



Diocese of Canterbury

CHANGED LIVES ➔ CHANGING LIVES

CANTERBURY DIOCESAN SYNOD

A Meeting of the Diocesan Synod held 9.00am on Saturday 18 November 2023 at The John Wallis Academy, Millbank Road, Kingsnorth, Ashford TN24 3HG

1. Welcome:

Ian Rich the Lay Chaplain of John Wallis Academy who has been here 17 years welcomed us to the school and prayed the Academy Prayer to start our meeting.

Miranda Ford welcomed those who were here for the first time and explained the etiquette for speaking. She thanked the Diocesan team for their work to facilitate our meeting and read the house keeping rules.

- 2. Bishop Rose** added her welcome and prayed that God would be very present with us today and led our act of worship, reflecting on the reading Matthew 6:19-end. We were led in intersessions in a Taize style with ended with the Lord's Prayer and the Bishop's greeting of peace.

3. Apologies:

There were 16 apologies from the members of the House of Clergy, 15 from the House of Laity.

4. Minutes:

Miranda Ford, Chair of the House of Laity took us through the minutes of the Diocesan Synod meeting of 4 July 2023 they were agreed without correction.

5. Matters arising:

Miranda Ford, Chair of the House of Laity

Matters arising: Gareth Dickinson (Maidstone Deanery) (GD) *asked what happened to the See of Maidstone item from the July Synod and wished to see it revived and proposed a motion to that end.* Rachel Webbley, General Synod, Reculver Deanery (RW) *was confused as to where this has come from on the agenda, and we have no papers for this.* Andrew Sweeney, Ospringe Deanery (AS) raised a point of order- *we need notice of such a proposal.* Steve Sheath, East Bridge Deanery: *this needs more consideration but from a procedural point of view we cannot proceed with this.*

Stephen Taylor (ST) *we note the request and it will be for Archbishop's Council to take this forward*

AS: *to be clear this synod cannot ask Archbishop's Council to take it forward on our behalf as we haven't agreed to do so.*

GD: *can I propose that Archbishop's Council considers this in the future?*

ST *We don't have this on the agenda for this meeting, nor do we have any supporting papers nor this time to take such a consideration forward – so we cannot have a proposal that Archbishop's Council takes this forward. But in their own deliberations those present here and on the*

Archbishop's Council can bring this forward onto that agenda in due course. Members can put items on Synod agenda's though a formal process.

There were no other matters arising.

6. Minutes from the Archbishop's Council from 7 October 2023 were received

RW asked: *Why was the Archbishop's Council asking so many questions on the Ospringe Deanery proposal? Have they subsumed the Strategic Programme Board? – and can we know who sits on the SPB?*

Colin Evans (CE) responded – *this was a special item that fell outside the SPG timescale and needed scrutiny to determine if it could be considered for diocesan support.*

7. General Synod Report

The formal GS report from the General Synod secretary was not available in time for this Synod to see. It will be circulated in due course. A report has been circulated taken from the GS online webpages that gives a flavour of the discussion and decisions.

8. The Environment Report – Joyce Addison, Diocesan Environment Officer

Joyce is our relatively new Diocesan Environment Officer and is assisted by Eco Champions in our deaneries. This session was co-presented by Jacob (13) from St Martin's Church, Maidstone youth group.

There was a video presentation from our Canterbury COP.

Jacob talked about the changes he had made in his life to be more environmentally conscious from cutting out crisps and snacks to reduce packaging waste, cycling to and from school, and not eating as much meat and fish. He also talked about changes that St Martin's had introduced to be more eco friendly.

