

# GENERAL SYNOD

November 2022

## QUESTIONS

of which notice has been given under Standing Orders 112–116.

### INDEX

<b>QUESTION 1</b>	<b>COUNCIL FOR CHRISTIAN UNITY</b>
Anglican Network in Europe	Q1
<b>QUESTIONS 2–8</b>	<b>MINISTRY COUNCIL</b>
IME1 report: decision to remove question re Issues in Human Sexuality	Q2
Age and Gender figures of ordinands by cohort	Q3
Maternity and family-friendly policies in dioceses	Q4
Age and Gender figures of ordinands from Resolution parishes	Q5
Working with international/cross-cultural organisations	Q6
Overseas Mission Agencies as part of discernment	Q7
Employment statistics for clergy in dioceses	Q8
<b>QUESTIONS 9–11</b>	<b>REMUNERATION &amp; CONDITIONS OF SERVICE COMMITTEE</b>
Rise in inflation: plans for stipend	Q9
HLC scheme: clergy couples in shared post	Q10
Comparison of stipend for female and male clergy	Q11
<b>QUESTIONS 12–13</b>	<b>MISSION AND PUBLIC AFFAIRS COUNCIL</b>
Rising costs: financial and pastoral support for those with disability	Q12
Encouragement to Government to increase targeted heating grants	Q13
<b>QUESTIONS 14–15</b>	<b>BUSINESS COMMITTEE</b>
Scheduling of informal sessions for Synod members	Q14
Code of Conduct: Commitment to Pastoral Principles	Q15
<b>QUESTION 16</b>	<b>CLERGY DISCIPLINE COMMISSION</b>
Clergy Discipline Measure	Q16
<b>QUESTION 17</b>	<b>LITURGICAL COMMISSION</b>
Rubrics to BCP Funeral rite on website	Q17
<b>QUESTIONS 18–25</b>	<b>ARCHBISHOPS' COUNCIL</b>
Risk Register: Division following LLF	Q18-19
Risk Register: Disestablishment	Q20
Duty of dioceses to assist PCCs in financial difficulty	Q21
Ability of dioceses to assist churches without PCC agreement	Q22
Targeted grants for those with additional heating needs	Q23
Energy Costs Grant: ordinands, TEIs and staff	Q24
Debates on Safeguarding matters	Q25
<b>QUESTIONS 26–61</b>	<b>HOUSE OF BISHOPS</b>
Rising costs: support for those with mental health concerns	Q26
Submissions to Commission on the Five Guiding Principles	Q27
Resolution parishes: clear information for worshippers	Q28
Streamlined committee procedures: value of the local	Q29
Governance Review: timetable for legislation	Q30

Motions in General Synod supporting Vision and Strategy	Q31
Vision and Strategy: Approval and agreement by General Synod	Q32
Number of dioceses reducing clergy posts	Q33
Bishops' role in the unity, discipline and faith of the Church	Q34
LLF: Decisions on doctrine and practice	Q35
Definition of marriage	Q36
Doctrine of marriage	Q37
Marriage and Civil Partnership (Minimum Age) Act 2022	Q38
LLF: results of feedback survey	Q39
Bishops' engagement with media re LLF	Q40
LLF: compensation re 'Issues in Human Sexuality'	Q41
Liturgy of thanksgiving for same-sex civil partnership	Q42
Bishops contradicting doctrine of marriage	Q43
Implementation of Lambeth Conference Calls	Q44
Lambeth Resolution 1.10 and Global South bishops	Q45
Mutual accountability on diocesan issues: further consideration	Q46
ISB Chair: conclusion of investigation into complaints	Q47
ISB: constitutional status, oversight and finance	Q48
ISB: legal personality	Q49
Domestic Abuse safeguarding training	Q50-51
Outstanding Safeguarding Reviews: publication	Q52
Publication of Makin review	Q53
PCR1: Advice to dioceses re overlooked cases	Q54
Inclusion of allegations against deceased clergy in PCR2 reports	Q55
Safeguarding portal: e-learning support	Q56
Safeguarding training requirements for PTO renewal	Q57
Definition of vulnerable adult	Q58
Interim Support Scheme: payments and budget	Q59
Preaching on marriage: safeguarding concerns	Q60
Information sharing agreement	Q61
<b>QUESTIONS 62–63</b>	<b>CHURCH COMMISSIONERS</b>
Mission and Pastoral Measure Review	Q62
Calculation of deanery synod representatives in merged parishes	Q63
<b>QUESTIONS 64–67</b>	<b>SECRETARY GENERAL</b>
NCIs' staffing and operational costs	Q64
UK Statistics Authority Code of Practice in Statistics	Q65
Criticism of recent survey results	Q66
Numbers of men and women in senior NCI posts	Q67
<b>QUESTION 68</b>	<b>CLERK TO THE SYNOD</b>
Appointment of General Synod Chaplain	Q68
<b>QUESTIONS 69–71</b>	<b>NATIONAL SOCIETY COUNCIL</b>
<i>Valuing All God's Children</i> : gender identity of primary school pupils	Q69
<i>Valuing All God's Children</i> : re-drafting to remove ambiguity	Q70
Teaching materials: warning of mental and physical health risks	Q71

## **COUNCIL FOR CHRISTIAN UNITY**

**Mr Chris Gill (Lichfield) to ask the Chair of the Council for Christian Unity:**

**Q1** Does the Church of England recognise the orders of the Anglican Network in Europe?

*The Bishop of Gibraltar in Europe to reply on behalf of the Chair of the Council for Christian Unity:*

**A** Currently the Church of England does not recognise the orders of the Anglican Network in Europe. Such a process could be set in train, were the Anglican Network in Europe to approach the Church of England to that effect.

## **MINISTRY COUNCIL**

**The Revd Tim Edwards (Rochester) to ask the Chair of the Ministry Council:**

**Q2** The new end of IME1 report still includes a *Five Guiding Principles* specific question, but no *Issues in Human Sexuality* question. It was in the old IME1 reports specifically to comment on under criterion E5. Who made the decision to drop it and with what authority?

*The Bishop of Chester to reply as Chair of the Ministry Council:*

**A** The expectation that candidates would live within the House of Bishops' Guidelines on *Issues in Human Sexuality* was an element in the previous formation criteria. The associated reporting template listed the main headings from the criteria but not the detailed elements. Under the new formation qualities, living within the House of Bishops' guidelines on sexuality is specified as expected evidence under the Trustworthiness quality. However, as previously, the new reporting template lists the higher-level requirements not the detail below them. Hence this appears explicitly in neither the old nor the new reporting templates, and therefore there was no decision to drop it.

**Dr Felicity Cooke (Ely) to ask the Chair of the Ministry Council:**

**Q3** What are the figures for the cohort of ordinands which began training this September (2022) by gender, and in 5-year age bands, when separated into the three different modes of ordination training: full-time residential, mixed mode and part time?

*The Bishop of Chester to reply as Chair of the Ministry Council:*

**A** We are in the process of moving to a new data system aligned to the Shared Discernment Process. The data requested is not currently readily available, but we have manually produced the required breakdown in 10-year age bands in an accompanying spreadsheet (see page 30). Please note the initial nature of these figures which have not been finally verified.

**Mrs Nicola Denyer (Newcastle) to ask the Chair of the Ministry Council:**

**Q4** Can the Chair of the Ministry Council confirm that all dioceses are offering maternity and family friendly policies which at a minimum comply with national policy and that there are links to the national policy on each diocesan website?

*The Bishop of Chester to reply as Chair of the Ministry Council:*

**A** I refer to the answer to Question 58 at the July 2022 sessions of General Synod.

We encourage Dioceses to produce maternity and family friendly policies and to provide information on their websites, but they are not legally required to do so. Recent research suggests that 22 dioceses have links to the national recommendations on their websites. Ministry Council does not have the remit to monitor the local implementation of these recommendations. Instead, we are exploring ways of helping dioceses to better communicate ways in which the Church can support ordinands and clergy with young families.

**Professor Helen King (Oxford) to ask the Chair of the Ministry Council:**

**Q5** What are the figures for cohorts of ordinands for the last three years from Resolution/petitioning parishes by gender, and in 5-year age bands, when separated into the three different modes of ordination training: full-time residential, mixed mode and part time?

*The Bishop of Chester to reply as Chair of the Ministry Council:*

**A** This information is simply not gathered or analysed in this kind of way. Whilst it might be possible to cross-reference sending parishes for all ordinands against a list of petitioning parishes (if there is an authoritative list), the work involved would vastly exceed the capacity of the existing team.

**Mr Gabriel Chiu (Liverpool) to ask the Chair of the Ministry Council:**

**Q6** Many of our churches have been blessed with new members, from a GMH background, who have recently moved to the UK. We have worked hard in our welcome through liturgical provision for those whose first language is Farsi and with our churches partnering with the UKHK/Welcome Churches network. To what extent does the National Church encourage working with institutions who have international/cross-cultural provision, like Cornhill, Crosslinks, and the Pars Institute, to recognise (perhaps via Reader/LLM appointments) and theologically resource/train those with a GMH background serving congregations and church groups that cater for those with different language needs and cultural provision?

*The Bishop of Chester to reply as Chair of the Ministry Council:*

**A** The Church of England is committed to serve every person and community in England in so far as we are able, both directly and cross-culturally. Both lay and ordained ministers are part of this work and our intention to widen diversity. We do not, though, have specific data regarding particular organisations. Nevertheless, we take the matter seriously. For example, in the discernment process for ordained ministry we have worked hard to meet the needs of Farsi-speaking candidates to enable access (as we have with other candidates whose first language is not English). This has included provision of some translated resources. Our TEIs work hard in various ways to enable candidates whose first language is not English to access training. Theological training and resourcing for Licensed Lay Ministers may take place at TEIs, but is normally a diocesan responsibility.

**Mr Gabriel Chiu (Liverpool) to ask the Chair of the Ministry Council:**

**Q7** How many of those going through the discernment process within the Church of England are directed towards overseas mission with Anglican Mission Agencies like Crosslinks?

*The Bishop of Chester to reply as Chair of the Ministry Council:*

**A** Discernment processes for Licensed Lay Ministers are organised entirely in dioceses. The discernment process for ordained ministry largely takes place in the dioceses before candidates are sent to national panels. It is not the place of national panels specifically to direct candidates to overseas mission. We do not have data regarding the practice in the dioceses. However, during initial training, ordinands may undertake overseas placements as agreed with their TEs and dioceses, which may be arranged through mission agencies, though we do not have numerical data. There is a formal partnership between CMS and Ripon College Cuddesdon, including joint pathways for ordinand training.

