that should a CNC not make a nomination to a See and the timing of the process is extended, the Chair of the Commission can decide, in consultation with the members of the Commission, to take the consideration of the vacancy back to an earlier stage in the process which may include re-electing the Diocesan members of the Commission from the ViSC. <i>(Para 149)</i>	Standing Orders Change	CNC

SECTION 5: Declarations of Interest			
Recommendation Number	Recommendation	Mode of Implementation	Responsibility for Implementation
37	We recommend that any failure to declare an interest when completing the proposed basic register would be communicated to all General Synod members. <i>(Para 170)</i>	Legislation	Business Committee
38	We recommend that it would be desirable for a General Synod register to be established and maintained and that the Business Committee should consider how this might be progressed. <i>(Para 172)</i>	Legislation	Business Committee