As a vicar herself Joyce is very aware of the everyday challenges but that we cannot set aside climate change, biodiversity and species loss. Joyce asked everyone to make room for creation care and to bring it back in to what we do in our everyday mission and ministry. There will be a list of things that can be done referring to some of the changes Jacob and his family had made and what they are doing at St Martin's, this information is also available on the Church of England website on the Environment page. Joyce highlighted the benefits of becoming an eco church and encouraged those who have not already registered to do so and that either herself or one of our eco champions could assist with the registration process. The list of eco champions was presented and Joyce welcomed people to come forward and become an eco champion in those deaneries or archdeaconries which are currently not represented. Joyce ran through a list of recent achievements and encouraged everyone to get involved. Jacob concluded the presentation with the question *what changes are we making in our lives and in our churches today to create a better tomorrow?*

9. Carbon Net Zero Action Plan – Colin Evans (CE), Strategic Programme Manager

CE explained that this is the next stage in our journey towards net zero. CE started by reminding Synod of the background to our journey; in November 2019 General Synod and Diocesan Synod adopted our commitment to achieving carbon net zero by 2030. In November 2021 we also adopted at Synod our Diocesan Care for the Environment Strategy. The following year the national church put together a route map to net zero based on consultation with various diocese. One key milestone coming out of the national route map is that every diocese should seek to adopt a net zero carbon action plan by December 2023. National church granted each diocese £15,000 to develop that action plan. We worked with The Craig Partnership who

provided expertise and capacity, there is further national capacity being made available and we will hopefully submit a joint bid with Rochester to work together on the next stage.

CE talked through the progress that has been made so far, he is very encouraged that many churches have taken up the church energy surveys which are available through the Parish Buying Scheme. We did manage to secure a small amount of money through the Marshall's Charity and have been able to help 8 churches with carbon reduction projects. As part of recent Deanery Roadshows we offered deaneries a number of topics one of which was Towards Carbon Net Zero and 6 out of the 15 deaneries took that up and CE was encouraged by how many churches were engaged with wanting to bring forward carbon reduction projects. We are placing investment in clergy housing towards helping to update our energy surveys on those houses and also to improve the energy efficiency measures. Within schools there have also been some energy reduction surveys and at Canterbury COP we also heard of some really good progress that the Cathedral is making towards net zero.

CE encouraged everyone to complete their Energy Footprint Tool, in 2021 we had 30% completion, we are now up to 46% but we need to get to nearly 100% so that we know what our true carbon footprint is.

CE reported on the help that is available and that there is a national programme of £190million through to 2030. There should be a couple of demonstrator projects in our diocese so that people can see what has been done to move those churches towards carbon net zero and the DAC are looking at that submission by March 2024. In terms of capacity, Rochester will be working with us and we hope by April 2024 we should have agreed funding for a Net Zero Carbon Programme Lead shared with Rochester and two Carbon Advisors. We are also putting in place a part-time Fundraiser, initially that is going to be one day a week to help draw in other funding. Julian Atkins who is the national Programme Director announced at Canterbury COP that there will be some funding available, CE has not received the information on that yet but asked Synod members to check The Briefing. Local administration won't be in place until second quarter 2024.

RW raised the following: *I am really grateful that we are doing this, thank you very much for your leadership and for the work that has gone into this. I apologise I have not had time to process this document in depth after General Synod for obvious reasons and I do wonder there might be a bit more work that is needed for example, we acknowledge that it is expensive but there is nothing in this document that recognises the greater cost of doing nothing and whether that could be included in the introduction, I think an acknowledgement of the long term cost even though it is expensive would be a helpful framing of the work. This draft action plan is helpful to us to meet this challenge but I would find it more helpful if some of the terms were clarified in the actual plan so it is all in one place e.g. who will establish the Parish Advisory Energy Team, how many people will be on it, are they paid roles, who will oversee and chair this group, how often will they report to Synod and Archbishop's Council, in other words how will this group fit with our wider Diocesan leadership and structures and it would be really helpful to understand this from the start. Identifying the top 20% of emitters, typically busy churches which are used during the week as well as Sundays, will be fairly straightforward but if the Parish Advisory Energy Team are the people who will prioritise these churches how will they judge that? How will they find these churches near to them and I would also like to understand if that group will provide project and funding support? Will they do that directly and in which case how will churches register their interest in receiving that support? Or would this involve the parishes doing the work themselves and how do we share that information? There are also abbreviations that I am unable to*