**The Revd Marcus Walker (London) to ask the Chair of the Ministry Council:**

**Q8** If he could provide a breakdown, by diocese, of clergy who are employed (a) in mission communities (b) in resource churches (c) in stipendiary parochial ministry (d) in sector chaplaincy (e) as Archdeacons, Assistant Archdeacons, or Associate Archdeacons (f) as full time Area Deans or Assistant Area Deans (g) by the diocese for any other role.

*The Bishop of Chester to answer as Chair of Ministry Council:*

**A** I regret that I cannot (as it would be interesting information) as the data is not categorised this way. There are many reasons we do not capture numbers in these categories, not least that stipendiary clergy often serve in many different roles within a parish or chaplaincy setting.

What we do know is that, according to initial 2021 figures (still being finalised), there are 7,570 stipendiary clergy in total. 7,140 of those are categorised as being in parochial ministry (incumbents, 'incumbent status' or assistant curates). 112 are categorised as Archdeacons and 246 are in episcopal or cathedral ministry. Around 80 are categorised as serving in a non-parochial setting. An additional 1,000 clergy serve in chaplaincy roles although we do not have breakdown of which are salaried/stipendiary or self-supporting.

## **REMUNERATION & CONDITIONS OF SERVICE COMMITTEE**

**Mr Luke Appleton (Exeter) to ask the Chair of the Remuneration and Conditions of Service Committee:**

**Q9** In light of some Church leaders recently calling for benefits to rise with inflation, what plans are there in the coming years to ensure that the stipend really is enough to live on?

*The Bishop of Hereford to reply as Chair of the Remuneration and Conditions of Service Committee:*

**A** The Archbishops' Council has agreed a policy "that the National Minimum Stipend should, in future, on average, increase in line with inflation, as measured by CPIH subject to three-yearly reviews and the need to review this position if high levels of inflation establish themselves." The policy allows for not reaching inflation in one year in the hope that compensating increases above inflation might be possible in future years.

We are mindful of the challenges clergy face given the rising cost of living, and the intention remains to maintain the value of the clergy stipend in the medium term, although this is ultimately dependent on the giving of parishioners. However, the current high levels of inflation and the significant financial challenges that many dioceses are continuing to face mean that an increase in line with current inflation is unlikely next year.

The remuneration review assessed the adequacy of the package and found that it was adequate for most clergy and its worth to be in the region of £50,000, excluding defined benefit pension but including stipend housing, and other benefits.

Further details will be provided in the Annual Report of the Central Stipends Authority as a GS Misc paper next February.

**Ms Rebecca Mynett (St Albans) to ask the Chair of the Remuneration and Conditions of Service Committee:**

**Q10** With the increase in fuel costs, the Heating, Lighting and Cleaning (HLC) Scheme is increasingly important for clergy finances. In order to be eligible for HLC, the recipient has to occupy, rent free, an official house from which they perform their duties and the house has to be provided by the Church for duties which are full-time.

What measures can be taken to assist in cases where the house is occupied by a clergy couple who job share a full-time post and officially divide the stipend and duties such that neither individual is full-time, without impacting on pension contributions for one party, as might happen were one person to become a Self-Supporting Minister while the other went full-time?

*The Bishop of Hereford to reply as Chair of the Remuneration and Conditions of Service Committee:*

**A** Under the rules of HMRC's HLC scheme, Clergy who do not work full time are not eligible to claim HLC. However, they may still claim tax relief on any work-related heating, lighting, cleaning and garden upkeep expenses through the Ministers of Religion Tax Return under "other expenses". This means that a clergy couple each receiving a half stipend should not be any worse off financially than a clergy couple where one is full-time stipendiary and the other one is self-supporting. This is made clear on the Church of England website at [HLC Scheme | The Church of England](#).

**Mr Samuel Wilson (Chester) to ask the Chair of the Remuneration and Conditions of Service Committee:**

**Q11** For the most recent period for which data is available, across all clergy in receipt of a stipend, what is the median stipend and mean stipend received by female clergy, compared to the median stipend and mean stipend received by male clergy? Please also provide gender pay gap information that would be required under the law if clergy were salaried employees employed by a single legal entity.

*The Bishop of Hereford to reply as Chair of the Remuneration and Conditions of Service Committee:*

**A** Our rough estimate of the current *median* stipend for stipendiary female clergy is £27,663, compared with £27,519 for male clergy, with the result that the median stipend for women clergy was £144 or 0.4% greater than the equivalent figure for men. Our estimate of the *mean* stipend for stipendiary female clergy is £28,633, compared with £27,839, with the result that the mean stipend for stipendiary female women was £794 or 3.7% greater than that for stipendiary male clergy. These figures compare with an overall UK median pay gap of 15.4% in 2021. We intend to carry out a more detailed analysis of the figures, which was not possible in the time available.

## **MISSION AND PUBLIC AFFAIRS COUNCIL**

**The Revd Canon Timothy Goode (Southwark) to ask the Chair of the Mission and Public Affairs Council:**

**Q12** In November 2021 I drew General Synod's attention to the additional costs that disabled people, or a family which includes a disabled person, incur – which presently stands on average at £600 per month – so that they may function to a level that is near to that of a non-disabled person. The huge rise in fuel costs has the potential to have a particularly catastrophic impact on the flourishing of disabled people. Given that I, like a significant number of disabled people, need to keep my home at a consistently warm temperature to help manage chronic pain, and given that many disabled people are already carrying the financial burden of significantly higher electricity bills to ensure the continued running of vital medical equipment, what is the national Church doing to ensure that disabled people receive appropriate and targeted financial and pastoral support and that their profound and pressing needs do not get lost in the ongoing political debate?

**The Revd Canon Dr Rachel Mann (Manchester) to ask the Chair of the Mission and Public Affairs Council:**

**Q13** Given that many people who are disabled with chronic pain rely on warmth to manage it, how has the Church's senior leadership sought to encourage the government to consider a greater financial uplift closer to the actual additional and unavoidable costs that people in pain have no choice but to bear this winter?

*Mr Mark Sheard to reply as Chair of the Mission and Public Affairs Council:*

**A** I would like to reply to questions 12 and 13 together.

In recent months, as members will be aware, the overall direction of government policy has been hard to predict and our priority in lobbying has been to emphasise the fundamental principal that, in a financial crisis, the most vulnerable must be protected. Lobbying to emphasise the experience of people in different categories of vulnerability, and to address the underlying causes of particular vulnerabilities, had to follow the establishment of that principle. In the end, the Lords Spiritual were able to give a cautious welcome to the Chancellor's Autumn Financial Statement for uprating benefits in line with inflation – which was not a foregone conclusion. The particular needs of disabled people were raised explicitly in discussions as the Lords Spiritual planned their approach to the cost of living crisis and will be prominent in the thinking of the MPA Council, Faith and Public Life staff and, I am sure, the bishops, as the impact of the energy and financial crises becomes clearer and as government policy directions evolve.

## **BUSINESS COMMITTEE**

**Dr Ros Clarke (Lichfield) to ask the Chair of the Business Committee:**

**Q14** Do the Business Committee plan to schedule future sessions for Synod, however optional and informal, with short notice and at a time when many people will be at work or have other commitments?

*Canon Robert Hammond to reply as Chair of the Business Committee:*

**A** The opportunity to attend presentations on areas of activity in November 2022 was optional and informal and they therefore were not sessions of Synod.

These webinars and presentations were held as a result of feedback from Synod members who requested updates on important issues and felt that the dates held for a possible group of sessions in November would be a good time to hold them. The Business Committee agreed and encouraged staff and working groups to identify subjects and arrange the sessions. This was the first time we have tried this, and I apologise that more notice wasn't given and therefore some members weren't able to join them.

However, the slides and presentations are available on the Synod website and have been circulated alongside the Questions Notice Paper. Many members have said how useful they found the sessions and the Business Committee will consider whether to propose this again and if so when, but will endeavour to give as much notice as possible.

**Mrs Caroline Herbert (Norwich) to ask the Chair of the Business Committee:**

**Q15** Will the proposed Code of Conduct for members of General Synod include a clear and explicit commitment to the Pastoral Principles?



*Canon Robert Hammond to reply as Chair of the Business Committee:*

- A** Work on the Code of Conduct is ongoing, no decisions have been taken and Synod will be updated at the appropriate time.

## **CLERGY DISCIPLINE COMMISSION**

**The Revd Canon Lisa Battye (Manchester) to ask the Chair of the Clergy Discipline Commission:**

- Q16** Given the discreditation of the existing Clergy Discipline Measure are those who are charged with responding to new Complaints now able to employ informed discretion in regard to how they implement the process while the Church waits for a safer Measure?

*The Bishop of Gibraltar in Europe to reply on behalf of the Chair of the Clergy Discipline Commission:*

- A** The Clergy Discipline Measure 2003 provides a legal procedure for the making of allegations of serious misconduct and the subsequent investigation and determination of those allegations. Whilst the current Measure remains in force all persons having anything to do with the administration of clergy discipline must continue to comply with the provisions of the Measure, the Clergy Discipline Rules 2005, the Code of Practice, and all other statutory guidance issued by the Clergy Discipline Commission.

## **LITURGICAL COMMISSION**

**The Revd Joanna Stobart (Bath & Wells) to ask the Chair of the Liturgical Commission:**

- Q17** Given that Canon B 38.2 was amended in July 2017 to allow our funeral services (including the BCP's funeral service at the discretion of the minister in question) to be used in cases of those who die by suicide, would it be possible to omit the opening rubrics of the BCP *At the Burial of the Dead* which continue to appear on the web page for this service and thus avoid the wholly unnecessary pain their presence might cause to grieving families?

*The Bishop of Exeter to reply as Chair of the Liturgical Commission:*

- A** The rubric in question was removed by Section 4(8) of the Church of England (Miscellaneous Provisions) Measure 2018. It would seem that the relevant web page was not amended. We are grateful that this was brought to our attention.

## **ARCHBISHOPS' COUNCIL**

**Mr Andrew Bell (Oxford) to ask the Presidents of the Archbishops' Council:**

- Q18** Does the Archbishops Council risk register include an entry relating to the costs (financial or other) which might arise from potential division following any decisions on marriage and human sexuality at the conclusion of the LLF process?

**The Revd Tim Edwards (Rochester) to ask the Presidents of the Archbishops' Council:**

**Q19** Does the Archbishops' Council risk register include an entry relating to the costs (financial or otherwise) that might arise from differentiation/schism following any decisions on human sexuality following the Living in Love and Faith process?

