

Saturday 24 February 2024

9.00 a.m. to 12.45 p.m.

ORDER PAPER II

SPECIAL AGENDA IV

DIOCESAN SYNOD MOTIONS

CODE OF CONDUCT FOR PCCS (GS 2335A AND GS 2335B)

The Revd Dr Sara Batts-Neale (Chelmsford) to move:

- 6** ‘That this Synod request that the Archbishops’ Council carry out a review to consider:
- (a) the possibility of drawing up a Code of Conduct for PCC members and lay volunteers,
 - (b) the issues required to put in place a disciplinary process for their removal from the PCC in cases where this is not followed,
 - (c) the resources required at national, diocesan and parish level to bring this about.’

Mr Adrian Greenwood (Southwark) to move as an amendment:

- 27** *‘Leave out* everything after “That this Synod” and *insert:*
“call upon every PCC in the Church of England within 12 months of the date of this motion being passed to agree and adopt a Code of Conduct which
- (i) is appropriate and proportionate to their scale of operations and which, among other things, sets out the standards of behaviour for members which are considered acceptable to enable the PCC to fulfil its responsibilities effectively and

efficiently in a spirit of Christian charity and for the glory of God;

(ii) provides for members of the PCC whose behaviour persistently falls below the standards, particularly bullying, to withdraw or to be asked to withdraw, for a reasonable period of time; and

(iii) reflects the 'Pastoral Principles for living well together' already endorsed by Synod, particularly 'paying attention to power'."

Item 28 only to be moved if item 27 is not carried

Mr Clive Scowen (London) to move as an amendment:

28 '*Leave out* paragraph (b).'

7 QUESTIONS

Not later than 11.15 a.m.

SAFEGUARDING INDEPENDENCE

8 Presentation under SO 107.

The Bishop of Stepney to move:

9 'That this Synod thank Sarah Wilkinson and Alexis Jay for their work and request that the process set out in paragraph 12 of GS 2336 for forming a response to, and considering any necessary implementation of, their recommendations be pursued as a matter of priority.'

Mr Peter Adams (St Albans) to move as an amendment:

29 '*Leave out* everything after "for their work and" and *insert*:

"(a) accept the recommendations of their reports in full and instruct the Archbishops' Council to proceed immediately to divest itself of its safeguarding responsibility so as to allow full independent delivery of safeguarding within the Church of England;

(b) call upon the Appointments Committee to constitute a Safeguarding Delivery Board to draw up plans for the future

delivery of safeguarding within the Church of England, and to appoint a chair for the board from a member of House of Laity of General Synod and agreed by General Synod;

(c) the constitution of the Safeguarding Delivery Board shall be: one survivor of abuse nominated by MACSAS; two members of Archbishops Council who are elected from the lower houses; a member of the House of Bishops to act as lead safeguarding bishop; a member of the National Safeguarding Team; and four elected members of General Synod, two clergy and two laity;

(d) the Safeguarding Delivery Board shall report to synod at each group of sessions until these plans are fully implemented and fully running for a period of three years. After two years of its running, it will bring to synod proposals as to whether it consider itself, its name and its constitution appropriate to continue the oversight of safeguarding on behalf of and accountable to synod through continuing annual reports, and if not make proposals as to the future composition, structure and name.”.’

Item 30 to be moved only if item 29 is not carried

Mr Clive Billenness to move as an amendment:

30 ‘*Leave out* everything after “for their work and” and *insert* “call upon the Archbishop’s Council to:

(a) instruct independent legislative counsel to prepare a draft Measure giving effect to Professor Jay’s proposals in the manner recommended by Dr Wilkinson (i.e. using external consultants);

(b) to publish the draft Measure for open consultation by 30 April 2024; and

(c) to bring that draft, together with a report setting out responses to the consultation, for first consideration at General Synod in July 2024.”.’

Item 31 to be moved only if items 29 and 30 are not carried

Mr Martin Sewell (Rochester) to move as an amendment:

- 31** ‘*Leave out* everything after “for their work and” and *insert* “accept the recommendations of their reports in full and the need to proceed with as much urgency as good governance will allow”.’

Mr Martin Sewell (Rochester) to move as an amendment:

- 32** ‘At the end *insert*:

“Furthermore, that this Synod regretfully conclude that the responsibility for the “collapse” of confidence in the Safeguarding culture of the Church of England, as described by Professor Jay and evidenced by Dr Wilkinson lies principally and institutionally with

- 1) The Archbishops of Canterbury and York
- 2) Archbishops’ Council
- 3) The Secretary General
- 4) The Lead Bishop for Safeguarding
- 5) The Senior Secretariat members”.’

Mrs Vicky Brett (Peterborough) to move as an amendment:

- 33** ‘At the end *insert*:

“That this Synod apologise to all members of the former Independent Safeguarding Board for the stress harm and professional embarrassment they have endured which have arisen as a result of the ISB formation, structuring, resourcing, implementation, and management for which they were not responsible.”.’

If items 29, 30 and 31 are not carried

Mr Martin Sewell (Rochester) to move as an amendment:

- 34** *Leave out* everything after “from their work and” to the end.

If item 29, 30, 31 or 34 is carried

Mr Martin Sewell (Rochester) to move as an amendment:

35 ‘At the end *insert*:

“That this Synod cannot endorse the proposal for an implementations group as currently established en bloc, by an opaque process, comprising some members who may exemplify concerns or bear significant responsibility for the failures to date.”.’

If item 35 is carried

36 ‘At the end *insert*:

“That this Synod note the lack of significant external but informed voices and heed the warnings that such a group created in such a way will carry neither the confidence nor the support of the survivor community.”.’

If item 30, 31 or 34 is carried

37 ‘At the end *insert*:

“That this Synod request that a new response group be formed by the Appointments Committee comprising nominees with no prior executive involvement with the ISB history and without having been personally subject to safeguarding complaint during the life of this Synod.”.’