decipher, and I think it would be helpful to include these, including the link to the Land Management Plan which is referred to on page 5. Who sits on the Carbon Net Zero Programme Board, who decides the membership terms, which of our colleagues are on it and that is important because that group will be recommending investment decisions, so I think it is important that right from the start we are transparent in how we work. The same questions apply to the Net Zero Working Group that has been established. Finally, finance - the £15k capacity building grant which was given earlier in the year, I learnt about it in July and it is really good to hear about it now and it was given to every diocese but we did not know anything about it until now, it would have been helpful to know that this had taken place and I would like to know if there is anything left from the £15k that was invested. We have a share of £190 million which is coming our way and we need to be transparent about how these grants are allocated and decided from the different funding streams which you have mentioned today. I really welcome the communications plan, particularly the section on Eco Church but apart from that I am concerned that there is a lot about measuring not a lot about engaging with parishes, to be as strategic and targeted as possible as it is the granular detail which will make changes possible and it would be a really helpful piece to include in our Action Plan. There are a whole set of immediate actions that can be done now which don't need a huge amount of investment and I think we would be wise if we incorporate that within our Action Plan.

GD brought to Synod's attention –the Rural Parishes Prosperity Fund which the government is ploughing millions of pounds into rural communities. Maidstone Borough Council where we are, although St Luke's is not eligible for this is ploughing in £500k into rural parishes so churches like Staplehurst Free Church received £45k, as well as other local Borough Councils, they still have £40k yet to allocate and that is between April 2023 and March 2025. All of the councils within our Diocese still have these pots of money so if you are a rural parish you will be eligible for funding for LED lighting, parish hall roofs, new heating systems and it doesn't have to be very expensive. We just replaced all of our LED lighting at St Luke's for the cost of £3.5k. It doesn't have to be expensive, it can be done and there is money available from government and big councils are looking to allocate the money.

CE responded to RW's questions as follows:

We are going to be living this plan for the next 7 years and there is plenty of opportunity to improve it and if you have suggestions to improve it, I am happy to receive those suggestions. The Energy Advisory Team is a Net Zero Programme Manager who we will share with Rochester and there will be an Energy Advisor. It is not as much capacity as we had hoped for but there is a finite limit on national capacity which is available. That is going to be a limited Team and it is going to be down to the Net Zero Programme Manager to work out what the processes are and understand what the national processes are and how we can help churches in that and obviously resources are going to be limited and signposting will be a part of that work but we are hoping that we will be able to add some help on top of that but we will have to see when we get the details through.

With regard to the abbreviations CE usually ensures that the names are written are full the first time they are mentioned but will review the document.

CE absolutely agrees that we need transparency on how this is going to be run but what we need to understand is that we do not yet have capacity in place for net zero apart from this plan when we have that Team in place we will have to look at the processes we will have to use a bit like the process involved for the strategic funding and work through what those processes should be. Any financial decisions will go to Archbishop's Council in the first instance, followed by Synod.

CE anticipates that there will need to be a set of criteria by which we work and some kind of prioritisation and he thinks it vital that those criteria go to Archbishop's Council and they will make the decision as to whether they need to go to Synod but this will be contained in the minutes. To be clear there is not enough money for everyone to get what they would like.

With regard to the Net Zero Team the document does state who is on that Team. It's the Senior Management Team which is the Diocesan Secretary, the Directors, relevant experts including the DAC Secretary, our Schools and Estates Officer and Property Director. The Net Zero Working Group will be the Programme Manager and Energy Adviser mentioned earlier.

There is nothing left from the £15k, at the time CE was made aware of this funding at the beginning of the year he had significant time pressures with regard to the work on the three bold outcomes and the SMMIB funding request. CE apologised that this was not mentioned earlier. CE explained that we did not have a choice on how we spent this money, and that this was used for consultants who assisted with the Net Zero Action Plan.

CE thanked GD for the good tips, please do go and find out what funding your local councils have available for you as we won't have any money in place until second quarter 2024.