*Mrs Maureen Cole to reply on behalf of the Presidents of the Archbishops' Council:*

**A** I will answer questions 18 and 19 together.

Whilst there is not a risk specifically in the Archbishops' Council (AC) Strategic Risk Register (SRR) for the Living in Love and Faith process, there are three risks that are intrinsically linked; Financial Pressures, Younger and More Diverse Church and Reputational risk.

It is worth adding that the AC has a robust risk management process in place, which includes regular discussion on risks in line with good governance. The Audit Committee considers the SRR three times a year and the AC considers the SRR annually.

**Dr Ros Clarke (Lichfield) to ask the Presidents of the Archbishops' Council:**

**Q20** Does the Archbishops' Council risk register include an entry relating to the costs (financial and otherwise) that might arise in the event of the disestablishment of the Church of England?

*Mrs Maureen Cole to reply on behalf of the Presidents of the Archbishops' Council:*

**A** Whilst there is not a risk specifically in the Archbishops' Council (AC) Strategic Risk Register (SRR) for the disestablishment of the Church of England, there are two risks that are intrinsically linked; Financial Pressures and Vision & Strategy.

It is worth adding that the AC has a robust risk management process in place, which includes regular discussion on risks in line with good governance. The Audit Committee considers the SRR three times a year and the AC considers the SRR annually.

**Mr Adrian Greenwood (Southwark) to ask the Presidents of the Archbishops' Council:**

**Q21** What duties, responsibilities and powers do dioceses have to assist PCCs who are having difficulties with meeting their financial, governance, or other statutory obligations?

**Mr Adrian Greenwood (Southwark) to ask the Presidents of the Archbishops' Council:**

**Q22** In setting out the duties, responsibilities and powers in answer to question 21 above, which of those identified permits a diocese to offer assistance to a PCC which is seen to be struggling with or failing to meet its obligations, without the consent of that PCC?

*The Bishop of Durham to reply on behalf of the Presidents of the Archbishops' Council:*

**A** I will answer questions 21 and 22 together.

Dioceses provide formal and informal support to parishes in a variety of ways, such as support for the work of church schools, diocesan advice in connection with church buildings and works to them, and the provision of a diocesan safeguarding team. Some dioceses provide discretionary services on financial and administrative aspects of parish life.

Dioceses have no duty to assist a PCC which may be struggling with or be unable to meet its legal obligations as a freestanding charity, but may be able to provide some support. What will be possible will depend on the resources of the Diocesan Board of Finance and its trustees' assessment of what may best further the mission of the Church of England in the diocese, and of course on what the PCC consents to accept. There is some general advice and guidance on the [Parish Resources](#) website overseen by the National Giving and Income Generation Team, and the [Association of Church Accountants and Treasurers](#) also provides useful material.

**The Revd Canon Dr Rachel Mann (Manchester) to ask the Presidents of the Archbishops' Council:**

**Q23** To what extent have the Church Commissioners considered making targeted grant provision to help with the unavoidable extra energy costs for clergy and family members who are disabled with chronic pain and who rely on warmth to manage it?

*Canon Dr John Spence to reply on behalf of the Presidents of the Archbishops' Council:*

**A** Earlier this year the Archbishops' Council and Church Commissioners worked together to provide £3m in Ministry Hardship grants. All dioceses received a share of this funding to allocate to clergy and lay workers who were considered likely to face significant hardship as a result of the high level of inflation in general and the significant increases in energy costs in particular. Senior diocesan clergy and diocesan staff have a much better knowledge of the personal circumstances of individual clergy and members of their household and so were given the maximum flexibility in the targeting of these funds.

In October £15m in Energy Costs Grants were distributed to dioceses to enable them to help PCCs cover the increased costs of energy. Dioceses may choose to use some of this funding to supplement Ministry Hardship grants.

**The Revd Dr Sean Doherty (Universities & TEIs) to ask the Presidents of the Archbishops' Council:**

**Q24** In the welcome release of the Energy Costs Grant and ministry hardship funding to assist clergy and parishes struggling with rising energy costs, what consideration is being given to assessing the impact of the rising costs on ordinands (who generally have lower incomes than clergy), TEIs, and their staff, and to making some assistance available to them?

*Canon Dr John Spence to reply on behalf of the Presidents of the Archbishops' Council:*

**A** The Ministry Development team is working with TEIs to understand the extent of the challenge each faces due to the increased costs of energy. This will vary depending on whether or not they have fixed rate arrangements and the period of such contracts. The Archbishops' Council will then consider what help might be given towards those TEIs facing increased energy bills.

Dioceses have been able to allocate Ministry Hardship Fund grants (which some dioceses may have supplemented from their own resources and / or the subsequent Energy Costs Grant primarily intended for parishes) to active clergy and lay ministers. Some TEI staff and ordinands may fall within these categories. Dioceses may also review the level of maintenance grants in the light of increased maintenance costs.

**Canon Peter Adams (St Albans) to ask the Presidents of the Archbishops' Council:**

**Q25** By the February 2023 meeting of the General Synod there will be many important steps on our Safeguarding journey which have not yet been considered by Synod. These include the final IICSA report, PCR2, possibly the Makin Review, the Devamanikkam Review, and the Information Commissioners Office report on the ISB. Will the Presidents of the Archbishops' Council please undertake to liaise with the Business Committee to ensure that sufficient time will be made available at General Synod to ensure that there is suitable format for our deliberations to do justice to the issues and all parties involved, and that new members be resourced so that they are brought up to speed on these long outstanding and complex matters.

*Canon Dr Jamie Harrison to reply on behalf of the Presidents of the Archbishops' Council:*

**A** The Presidents fully recognise the need for Synod to have appropriate opportunity to engage with safeguarding matters and will of course liaise with the Business Committee over the best way to do this.

## **HOUSE OF BISHOPS**

**The Revd Canon Timothy Goode (Southwark) to ask the Chair of the House of Bishops:**

**Q26** Moneyandmentalhealth.org national survey has found that, due to rising fuel and food costs, 4 in 10 of people who live with a mental health problem are descending into greater poverty which in turn is profoundly worsening their already fragile mental health. Given that we are called to be a Church for the poor, what is the national Church doing to ensure that the needs and concerns of those living with a mental problem are being addressed at both local and national governance?

*The Bishop of Carlisle to reply on behalf of the Chair of the House of Bishops:*

**A** I think it is fair to say that improving awareness of the needs of people with mental health problems is still something of a Cinderella in the Church of England's efforts to enable wider participation in its life. As the position of disabled people has begun to rise up the agenda, not least thanks to the energy and persistence of the

questioner, it is important that people with mental health problems are not forgotten, and I know that CMDDP will help keep them very much in view.

Meanwhile, collaborative work is taking place with the Church Works Commission for covid recovery to support local churches in offering mental health help in the context of wellbeing, alongside family hubs and the Warm Welcome scheme in the specific context of the current energy and financial crises. The national Church is an active partner with the Bishop of Durham chairing the Commission and the Chair of the MPA Council as a Commissioner.

**Dr Felicity Cooke (Ely) to ask the Chair of the House of Bishops:**

**Q27** The role of the Standing Commission on the Five Guiding Principles includes:

- to receive and disseminate good practice in relation to the implementation of the House of Bishops' Declaration at all levels within the Church
- to consider how effectively the Declaration, including the Five Guiding Principles, is being promoted throughout the Church
- to receive and comment on reports published by the Independent Reviewer
- to provide an annual report to the House of Bishops

What are the arrangements for submissions to the Standing Commission and how will its reports be disseminated beyond the House of Bishops?

*The Bishop of Lichfield to reply on behalf of the Chair of the House of Bishops:*

**A** The Standing Commission welcomes submissions from anyone who wishes to make them. They can do so by writing to me, as Chair of the Standing Commission, or via Elise Sandham, Secretary to the Standing Commission, on [elise.sandham@churchofengland.org](mailto:elise.sandham@churchofengland.org)

The first report to the House of Bishops will be written by the Standing Commission in the summer of 2023. On receipt of the report, the House will decide how to publish its contents. The Standing Commission expects that the annual report will be made public.

**Mrs Nicola Denyer (Newcastle) to ask the Chair of the House of Bishops:**

**Q28** What steps are being taken to ensure that all involved in worship in resolution churches are clearly and accessibly informed of the PCC's stance on women's ministry?

*The Bishop of Lichfield to reply on behalf of the Chair of the House of Bishops:*

**A** Neither the House of Bishops nor the Standing Commission has addressed this question and are therefore unable to say where this stands. The Standing Commission is open to submissions on this point.

**Mrs Mary Durlacher (Chelmsford) to ask the Chair of the House of Bishops:**

**Q29** Following on from the recent Zoom session on planned governance reform, which outlined the NCI proposals for a greater efficiency through the streamlining of

committee and membership, how does the oft referred-to and valued role of the local fit into the decision-making procedures at national and local level?

*The Bishop of Guildford to reply on behalf of the Chair of the House of Bishops:*

**A** The proposals of the Governance Review Group (GRG) approved by Synod in February 2022 and being developed by the National Church Governance Project Board (NGPB), were intended to simplify and clarify the functions of the national bodies to enable them to be better understood and accountable to the Church at every level, not least the local. The NGPB recognises that there will be a need for a greater number of committees and advisory groups than suggested in the GRG report and believes that the committee structure should ensure that a broad range of individuals from across the wider Church continue to contribute to the development of National Policy and advise on the services that CENS is proposed to provide. It is certainly envisaged that Synod members would continue to play an active and important role in the composition of these committees.

**Mrs Rebecca Chapman (Southwark) to ask the Chair of the House of Bishops:**

**Q30** Following the recent synod Governance webinar, please can you provide a complete list, with the current anticipated timings, of the formal stages of approval required for the upcoming proposed National Church Governance legislation, and from which groupings or bodies this approval is required, from the now up to final Royal Assent?

*The Bishop of Guildford to reply on behalf of the Chair of the House of Bishops:*

**A** The National Church Governance Project Board (NGPB), subject to approval from the Business Committee, hopes to present an outline of its developing proposals at the February 2023 General Synod. It will then refine its proposals in light of the Synod's response and would hope to bring forward its detailed proposals to the July 2023 Synod for approval, together with a motion for the Synod to endorse the introduction of legislation to reflect those proposals. If that endorsement is given, the Board expects to present a draft Measure for First Consideration in February 2024, with Revision Stage in July 2024 and Final Consideration in February 2025. The timing of the Parliamentary process from there to Royal Assent is estimated at six months, although we are of course in the hands of the House authorities, and there may be delay due to a General Election.