Edward Thomas, East Bridge Deanery asked the following questions, *what is the plan for funding and is it realistic that we are going to raise £4 million a year, if you exclude the national programme funding the government funding for schools which amounts to £20 million, do you think that is a realistic amount to raise?*

CE put the question back to Synod, what are you going to do about it? Every accountable body, every PCC, every school is to going to have to make tough choices in whether it wants to invest in Net Zero or Mission. It is a challenge for all of us, we've all got to answer tough questions, our Diocese is the second poorest diocese in the country. We don't have a significant amount of money that we can invest in this as a whole diocese. We are going to have to be creative on how we do this. We are going to have to do the bits we can, look at the pots of money we have in the parish funds and see if we can use these.

The Chair asked for Synod for a Proposer for the Net Zero Action Plan:

Proposer Harry MacDonald

Secunder: Jeremy Worthen

In favour: 63

Against: 1

Abstentions: 3

AB took over as Chair following the refreshment break.

10. 2024 Proposed Budget

Peter Wyllie (PW) talked through the proposed 2024 budget, the key points to highlight is a 5% increase in stipends and salaries, this relates to inflation and spending.

The increase in shared costs, relates to the university chaplains who are now being included in this part of the budget rather than in the Social Justice Network. There are also higher ordained and curate costs, particularly the curate costs. Bottom line the shared costs relating to Mission

and Ministry are the reason for the substantial increase. For the year end of 2024 what that all means is there an increase in parish share of 3.4% in monetary terms 3% in ministry costs and the increase in other costs mentioned earlier but worth pointing out that there is a 4.5% decrease in other shared costs. I want to stress the management and focus on containing and managing shared costs is very active and it shows. We have budgeted for break even for 2024.

Neil Logan-Green, General Synod Canterbury Deanery raised the following:

In relation to the 2024 budget, I would like to mention that the Church of England Evangelical Council announced yesterday that following the General Synod vote on LLF they are setting up an Ephesian Fund in which they are going to pay some portion of their parish share and I discussed this with Mr Gibb. Were they to pay one half of this into the fund would take £250k from the budget. Were they to pay the entirety of their parish share into the Ephesian fund that would take £500k from the budget.

Facts show that numbers of faithful attending our church continue to fall, we have a deep-seated year-on-year loss of £700k. We cannot, Diocesan Synod, continue on this basis we must balance the books, income must be spent on ministry. We cannot keep asking the parishes to pay more, they can't do it, my own parish share has gone up by £4k, it won't be paid. We can't pay it we have a deeply faithful, prayerful congregation of between 35-40 so a contribution of £70k that represents £2k each. If we had the money we would not be in arrears, we can't even afford to heat our church so going forward together we must embrace the truth we must radically cut our diocesan expenses, we must produce a balanced budget as soon as possible.

David Kemp, General Synod Reculver Deanery (DK) raised the following:

There are a number of questions about this budget such as why the budget shows an increase in parish share this year of 3.4% but we find that the increase in total parish share requested in the schedule of individual parish share circulated this week is actually 5.5%. A quarter of the parishes will be paying more than 7% above this year's.

Leaving aside the consequences of this week's General Synod vote, the Diocese is facing two existential threats; the first is climate change, the second is the financial threat of going broke if we don't change our ways of living. The climate will change with unforeseeable results if we do not address the financial threat. The Diocese will run out money and will not be able to pay its bills including stipends for the clergy. If you look at the final page of Appendix D the final line of figures lays bare the problem we are haemorrhaging cash at the rate of £700k a year. We started this year with £7.8million of cash by the end of 2026 it will be down to £4.8million and falling fast. We have to balance the books, we have known about this problem for some time, as long ago as 2017 when we bought a motion to Synod arguing that the financial system was broken, the problem was unaddressed. In 2019 the budget was nearly thrown out then Covid struck. We have to balance the books.

I am proposing a motion, "This Synod reluctantly approves the 2024 Diocesan budget and tasks the Archbishop's Council with bringing to this Synod, no later than July 2024, credible proposals for ensuring that the CDBF account achieves a sustainable balance of income and expenditure by 2027".

In order to balance the books, we either have to increase income or cut costs or do both. It is very hard to increase income, every treasurer and PCC knows that despite the consistent and, in some cases sacrificial generosity of church members, we have to look seriously at our costs. That means hard thinking and hard decisions. The answer to question 13 today in the Synod papers reveals

that we don't actually know why parishes don't pay their full parish share that is why this motion before you gives the Archbishop's Council the opportunity to get to grips with the indications of balancing the books.

The motion asks Archbishop's Council to be realistic to produce credible proposals. It is no use assuming attendances will increase by 10% a year from now and solve the problem. Inflation is still high, the world is wracked by wars, the political and financial outlook is uncertain to say the least. We must not fool ourselves there are easy answers, other dioceses are facing the same issues. The Church Commissioners are putting their money into growth projects, we have to deal with this ourselves. The responsibility is ours; it is the responsibility of the Synod to decide on the financial direction of the Diocese, it is not the responsibility of the Archbishop's Council, Archbishop's Council are the standing committee of Synod. We, all of us, have to shoulder this responsibility.

This challenge will require a number of bodies to work together, Synod, Archbishop's Council, Finance & Assets and the Strategic Programme Board. There must be excellent communication and complete transparency. The Synod should see minutes of the Finance & Assets Committee and Strategic Programme Board, everyone has to step up to the plate and play their part. I know full well for some of us money is not an area of expertise but if we don't all face up to this challenge our successors will not forgive us. I beg to move this motion, standing in my name.

Seconder: Simon Tillotson, Area Dean Reculver Deanery

Paul Worledge, Thanet Deanery (PWorledge) raised the following:

We need to be financially viable, also we don't want to stop investing so that priests decline. In the budget it states there are unrestricted funds and designated funds of £16 million. Can we have some information on what the designated funds are for?

DG, Director of Finance responded to PWorledge's question:

"Designated funds relate to ministry housing which is owned by the Diocese."

DG also responded to DK: *The problem we have I feel is that if we share lots of information it helps people in some ways but also causes confusion. The 5.5% increase that DK refers to is correct, however, the front page of the document shows a parish share increase of 3.4%. 3.4% is correct, the reason that 5.5% is shown on the last page is because the figures shown for parish share include an allocation for LInC grants, the LInC grants have not yet been made so the increase will be much less than 5.5% and possibly lower than the 3.4%. I just wanted to clarify that point.*

Darren Miller, Archdeacon of Ashford commented as follows:

I would not usually comment but I think I need to on this. If we are a people who says we are content where we are, we are content with the numbers that we have and we are aware that the income we have from those numbers is challenged and therefore we need to cut the centre and support from the centre so be it, but that way is palliative care for the Church of England in this Diocese. Instead, we as a Synod have already set the direction in which we need to go, we have embraced 3 Bold Outcomes, we have challenged ourselves by 2030 to create 200 new worshipping communities. If they are worshipping disciplined communities there will be money, not immediately but those who follow Christ do give. We have also asked every parish and every benefice to come up with some signs of new life to reengage with our faith which gives us life

which enables us to live in Christ's name and share what he has given us and can give to the World. That is a really challenging direction to go in and that is looking to change the situation that we are in, it is one of hope and is one the budget will have to account of because if we don't believe we will achieve something then don't put it in the budget and we should never have passed it. If we believe we can be challenged to do something in God's name then we do need our budget to reflect that, so we take out the palliative care for a care of the people who are changing and moving forward.

The support we can give to our Diocese and the diocesan budget for 2024 is there, the central costs overall are cut other than the future investment in curacies to enable that ministry to happen.

PWorledge raised a subsequent point:

I can see the argument for both sides, we also need to make sure that we are not going to run out of money.

*I propose an amendment to the amendment "This Synod reluctantly approves the 2024 Diocesan Budget and tasks the Archbishop's Council with bringing to this Synod, not later than July 2024, credible proposals for ensuring that the **CDBF accounts achieve a sustainable balance of income and expenditure by 2030 with a reduction year on year.***

The Chair asked DK if he would accept that amendment to his proposal.