**The Revd Marcus Walker (London) to ask the Chair of the House of Bishops:**

**Q31** If they would please detail the measures or motions passed by General Synods which have indicated Synodical support for the various parts of the Vision and Strategy for the Church of England in the 2020s.

*The Archbishop of York to reply as Chair of the House of Bishops:*

**A** The Church of England's Vision and Strategy was first presented to General Synod in November 2020 by the House of Bishops following agreement by the College of Bishops and all Diocesan Secretaries. It builds on numerous Synod resolutions, suggesting a direction of travel for the Church of England in its dioceses and parishes which is where most decisions and action will take place. Aspects of the vision are regularly brought to Synod for update and consultation.

Wherever new financial support is needed, specific motions are brought. Motions on which various parts of the Vision and Strategy build are listed in the Annex on pages 32-35. The Business Committee may wish to consider introducing a motion in a future session on “*A parish system revitalised for mission so that churches can reach and serve everyone in their community.*” This is the only bold outcome which does not build on a recent motion.

**Mr Jonathan Baird (Salisbury) to ask the Chair of the House of Bishops:**

**Q32** When did General Synod approve, and agree to, Vision & Strategy?

*The Archbishop of York to reply as Chair of the House of Bishops:*

**A** In July 2022, the Synod voted in favour of the motion as follows:

‘That this Synod:

(a) welcome the spending plans by the Church Commissioners and Archbishops’ Council, set out in GS 2262, for financial distributions over 2023 to 2025 and indicative distributions for the subsequent six years;

(b) welcome the investment in ministry in parishes, chaplaincies, schools, Cathedrals and other forms of church **in support of the Church’s vision and strategy** as set out in Annex A of GS 2262; and

(c) welcome the focused investment to support previously agreed commitments to a 2030 net zero carbon target and to address racial justice.’

I am encouraged to see how dioceses and parishes are already building on the vision and strategy work in their local contexts as we move through the 2020s proclaiming Jesus Christ afresh to our nation.

**The Revd Dr Ian Paul (Southwell & Nottingham) to ask the Chair of the House of Bishops:**

**Q33** What is the latest information on how many dioceses are reducing their number of stipendiary clergy posts, by how much in each diocese, and in total?

*The Archbishop of York to reply as Chair of the House of Bishops:*

**A** In the most recent gathering of this data, 28 dioceses responded. Overall, those responses indicated a marginal increase in the forecast number of stipendiary clergy posts (not including curates) in 2023 compared with 2022. In more detail, 11 dioceses indicated an increase, 8 indicated maintaining a stable cohort and 9 were proposing reductions. Whilst increases ranged from between 1% and 11%, most decreases were 1% (with two dioceses indicating decreases of 3%).

Investing in clergy remains a fundamental aim for all dioceses but recognising the huge challenges most dioceses are facing we recognise, as has been the case for a very long time, that in some cases, clergy numbers may fall. Overall, the projections are positive. But this is an evolving picture. And even in dioceses where small decreases are envisaged, it is usually against a backdrop of developing sustainability and an overall increase in ordained and licensed lay ministry.

**Mr Chris Gill (Lichfield) to ask the Chair of the House of Bishops:**

**Q34** Over the last few years to what extent have the College and House of Bishops considered their individual and corporate roles in the Mission of a Bishop to "...maintain and further the unity of the Church, to uphold its discipline, and to guard its faith"?

*The Archbishop of York to reply as Chair of the House of Bishops:*

**A** In our discussions within the College and House of Bishops, bishops are always attentive to the importance of their calling and leading of the Church of England, and the weight of responsibility they carry to maintain and further the unity of the Church, to uphold its discipline and to guard its faith.

**Mrs Mary Durlacher (Chelmsford) to ask the Chair of the House of Bishops:**

**Q35** In view of the widespread secular interest shown in the outcome of our lengthy listening and sharing consultation over sexuality, can the House of Bishops reassure us that any decision reached at the conclusion of the LLF process will be made by General Synod as the proper forum for determining matters of doctrine and practice for the Church of England?

*The Bishop of London to reply on behalf of the Chair of the House of Bishops:*

**A** Yes.

**Mr Sam Margrave (Coventry) to ask the Chair of the House of Bishops:**

**Q36** In answer to a previous question from Mrs Andrea Minichiello-Williams (Q49 in February 2019) the then Bishop of Newcastle, on behalf of the Chair of the House of Bishops, confirmed that the House of Bishops' position on marriage is that set out in Canon B 30 – '*marriage is in its nature a union permanent and lifelong, for better for worse, till death them do part, of one man with one woman*'. Is the position of the House of Bishops that this represents the doctrine of the Church and, if so, that any sexual relations outside of this definition of marriage is a sin?

*The Bishop of London to reply on behalf of the Chair of the House of Bishops:*

**A** Canon B 30 does indeed continue to articulate the doctrine of the Church, including asserting that holy matrimony is the proper context for sexual intimacy.

**Mrs Ruth Allan (Guildford) to ask the Chair of the House of Bishops:**

**Q37** In what authorized texts and documents is the Christian doctrine of marriage as the Church of England has received it recorded?

*The Bishop of London to reply on behalf of the Chair of the House of Bishops:*

**A** The Church's doctrine of marriage is set out in Canon B 30, in the Form of Solemnization of Matrimony contained in the *Book of Common Prayer*, and in the Marriage Service in *Common Worship*. You can find out more in Chapter 3 of the LLF Book.

**Mrs Ruth Allan (Guildford) to ask the Chair of the House of Bishops:**

**Q38** Given that the *Marriage and Civil Partnership (Minimum Age) Act 2022* will come into force on 26 February 2023 making it illegal for anyone under the age of 18 to



get married (whilst the age of consent for sexual intercourse remains at 16), what consideration has the House or College given to the implications of this legislative change for the teaching and practice of Christian sexual ethics as received by the Church of England, especially in Church of England schools and colleges and church-based youth groups – whether as part of the LLF process or separately?

*The Bishop of London to reply on behalf of the Chair of the House of Bishops:*

**A** The bishops are currently reflecting on and discerning what actions to take in response to the Church-wide LLF teaching and learning process. While it is not possible to predict what commitments bishops will make, you raise an important point for which I am grateful. I will make sure it is raised in our deliberations in the College.

**Mr Luke Appleton (Exeter) to ask the Chair of the House of Bishops:**

**Q39** Following the results of the LLF feedback survey, what steps are being taken to address the lack of knowledge and understanding of Church of England doctrine demonstrated by a sizable number of respondents?

*The Bishop of London to reply on behalf of the Chair of the House of Bishops:*

**A** The bishops are currently reflecting on and discerning what actions to take in response to *Listening with Love and Faith*. They are doing this alongside their own study of the LLF resources that were prepared for teaching and learning in the Church. While it is not possible to predict what actions and commitments bishops will make, I am grateful for your question and will make sure it is raised in our deliberations in the College.

**Mrs Sandie Turner (Chelmsford) to ask the Chair of the House of Bishops:**

**Q40** Could it be clarified whether members of the College of Bishops are encouraged to engage with the media, on actions that they believe should be taken by the Church of England arising from the Living in Love and Faith process, as long as it is done 'in a way that honours our commitment to travelling together and to being appropriately open about the diversity of perspectives among us,' as was recently attributed in an online report to a spokesperson from the Living in Love and Faith Next Steps Group?

*The Bishop of London to reply on behalf of the Chair of the House of Bishops:*

**A** Members of the College of Bishops have not been 'encouraged' to engage with the media in relation to the outcomes of the LLF process, but, were they to choose to do so, bishops have indeed been encouraged to communicate "in a way that honours [bishops'] commitment to travelling together and to being appropriately open about the diversity of perspectives among [bishops]'".

**Mr Sam Margrave (Coventry) to ask the Chair of the House of Bishops:**

**Q41** If the LLF process leads to the Church of England departing from the biblical understanding and teaching of marriage, and results in a revocation of the House of Bishops statement *Issues in Human Sexuality* (1991), what steps will be taken to provide compensation to all those who have suffered and/or been harmed

(including as a result of spiritual abuse) by the requirement to order their lives in accordance with the teaching of the 1991 statement?

*The Bishop of London to reply on behalf of the Chair of the House of Bishops:*

**A** The LLF process – and its as yet unknown outcomes – has and will continue to touch the lives of many because of the deeply personal nature of the questions it explores. Throughout this time, including after decisions have been reached, it will be vital for the Church to offer compassionate pastoral care for all who are affected.

**Mr Richard Denno (Liverpool) to ask the Chair of the House of Bishops:**

**Q42** What legal opinion has been obtained on the issue of whether a liturgy of thanksgiving for a same-sex civil partnership is lawful in light of the Book of Common Prayer, the 39 Articles of Religion, and the Canon Law of the Church of England?

*The Bishop of London to reply on behalf of the Chair of the House of Bishops:*

**A** The Legal Office of the Church of England is providing advice as required to support the discernment and decision-making process currently being undertaken by the College and House of Bishops.

**Canon Peter Adams (St Albans) to ask the Chair of the House of Bishops:**

**Q43** In response to supplementary questions following on from my July 2022 question (Q1) on how mutual accountability within the House of Bishops on diocesan issues impacting the national Church might be extended to General Synod, the Chair of the House responded that they would consider it. What further consideration has been given to this matter?

*The Archbishop of Canterbury to reply as Chair of the House of Bishops:*

**A** Until the 21st century there had been very little sense of mutual accountability between Dioceses. That sense of autonomy increased the further back in history one went, at least until the Norman Conquest. Diocesan Bishops were Barons, with independent feudal obligations to the monarch. In recent years that has begun to change. Members of the House of Bishops are conscious of their responsibility, as shepherds and pastors, for mutual accountability in their leadership of the Church. Many of the discussions in the House bear on this mutual accountability, relating to many aspects of national and diocesan church life.

**Mr Benjamin John (St Albans) to ask the Chair of the House of Bishops:**

**Q44** Will the Archbishops discipline those Bishops that have openly spoken out against the Church's doctrine of marriage, thereby violating their ordination vow "to banish and drive away all erroneous and strange doctrine contrary to God's Word"?

*The Archbishop of Canterbury to reply as Chair of the House of Bishops:*

**A** Paragraph 25 of the 'House of Bishops Pastoral Guidance on Same Sex Marriage 2014' states that:

'The Church of England will continue to place a high value on theological exploration and debate that is conducted with integrity. That is why Church of England clergy are able to argue for a change in its teaching on marriage and human sexuality, while at the same time being required to fashion their lives consistently with that teaching.'

As such, openly and compassionately exploring through debate and comment the Church's theological position on the doctrine of marriage does not constitute a violation of ordination vows, and is not a matter for discipline.

**Mrs Rebecca Chapman (Southwark) to ask the Chair of the House of Bishops:**

**Q45** Which department or team within the NCI's, and/or the wider Church of England, has responsibility for leading the Church of England implementation of the Lambeth Calls and associated Phase 3 work coming out of the Lambeth Conference?

*The Archbishop of Canterbury to reply as Chair of the House of Bishops:*

**A** The Lambeth Calls refer to a range of actions on a number of different topics, and therefore a range of groups and bodies will be best placed to engage provinces and dioceses in their responses to them. Therefore no one department or team has responsibility for leading the Church of England's response to the Calls. The response is likely to involve work by, *inter alia*, the House of Bishops, the Archbishops' Council and the General Synod. A working group is currently being set up under the direction of the Secretary General of the Anglican Communion, to oversee the Phase 3 work emerging from the Lambeth Conference and the Lambeth Calls. Its membership will be announced shortly.

**Mrs Sarah Finch (London) to ask the Chair of the House of Bishops:**

**Q46** In the light of developments at the recent Lambeth Conference, what steps is the Archbishop of Canterbury taking to affirm to the bishops of the Global South that Lambeth Resolution 1.10 still represents the official teaching of the Anglican Communion?

*The Archbishop of Canterbury to reply as Chair of the House of Bishops:*

**A** In a speech to the Lambeth Conference on 2nd August 2022 I said that the Lambeth Call on Human Dignity: "states as a fact that the vast majority of Anglicans in the large majority of Provinces and Dioceses do not believe that a change in teaching is right. Therefore, it is the case that the whole of Lambeth 1.10 1998 still exists. This Call does not in any way question the validity of that resolution. The Call states that many Provinces – and I say again, I think we need to acknowledge it's the majority – continue to affirm that same-gender marriage is not permissible. The Call also states that other provinces have

blessed and welcomed same sex union or marriage, after careful theological reflection and a process of reception.” This remains the reality of the situation in the Anglican Communion.

**Mrs Jane Rosam (Rochester) to ask the Chair of the House of Bishops:**

**Q47** The Chair of the ISB, Maggie Atkinson, has been asked to step back from duties pending determination of complaints against her. Can you please explain the process and best estimate for conclusion thereof?

*The Bishop of Rochester to reply on behalf of the Chair of the House of Bishops:*

**A** As I said on 4 August, a complaint to the National Church Institutions from a data subject about a data and confidentiality breach by the Chair of the Independent Safeguarding Board (ISB), Professor Maggie Atkinson, has been upheld. The Information Commissioner’s Office (ICO) has been notified and the Archbishops’ Council has made a Serious Incident Report to the Charity Commission. I hope that I will be able to give an update on this as soon as possible.

**Mr Martin Sewell (Rochester) to ask the Chair of the House of Bishops:**

**Q48** In its only published report to date (*‘Don’t panic, be pastoral’*), the Independent Safeguarding Board (ISB) included a definition section for the Church of England, Archbishops’ Council, and the National Safeguarding Team (NST), but not the ISB itself. Can Synod now be provided with a similar clear description of the ISB and where it sits constitutionally within the structures of Church of England with particular reference to its constitutional status, powers, oversight {if any), appointment/dismissal of members and staff, and finance?

*The Bishop of Rochester to reply on behalf of the Chair of the House of Bishops:*

**A** The ISB does not form part of the constitutional structure of the Church of England. In its initial phase (phase one) it comprises three individuals who are engaged to provide services to the Archbishops’ Council, acting not as its agents but as independent service providers at arms-length. The author of the report gives a clear summary of the ISB and its status: “We...wish to reiterate that this report and the ISB itself, are independent. This report is ours in its entirety, and provides an independent view into safeguarding systems, focusing on victims and survivors.” The ISB members will bring forward recommendations for their future structure as part of phase two of their work.

**Mr Martin Sewell (Rochester) to ask the Chair of the House of Bishops:**

**Q49** Who or what body within the constitutional architecture of the Church of England, including its structures, committees, and directorates, has the right, duty, and/or power to issue litigation instructions for and on behalf of the Independent Safeguarding Board?

*The Bishop of Rochester to reply on behalf of the Chair of the House of Bishops:*

**A** I understand that this question is currently the subject of an appeal as part of ongoing litigation for which reason it is not appropriate to reply at this time.

**Mrs Rosemary Lyon (Blackburn) to ask the Chair of the House of Bishops:**

**Q50** Are PCC members and/or Church Wardens required to complete the Domestic Abuse training course as laid down in the April 2021 pathway or has there been a change of policy?

**Mr Andrew Bell (Oxford) to ask the Chair of the House of Bishops:**

**Q51** Please can you clarify the situation regarding the safeguarding training module on "Raising Awareness of Domestic Abuse"? The Safeguarding Learning and Development Framework (dated April 2021 <https://www.churchofengland.org/sites/default/files/2021-06/SafeguardingLearningAndDevelopmentFramework2021.pdf> page 31) states that it is required for "PCC members / Lay Chapter Members", but at least some dioceses have indicated that it is no longer a requirement for Churchwardens or PCC members.

*The Bishop of Rochester to reply on behalf of the Chair of the House of Bishops:*

**A** I will answer questions 50 and 51 together.

There has been no change in policy. Domestic abuse is a growing and significant concern for the Church, and PCR2 identified the need to increase understanding across the Church – especially the harm done to children. Research shows that faith communities have a poor track record of responding well to domestic abuse. Work will be undertaken to promote better understanding of, and support for, victims of domestic abuse within Church communities. We will review training requirements as part of this. However, the existing requirements remain in force in the meantime.

**Mrs Kat Alldread (Derby) to ask the Chair of the House of Bishops:**

**Q52** What is the current delivery and publication date of all outstanding safeguarding reviews requested or commissioned on behalf of Archbishops' Council and, where different, what was the last published due date for each review?

*The Bishop of Rochester to reply on behalf of the Chair of the House of Bishops:*

**A** There are three ongoing independent Learning Lesson Reviews.

1. *The Makin Review* was announced in August 2019 and it was initially anticipated that this would be completed in 9 months. There have been significant delays due to COVID and the exceptionally high volume of information. The review is now in the final stages and an announcement will be made in early December on the timetable for next steps.
2. *The Trevor Devamanikkam Review* was announced in the Autumn of 2019 and was anticipated to take six months. An announcement was made in February 2022 as a result of the ISB reviewing the process, the review is now in its later stages.
3. *The Christ Church Oxford Review* is now in the hands of the ISB, who stated in October 2022 that plans for the Christ Church Review are currently paused, while they consider their capacity and resources to undertake this review. Their decision will be published on their website in due course.

**Professor Helen King (Oxford) to ask the Chair of the House of Bishops:**

**Q53** The Makin Review is now over 900 days late, and estimates at its cost to date range either side of £1,000,000. Please can the Lead Bishop advise

A) when we can expect the review to become public; and

B) whether any redress has yet been offered to victims of John Smyth in the UK or in Zimbabwe and South Africa?

*The Bishop of Rochester to reply on behalf of the Chair of the House of Bishops:*

**A** There is always a financial cost associated with any Independent Review, however this must be balanced with establishing the truth and listening to the voices of victims and survivors.

A) The review is reaching its final stages and the draft report has been completed. Consultation with victims and the representation process, with those individuals who may be criticised in the report, will follow. A further announcement will be made about this progress in early December.

B) Any offer of redress would need to be made under the auspices of the Church's redress scheme which is under development, and which will offer redress where it is within the scheme's scope.

**Mrs Tina Nay (Chichester) to ask the Chair of the House of Bishops:**

**Q54** What care was planned centrally by the NST or advised to Dioceses to ensure support to survivors who have been notified that their cases have been identified as overlooked in PCR1, given the foreseeably wide range of potential reaction and responses?

*The Bishop of Rochester to reply on behalf of the Chair of the House of Bishops:*

**A** As part of the PCR2 every Diocese were required to have a survivor strategy in place for all victims and survivors, this strategy was locally implemented and monitored. There was also a national dedicated telephone helpline for victims and survivors.

**The Revd Canon Dr Judith Maltby (Universities & TElS) to ask the Chair of the House of Bishops:**

**Q55** Were allegations against deceased clergy identified and uniformly included in all diocesan PCR2 reports?

*The Bishop of Rochester to reply on behalf of the Chair of the House of Bishops:*

**A** The PCR2 process did not include deceased clergy, however some Dioceses did decide to go beyond the scope guidance and include deceased clergy in their reviews.

**Mrs Catherine Butcher (Chichester) to ask the Chair of the House of Bishops:**

**Q56** What proportion of people completing the National Safeguarding Training Courses through the CofE portal, have to contact the e-learning support team to navigate their way through the website to complete the courses?

*The Bishop of Rochester to reply on behalf of the Chair of the House of Bishops:*

**A** The portal receives on average 150 support calls per week - not all from learners, but most will be. As a proportion of the user base and based on the past week, we saw about 4200 logins to the site. So, 150/4200 is about 3.5%.

**Mrs Rosemary Lyon (Blackburn) to ask the Chair of the House of Bishops:**

**Q57** What are the safeguarding training requirement for clergy who seek to renew their Permission to Officiate (PTO) and has any consideration been given to whether these requirements are disproportionately onerous?

*The Bishop of Rochester to reply on behalf of the Chair of the House of Bishops:*

**A** The agreed Safeguarding Learning & Development Framework 2021 details the PTO requirement as a one three-hour session delivered in person or online. The prerequisites are the Basic Awareness and Foundation. The requirements are in line with the seniority and importance of the role, as well as the influence PTO clergy hold and can bring to bear in creating a healthy culture across the Church.

**Ms Fiona MacMillan (London) to ask the Chair of the House of Bishops:**

**Q58** Current safeguarding legislation (Safeguarding & Clergy Discipline Measure 2016) gives a definition of 'vulnerable adult' in terms of individual characteristics. By contrast the Social Care Act 2014 defines vulnerability as a matter of circumstance and context, recognising that no adult is inherently vulnerable. Are there any plans to amend the 2016 Measure so that it reflects the language and understanding of the Care Act?

*The Bishop of Rochester to reply on behalf of the Chair of the House of Bishops:*

**A** There are no plans to amend the Safeguarding & Clergy Discipline Measure 2016. This definition, which has been Church law since 2016, encompasses the possibility that the ability of people to keep themselves safe can depend on the context they find themselves in, as well as on their own personal characteristics or abilities. For example, in some settings or relationships, people may find themselves in less powerful positions than others, and this could significantly impair their ability to protect themselves from physical abuse or exploitation by the person who is in the more powerful position. The definition of "adult at risk" taken from the Social Care Act 2014 is designed to address thresholds for care and support needs and therefore has limitations which could adversely impact on the realities of safeguarding in the Church context, for example, it would not cover cases of domestic abuse.

**Mrs Tina Nay (Chichester) to ask the Chair of the House of Bishops:**

**Q59** In relation to the Interim Support Scheme, please can you set out how much has been disbursed, over what period of time, to how many recipients, and from which budget that money derives?

*The Bishop of Rochester to reply on behalf of the Chair of the House of Bishops:*

**A** Between 1 August 2020 and 31 October 2022, the total figure disbursed in payments from the Interim Support Scheme was £1,129,687.84. The number of recipients over that period was 56.

These figures include expenditure for advocacy paid out on behalf of applicants (which cannot effectively be disaggregated) but excludes expenses paid out to panel members.

The Scheme does not have an ear-marked budget as such, but the Archbishops' Council has committed to making such funds as are required available.

**Mrs Rebecca Hunt (Portsmouth) to ask the Chair of the House of Bishops:**

**Q60** What duties are clergy under, and what guidance is available on those duties, to ensure that where a member of the clergy preaches a sermon that expresses views on marriage in line with the doctrine of the Church of England, it does not give rise to any safeguarding concerns?

*The Bishop of Rochester to reply on behalf of the Chair of the House of Bishops:*

**A** There is no duty or guidance that specifically deals with preaching a sermon on marriage. Canon B 18 ('Of sermons in parish churches') provides that the preacher "shall endeavour with care and sincerity to minister the word of truth, to the glory of God and to the edification of the people". Further, the Guidelines for the Professional Conduct of the Clergy (2015) set out at paragraph 12.2 that "In all forms of ministry, in leadership, teaching, preaching and presiding at worship, the clergy should resist all temptation to exercise power inappropriately. This power needs to be used to sustain others and harness their strengths, and not to abuse, bully, manipulate or denigrate." Clergy at all times must have due regard to the House of Bishops' policies on safeguarding children and vulnerable adults.

**Canon Dr Jamie Harrison (Durham) to ask the Chair of the House of Bishops:**

**Q61** Can you confirm that the information sharing agreement between the Independent Safeguarding Board and the NCIs referred to in paragraph 11 of GS 2263 is in place and is operational?

*The Bishop of Rochester to reply on behalf of the Chair of the House of Bishops:*

**A** The ISB had signed an information sharing agreement which had been drafted by their own legal advisers. However, adaptations were needed so it met the requirements of the NCIs. This work is still in progress and an ISA suitable to both parties is yet to be signed formally.

## **CHURCH COMMISSIONERS**

**Mr Jonathan Baird (Salisbury) to ask the Church Commissioners:**

**Q62** The Church of England's website states concerning the Review of the Mission and Pastoral Measure 2011 that:

*"In 2020 the Church Commissioners were asked to review the Mission and Pastoral Measure 2011 (MPM). A consultation paper (GS2222) was debated by*



*General Synod in July 2021 and a period of public consultation followed. The analysis of the consultation exercise (GS Misc 1312) was presented to the General Synod in February 2022. General Synod has asked the Commissioners to continue the work and bring forward draft proposals for debate in February 2023.”*

(i) By whom were the Church Commissioners asked to review the MPM?

(ii) Where is the evidence that “General Synod has asked the Commissioners to continue the work and bring forward draft proposals for debate in February 2023”?

*The Revd Canon Flora Winfield to reply as Third Church Estates Commissioner:*

**A** The Legislative Reform Committee recommended to the Archbishops’ Council in July 2020 that the Mission and Pastoral Measure 2011 should be reviewed, and the House of Bishops endorsed that decision in July 2020. The Archbishops’ Council then asked the Church Commissioners to lead the review as they have the governance and management responsibility for the legislation. In July 2021 General Synod was asked to debate the following motion:

‘That this Synod:

- a) welcome the consultation paper Mission in Revision: A Review of the Mission and Pastoral Measure 2011 (GS 2222);
- b) commend it for discussion; and
- c) invite the Archbishops’ Council, the Legislative Reform Committee and the Church Commissioners to bring forward draft legislation for consideration by the Synod no later than July 2022.’

This was carried following a counted vote of the whole Synod. The voting was as follows: In favour – 278; Against – 2; Abstentions – 7.

**Mr Richard Denno (Liverpool) to ask the Church Commissioners:**

**Q63** During a pastoral reorganisation proposing to convert a deanery into a single parish, what safeguard exists to prevent a diocesan synod changing the method of calculation of number of representatives on deanery synod so as to allocate more representation to those parishes who have decided to join and thereby dilute the representation of those parishes who have decided not to join the proposed single parish?

*The Revd Canon Flora Winfield to reply as Third Church Estates Commissioner:*

**A** The election of members to deanery and diocesan synods is dealt with under the Church Representation Rules, which also make provision for varying the membership of deanery synods. The Mission and Pastoral Measure 2011 only makes provision for pastoral changes to parishes, benefices and deaneries, and so the Church Commissioners do not consider any matters relating to the consequential elections for deanery and diocesan synods.

See [Church Representation Rules online - part 3 | The Church of England](#).

## SECRETARY GENERAL

### Mr Nigel Bacon (Lincoln) to ask the Secretary General:

**Q64** At the July 2022 Group of Sessions, the Secretary General, for the reasons noted in his reply, was not able to provide all the information requested through Question 168. Will he please now provide the full set of requested information?

*Mr William Nye to reply as Secretary General:*

**A** I am afraid that in the four working days we have to answer this and every other Synod question, it is again not possible to provide a full answer as requested in July. Indeed, the information provided in July in itself took a significant amount of work for several staff across a number of teams. However, I am grateful to colleagues who have been able to provide most of the 2022 and 2023 budget figures which are provided in the Annex (see page 36).

Given the significant amount of time it would take staff if we endeavoured to provide you with all the data you have requested, I wonder whether I might invite you to meet me and colleagues in our Finance and HR teams to discuss the nature of your request and I will be in touch to organise this in due course.

### Mr Andrew Presland (Peterborough) to ask the Secretary General:

**Q65** Further to the answer given to Question 120 in February 2022, which stated that there were no plans to comply voluntarily with the UK Statistics Authority's Code of Practice in Statistics in producing and publishing statistics and that the Data Services team would continue to work with the appropriate best practice guidance to produce quality statistics for their users, what particular external guidance, if any, is being followed on matters such as who decides when statistics should be published and what factors should be borne in mind when making the decision?

*Mr William Nye to reply as Secretary General:*

**A** The new NCIs' Data Services Team was set up in June 2022 and is engaged in embedding new ways of working to build a centre of excellence for data management in the Church of England. One aspect of this is connecting well with a range of people across the Church and also with external expertise to shape its services. An information steering group with external stakeholders will be established in 2023. The decision on when and how data is shared or published is managed between the Data Services Team and any relevant other teams, alongside the relevant Chief Officer, who consider the priorities of the NCIs and the wider Church when looking at publishing data.

### Mr Andrew Presland (Peterborough) to ask the Secretary General:

**Q66** In the light of criticism in the church press in recent months at the apparently uncritical way in which the results of some surveys commissioned by the Church of England have been reported, such as those from the Savanta ComRes survey on prayer, as summarised at <https://www.churchofengland.org/media-and-news/press-releases/younger-people-more-likely-pray-older-generations-survey-finds> on 28 August, what processes are routinely carried out to query initial

findings which appear to be out of line from what is already known from other surveys?

*Mr William Nye to reply as Secretary General:*

**A** With any polling published by the Church of England, the exact wording of any published summary is carefully reviewed with the polling organisation, in line with its own policies.

Savanta ComRes is a respected member of the British Polling Council and abides by its rules. The survey used quotas and weighting to ensure a nationally representative sample.

The results of the survey on prayer were positively reported in the media and prompted widespread discussion about the role of prayer in what is assumed to be an increasingly secular society.

Strikingly, these findings provided further evidence of an apparent trend identified in previous surveys.

**The Revd Canon Dr Judith Maltby (Universities & TElS) to ask the Secretary General:**

**Q67** In the July 2022 Synod, I asked the Secretary General for a breakdown of the gender ratio of women to men in senior roles in the NCIs. He gave Synod the following figures of women to men for the past five years:

2017 - 39:61

2018 - 37:63

2019 - 38:62

2020 - 41:59

2021 - 42:58

May Synod know the gender ratio of women to men in the most senior band, Band 0, broken down by NCI, as well as have a comparative breakdown, also by NCI, by band for bands 0, 1 and 2 over the past 5 years?

*Mr William Nye to reply as Secretary General:*

**A** The data requested is provided in the Annex (see page 37).

## **CLERK TO THE SYNOD**

**Mr Clive Scowen (London) to ask the Clerk to the Synod:**

**Q68** Whose responsibility is it to appoint a new Chaplain to the General Synod, and what procedure is being followed in the appointment of a new Chaplain?

*Mr Simon Gallagher to reply as Acting Clerk to the Synod:*

**A** The HR team of the NCIs is managing the process to appoint a new chaplain. The information on the role is available on pathways (the NCI recruitment portal) and has been shared with networks across the Church, including the Archdeacons' Network, Diocesan Secretaries, and through informal liturgical contacts.

There is a formal recruitment process with applicants submitting CVs and supporting statements, there will be a shortlisting process and formal interviews with a panel chaired by the Clerk to the Synod.

## NATIONAL SOCIETY COUNCIL

### **Mrs Rebecca Hunt (Portsmouth) to ask the Chair of the National Society Council:**

**Q69** Will the Church of England confirm that contrary to the content of the *Valuing All God's Children* Guidance, they do not in fact recommend that primary school children should be affirmed in their preferred "gender identity"?

*The Bishop of Durham to reply as Chair of the National Society Council:*

**A** *Valuing all God's Children* is the Church of England Education Office's guidance for schools on combatting anti-LGBT+ bullying. The Chief Education Officer has responded to recent claims about the document, explaining that *Valuing All God's Children* does **not** say that children as young as five should be affirmed if they want to identify as the opposite gender. It doesn't use the language of affirmation at all, anywhere. This is a misrepresentation of a resource which is designed to help schools ensure all children are treated with the dignity they deserve. The response in full can be accessed here for further information [Valuing All God's Children - response to recent claims | The Church of England](#).

### **Mr Clive Scowen (London) to ask the Chair of the National Society Council:**

**Q70** What steps are being taken to redraft *Valuing all God's Children* to remove any ambiguity and to make clear beyond doubt that it means what the Chief Education Officer claims that it means rather than what Christian Concern and others claim that it means?

*The Bishop of Durham to reply as Chair of the National Society Council:*

**A** *Valuing All God's Children* is reviewed along with all our policies and guidance documents in light of updated legislation and Government guidance. The Government has indicated that it will consult, and issue updated guidance for schools in relation to how schools provide for transgender children, and we will engage with that consultation and revise *Valuing All God's Children* in the light of that process. Such a revision will also be mindful of Living in Love and Faith and any changes to the guidance that may be needed in the light that process. This is an area in which we acknowledge there are a range of views, and we will seek to continue to offer schools clear guidance on how to ensure all children are treated with the dignity they deserve.

### **Mr Benjamin John (St Albans) to ask the Chair of the National Society Council:**

**Q71** Do any of the materials that Church of England schools use to "[support pupils] to accept their own gender identity or sexual orientation" include warnings about the physical and mental health risks of gender transition and homosexual activity?

*The Bishop of Durham to reply as Chair of the National Society Council:*

**A** The materials and resources that Church of England schools use are a matter for the school to determine in the light of their governing body's policy on Relationships, Sex and Health Education (RSHE) and with due regard to advice from their Diocesan Board of Education. Schools are encouraged to always ensure any resources are sensitive to the different needs of their community. In

2019 the Church of England Education Office published a [Relationships, Sex and Health Education | The Church of England](#) charter in which we explain that RSHE should ensure that children are able to cherish themselves and others as unique and wonderfully made, keep themselves safe and form healthy relationships where they respect and afford dignity to others.

## ANNEX – Supplementary information

The detailed information on the following pages in response to questions would normally be posted on the 'Notice Board' at Synod.

### Question 3

Estimated 2022 starters

Age Gender	20-29		Total	30-39		Total	40-49		Total	50-59		Total	60 and over		Total	Grand Total
	Female	Male		Female	Male		Female	Male		Female	Male		Female	Male		
FTNR (Full-Time Non-Residential/Context)	12	12	24	20	22	42	16	15	31	6	5	11	1	1	2	110
Part-time Non-Residential	2	3	5	11	9	20	36	23	59	38	24	62	16	5	21	167
Residential	13	29	42	10	26	36	7	12	19	1	3	4				101
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>44</b>	<b>71</b>	<b>41</b>	<b>57</b>	<b>98</b>	<b>59</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>109</b>	<b>45</b>	<b>32</b>	<b>77</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>378</b>

## **Question 31**

The following are a list of General Synod measures and motions which have indicated Synodical support for the various parts of the Vision and Strategy.

These are in two sections

- A) Motions approved by General Synod**
- B) Reports which General Synod agreed to take note of on relevant matters**

### **Motions approved by General Synod**

- 1. SPENDING PLANS OF THE CHURCH COMMISSIONERS AND ARCHBISHOPS' COUNCIL (GS2262) July 2022**
- 2. SETTING GOD'S PEOPLE FREE: REPORT FROM THE ARCHBISHOPS' COUNCIL (GS 2056) February 2017**
- 3. SETTING GOD'S PEOPLE FREE (GS 2145) July 2019**
- 4. ESTATES EVANGELISM (GS 2122) February 2019**
- 5. MISSION-SHAPED CHURCH 15 YEARS ON (GS 2142) July 2019**
- 6. ENCOURAGING YOUTH EVANGELISM (GS 2124A AND GS2124B February 2019**
- 7. GROWING FAITH: MINISTRY AMONGST CHILDREN AND YOUNG PEOPLE (GS 2121) February 2019**
- 8. CHILDREN AND YOUTH MINISTRY (GS 2161) February 2020**
- 9. CENTURIES OF MARGINALISATION, VISIONS OF HOPE: MISSION AND MINISTRY AMONG GYPSY, ROMA AND TRAVELLER COMMUNITIES (GS 2123) February 2019**
- 10. WINDRUSH COMMITMENT AND LEGACY (GS 2156A and GS 2156B) February 2020**
- 11. THROUGH HIS POVERTY (GS 2149A and GS 2149B) February 2022**
- 12. AFFIRMING AND INCLUDING DISABLED PEOPLE IN THE WHOLE LIFE OF THE CHURCH (GS 2270) July 2022**

### **Reports which the Synod voted to take note of, on relevant matters.**

- 1. VISION AND STRATEGY (GS 2223) July 2021**
- 2. RACIAL JUSTICE: INTRODUCTION TO THE ARCHBISHOPS' RACIAL JUSTICE COMMISSION, AND UPDATE TO SYNOD ON RACIAL JUSTICE WORK (GS 2243) February 2022**
- 3. GOD'S PEOPLE SET FREE: LIVING AS MISSIONARY DISCIPLES OF JESUS CHRIST IN THE WHOLE OF LIFE TO BRING TRANSFORMATION TO THE CHURCH AND WORLD (GS 2248) February 2022**

### **Motions approved by General Synod**

#### **Vision and Strategy**

- 1. SPENDING PLANS OF THE CHURCH COMMISSIONERS AND ARCHBISHOPS' COUNCIL (GS2262) July 2022**

In July 2022, the Synod voted in favour of the motion as follows:

'That this Synod:

- (a) welcome the spending plans by the Church Commissioners and Archbishops' Council, set out in GS 2262, for financial distributions over 2023 to 2025 and indicative distributions for the subsequent six years;

- (b) welcome the investment in ministry in parishes, chaplaincies, schools, Cathedrals and other forms of church **in support of the Church's vision and strategy** as set out in Annex A of GS 2262;

and

- (c) welcome the focused investment to support previously agreed commitments to a 2030 net zero carbon target and to address racial justice.'

### **Missionary Disciples**

#### **2. SETTING GOD'S PEOPLE FREE: REPORT FROM THE ARCHBISHOPS' COUNCIL (GS 2056) February 2017**

The motion 'That this Synod:

- (a) welcome the report from the Archbishops' Council, Setting God's People Free (GS 2056);

and (b) call on the Archbishops' Council to develop the implementation plan referred to in section 5 of the report and to work closely with the House of Bishops and the dioceses in taking it forward.' was carried

#### **3. SETTING GOD'S PEOPLE FREE (GS 2145) July 2019**

The motion "That this Synod

- a) note the progress made in implementing the recommendations of the report Setting God's People Free (GS2056);

b) affirm the importance of work undertaken in dioceses and across the NCIs to enable the whole people of God to live out the Good News of Jesus confidently in all of life, Sunday to Saturday;

c) affirm the importance of the laity within the whole people of God and emphasise all can and should play a full part in living out the Good News regardless of their race, class, gender, sexuality or physical ability;

d) call on the Archbishops' Council, the House of Bishops, and the dioceses to drive forward the changes in culture the Report demands especially in the area of lay and clergy mutuality and relationships;

e) call on the Archbishops' Council to maintain focus on this as a strategic priority throughout the next quinquennium; and

f) encourage further work to explore and broaden our understanding of God's kingdom in our daily lives to enable and embed the desired culture mentioned in this report.' was carried.

### **Mixed ecology**

#### **4. ESTATES EVANGELISM (GS 2122) February 2019 (also relates to younger and more diverse)**

The motion "That this Synod, committed to the Church of England's vocation to be a Christian presence in every community, and noting the historic marginalisation of social housing estates in the policies of both Church and nation:

a) commend the vision of the Estates Evangelism Task Group to see a serving, loving and worshipping Christian community on every significant social housing estate in the country;

b) urge every diocese to build ministry and mission on estates into its mission strategies, clergy deployment plans and SDF funding bids; and

c) give thanks for the Christian leadership offered by people from estate communities and calls upon the Archbishops' Council, the Church Commissioners and the NCIs, through their work under the Renewal and Reform programme, to enable the voices of people from



estates and other marginalised communities to be heard and heeded in the life of the Church of England.’ was carried.

- 5. MISSION-SHAPED CHURCH 15 YEARS ON (GS 2142) July 2019** encouraged every parish and diocese to be part of this movement forming new disciples and new congregations through a contextual approach to mission with the unreached in their community (i.e., a goal greater than 10,000 new worshipping communities)

The motion ‘That this Synod:

- (a) celebrate this new missionary movement of the last 20 years and the impact made on the Church and society through the planting of thousands of fresh expressions of church since the Mission Shaped Church report in 2004.
- (b) encourage every parish and diocese to be part of this movement forming new disciples and new congregations through a contextual approach to mission with the unreached in their community.
- (c) call on the Archbishops’ Council to bring to General Synod an update on the progress of the new project being led by the Head of Development for fresh expressions to develop fresh expressions in ten dioceses by July 2021.’ was carried.

### **Younger and More Diverse**

- 6. ENCOURAGING YOUTH EVANGELISM (GS 2124A AND GS2124B):February 2019**

The motion ‘That this Synod

- a) affirm the importance of evangelism to and with younger people, recognising that many parishes and fresh expressions of church are doing excellent work with young people;
- b) commend the work of Diocesan Youth Officers and the staff of the National Church Institutions in inspiring the wider Church in youth evangelism;
- c) support dioceses in investing resources to create more youth ministry posts across the Church; and
- d) encourage dioceses and parishes to consider fresh ways to reach young people with the good news of Jesus Christ and to nurture them as Christian disciples, in particular by helping Christian parents fulfil these tasks with their own children.’ was carried.

- 7. GROWING FAITH: MINISTRY AMONGST CHILDREN AND YOUNG PEOPLE (GS 2121): February 2019**

The motion ‘That this Synod

- a) welcome the House of Bishops’ vision set out in Growing Faith (GS 2121); and
- b) encourage all dioceses, parishes, fresh expressions, Church of England schools, cathedrals and college or university chaplaincies to ensure they weave it through every strand of their strategies for mission and ministry.’ was carried.

- 8. CHILDREN AND YOUTH MINISTRY (GS 2161) February 2020**

The motion That this Synod, recognising the continuing decline in numbers of under 16’s engaging with Church:

- a) encourage dioceses to act urgently and consider practical ways they can support and resource those churches both with significant numbers of children and young people and with specific aspirations to increase their numbers of the same;
- b) encourage dioceses to make provision to support and resource those churches serving communities which 23 currently have small numbers of children, teenagers and young people;
- c) request dioceses to share good models of practice through churches helping to resource others so that we have many more churches engaging with children and young people;
- d) request the NCIs to commit funding for qualitative research on the data received to help

understand best practice in a variety of contexts;

e) encourage dioceses to explore new ways to grow new church communities with young people as a primary missional focus;

f) request the Evangelism and Discipleship team to ensure this work is clearly joined up with Growing Faith; and

g) request an update from the Evangelism and Discipleship team in two years with analysis of progress in these areas.' was carried

#### **9. CENTURIES OF MARGINALISATION, VISIONS OF HOPE: MISSION AND MINISTRY AMONG GYPSY, ROMA AND TRAVELLER COMMUNITIES (GS 2123) February 2019**

The motion 'That this Synod, mindful of the Church of England's commitment to combat racism in all its manifestations:

a) call upon the Church's leadership, including the Lords Spiritual, other bishops, senior staff, the Mission and Public Affairs Division and others, to speak out publicly against racism and hate crime directed against Gypsies, Irish Travellers and Roma, and urge the media to stop denigrating and victimising these communities;

b) request every diocese to appoint a chaplain to Gypsies, Travellers and Roma, to provide pastoral care, harness the potential for church growth among these communities and help combat racism in the Church and wider communities;

c) request the Mission and Public Affairs Council, in its forthcoming work on housing, to evaluate the importance of provision of sites for Gypsies and Travellers in wider housing policy, and recommend Church bodies to play their part in lobbying for and enabling land to be made available for such sites; and

d) request the Lords Spiritual and staff of the National Church Institutions to meet with representatives from Her Majesty's Government and Loyal Opposition, as well as leaders from Local Government, including the Local Government association, to co-ordinate and collaborate on shared plans to make traveller stopping points available across England, to develop community cohesion' was carried.

#### **10. WINDRUSH COMMITMENT AND LEGACY (GS 2156A and GS 2156B) February 2020**

The motion That this Synod, commemorating in 2018 the martyrdom of the Revd Dr Martin Luther King, Jr., noting with joy the 70th anniversary of the arrival of the Empire Windrush liner in the United Kingdom in June 1948 bringing nearly 500 Commonwealth citizens, mainly from the Caribbean, to mainland UK; and the eventual arrival of approximately half a million people from the West Indies, who were called to Britain as British subjects to help rebuild the post-war United Kingdom:

a) lament, on behalf of Christ's Church, and apologise for, the conscious and unconscious racism experienced by countless Black, Asian and minority ethnic (BAME) Anglicans in 1948 and subsequent years, when seeking to find a spiritual home in their local Church of England parish churches, the memory of which is still painful to committed Anglicans who, in spite of this racism from clergy and others, have remained faithful to the Church of England and their Anglican heritage;

b) request the Archbishops' Council to commission research to assess the impact of this on the Church of England in terms of church members lost, churches declining into closure, and vocations to ordained and licensed lay ministries missed, and to report back to this Synod and the wider Church;

c) express gratitude to God for the indispensable contribution to the mission, ministry, prayer and worship of Christ's Church in this nation made by people of BAME descent in the Church of England;

d) acknowledge and give joyful thanks for the wider contribution of the 'Windrush generation' and their descendants to UK life and culture in every field of human activity, including service across the Armed Forces and other services during and after the Second

World War;

e) resolve to continue, with great effort and urgency, to stamp out all forms of conscious or unconscious racism, and to commit the Church of England to increase the participation and representation of lay and ordained BAME Anglicans throughout Church life; and

f) request the Archbishop's Council to appoint an independent person external to the Church to assess the current situation as regards race and ethnicity in the Church, in order to present a report to this Synod with recommendations for actions to achieve reconciliation and authentic belonging so that we can move towards truly being a Church for all people; to the greater glory of the God in whose image every human being is made.'

was carried after a counted vote of the whole Synod.

#### **11. THROUGH HIS POVERTY (GS 2149A and GS 2149B) February 2022**

The motion 'That this Synod call on the Archbishops' Council to commission a study that

- a) explores the reasons why the Church of England is generally less effective in communicating with, and attracting people from, more disadvantaged communities despite the gospel being good news for the poor;
- b) explores ways of addressing and reversing this situation, such as: i. actively seeking to select and train more people from disadvantaged communities ii. deploying more resources into reaching people from disadvantaged communities iii. gathering and disseminating stories of good practice from churches working in disadvantaged communities; and
- c) builds upon the work of the GRA:CE project in exploring the links between social action, discipleship, and church growth. was carried

#### **12. AFFIRMING AND INCLUDING DISABLED PEOPLE IN THE WHOLE LIFE OF THE CHURCH (GS 2270) July 2022**

The motion 'That this Synod, affirming disabled people (with hidden as well as visible disabilities) to be fearfully and wonderfully made in the image and likeness of God, and mindful of the progress already made in removing some of the barriers which disabled people, clergy and lay, face; commit to working towards the removal of all remaining barriers to full participation for disabled people in the life and ministry of the church, and, in initiating that process:

- a) request the Faith and Order Commission and the Liturgical Commission to consider how our liturgies might be made more inclusive to disabled people (e.g., by removing rubrics such as "all stand");
- b) call upon the Research and Statistics team to interrogate existing data and gather new data, which quantifies the numbers of disabled people among clergy, whilst also planning to extend to include lay ministers and NCI/diocesan staff in the future, so that Synod can monitor the representation of disabled people within the church and encourage accountability for progress.
- c) request the Archbishops' Council to introduce legislation to amend the Ecclesiastical Jurisdiction and Care of Churches Measure 2018 to require every DAC to include at least one person with direct experience and knowledge of accessibility issues in its membership or co-opted if not appointed as a member; and
- d) acknowledging that the General Synod motion passed in July 2007 (that every Diocese should appoint a lead person on disability issues), request that the ongoing review of dioceses, recognising that resources for additional officers in every diocese are limited, encourage dioceses to cluster together to employ a full time Disability Adviser across a manageable group of dioceses." was carried.

## Question 64

<u>Staff numbers</u>	2022	2023
	Budget	Budget
	FTE posts	FTE posts
Archbishops' Council	161	} see note
Church of England Pensions Board	81	
Church Commissioners (internal investment team)	79	
Church Commissioners (non investment teams)	51	
Lambeth and Bishopthorpe Palaces*	69	
Church of England Central Services Ltd	168	
<u>Notes:</u>		
2023 figures are not included as decisions have yet to be taken on the level of staff resource necessary to support the delivery of some aspects of the 2023-25 spending plans and in which NCI any new posts will be located.		
*excludes Lambeth Palace Library		
<u>Operating Expenditure</u>		
	2022	2023
	Budget	Budget
	£'million	£'million
Archbishops' Council (Vote 2)	28.2	33.1
Church of England Pensions Board	11.1	not yet set
Church Commissioners (internal investment team)	20.6	24.3
Church Commissioners (non investment teams)	9.9	10.7
Lambeth and Bishopthorpe Palaces*	6.3	7.3
Church of England Central Services Ltd (relevant share of which has been included within funding NCIs figs above)	15.8	16.0
<u>Notes:</u>		
Archbishops' Council increase 2022-2023 includes £2.9m accommodation project on behalf of all NCIs		
Church Commissioners internal investment activity is treated as expenditure on raising funds		
Pensions Board expenditure is net of c.£0.1m p.a. income from National Investing Bodies for Ethical Investment Advisory Group		
The Pensions Board will consider its 2023 budget at its December meeting.		
*excludes Lambeth Palace Library		

### **Question 67**

The ratio of women to men at band 0,1 and 2 by NCI in the requested five-year period was:

#### **2021**

	<b>LP</b>	<b>BP</b>	<b>AC</b>	<b>CC</b>	<b>ChECS</b>	<b>PB</b>	<b>Total</b>
<i>B0</i>	67:33	0:100	33:67	50:50	40:60	50:50	46:54
<i>B1</i>	100:0	n/a	43:57	25:75	46:54	17:83	39:61
<i>B2</i>	44:66	0:100	58:42	21:79	25:75	75:25	42:58
<i>Total</i>	54:46	0:100	51:49	37:63	35:65	43:57	42:58

#### **2020**

	<b>LP</b>	<b>BP</b>	<b>AC</b>	<b>CC</b>	<b>ChECS</b>	<b>PB</b>	<b>Total</b>
<i>B0</i>	75:25	0:100	45:55	47:53	40:60	50:50	47:53
<i>B1</i>	50:50	n/a	38:63	25:75	60:40	17:83	40:60
<i>B2</i>	37:63	50:50	41:59	27:73	26:74	60:40	37:63
<i>Total</i>	57:43	33:67	42:58	37:63	37:63	40:60	41:59

#### **2019**

	<b>LP</b>	<b>BP</b>	<b>AC</b>	<b>CC</b>	<b>ChECS</b>	<b>PB</b>	<b>Total</b>
<i>B0</i>	75:25	0:100	45:55	40:60	25:75	33:67	41:59
<i>B1</i>	50:50	n/a	40:60	25:75	64:36	29:71	45:55
<i>B2</i>	50:50	50:50	40:60	25:75	20:80	60:40	35:65
<i>Total</i>	57:43	33:67	41:59	31:69	33:67	40:60	38:62

#### **2018**

	<b>LP</b>	<b>BP</b>	<b>AC</b>	<b>CC</b>	<b>ChECS</b>	<b>PB</b>	<b>Total</b>
<i>B0</i>	75:25	0:100	44:56	43:57	14:86	33:67	39:61
<i>B1</i>	0:100	n/a	43:57	25:75	50:50	20:80	38:62
<i>B2</i>	43:57	50:50	36:64	25:75	28:72	75:25	35:65
<i>Total</i>	50:50	33:67	39:61	30:70	32:68	42:58	37:63

#### **2017**

	<b>LP</b>	<b>BP</b>	<b>AC</b>	<b>CC</b>	<b>ChECS</b>	<b>PB</b>	<b>Total</b>
<i>B0</i>	67:33	0:100	33:67	43:57	38:62	50:50	41:59
<i>B1</i>	50:50	n/a	40:60	0:100	42:58	20:80	35:65
<i>B2</i>	60:40	50:50	39:61	23:77	36:64	100:0	40:60
<i>Total</i>	60:40	33:67	39:61	27:73	38:62	50:50	39:61

LP – Lambeth Palace; BP – Bishopthorpe; AC – Archbishops' Council; CC – Church Commissioners; ChECS – Church of England Central Services; PB – Pensions Board.