DK responded I understand both Paul and Darren, my aim here is to get the Archbishop's Council and Synod to be thinking seriously about the realities of this present situation. I would like them to come back with credible proposals, we can have a sustainable balance in all sorts of ways. At the moment we are simply not facing up to the reality that the Church of England in this Diocese cannot afford the Church of England in this Diocese. There has got to be change certainly, is it possible that God is saying to us that your money is running out, it is sign that you need to change, and I want that debate on change into the future to happen and all I have done is put 2027 to sharpen our minds.

The Chair addressed Synod on DK's motion and PWorledge's proposed friendly amendment to that motion. Does that have a seconder? As there was no seconder the Chair advised that that amendment is not passed.

The Chair we have DK's proposal before us which will in effect accept the 2024 budget with those provisos moving forward and making considerations to the Archbishop's Council.

In favour: 44

Against: 15

Abstentions: 3

The Chair confirmed that the 2024 budget is approved with the Archbishop's Council charged to do some hard work going forwards.

11. 2025 and 2026 Budget Forecasts

Anthony Everett, Reculver Deanery raised a point of order: *Is there any point in us doing that after what we have just passed, because it is going to have to change all the words that we have just passed as an amendment, so I move that we go on to the next order of business.*

The Chair accepted the point of order.

12. Parish Share Review Proposals

PW briefed Synod on the parish share review proposals:

Option A – is everything including ministry costs, this will be a total review.

Option B – this seeks to factor in unrestricted income into the current methodology so that will include Average Weekly Attendance, Indices of Multiple Deprivation, unrestricted income and population numbers.

Option C – no review.

The Chair asked Synod for any questions on the parish share proposals.

Harry Macdonald, Canterbury Deanery – *Bearing in mind how long the previous review took, is it realistic to do a full review within 3 months?* The Chair confirmed that a serious review would take longer than 3 months.

Mike Gallagher, East Bridge Deanery – *we have already had a fair exhibition of eloquence this morning on central costs. I think we have just imposed quite a sizeable task on the Diocese to get as far as our first proposition is concerned and that is the difficulty that we have. I raised this in July and I said then that we have a mountain of a problem. Now we are 5 months later on and we moved nowhere. For God's sake, quite literally, let's get on with this one, let's not waste time about how parish share works or what is the best way of splitting until we have decided what our aim is, what are we trying to finance and how are we going to do this. So let's get that done first.*

PWorledge: *I am not a great fan of the parish share system as it is, in Ramsgate we have been forced to reduce to 2.5 clergy where as in Broadstairs there are 3 clergy and Broadstairs is only half the population of Ramsgate so there are issues that need addressing. Having said that I don't think this is the time to do that, partly for reasons we have just passed and the challenges around costs as a whole, partly because of issues around unity which we are going to be discussing this afternoon, the financial costs that may impose. This needs doing but now is not the right time.*

Gordon Brown, Ospringe Deanery: *Is concerned reading the paper that we are working from, the postscript to me says hold fire, why are we even discussing this now if we are going to get changes coming out of the centre.*

Regarding Option A point 6, can you talk more to that?

The Chair responded that that would only be a factor if a major review was voted for.

What would look like in practice?

ST explained that any review would need to take into account any support from the national church that would dioceses.

Barney de Berry, Canterbury Deanery. *Just a point about all our discussions about parish share but can it be noted that parish share is not the only measure of generosity from our congregations as well. We had the point from our Archdeacon that actually for our bold outcomes which are fantastic to grow our children and to see new worshipping communities*

grown, born, that is going to be locally funded mission, we are told central funding might come later. That is going to take generosity away from our congregations. So often the word generosity is used around parish share and actually we just need to be careful not to accuse our congregations of not being generous when actually so much is being funded in mission and to achieve these bold outcomes we do need that generosity not for the share but in other ways to be expressed so can we please take that into consideration into all our discussions about parish share.

+Rose: Thank you Barney for the excellent point that you made with regards to the kind of generosity we see at local levels and I think that is important, needs to be encouraged because it is about the local church asking itself what is our mission here in this place in this context that we find ourselves and then the next question what resources do we need for it and if we think this is right if this is what God is saying to us and how are we going to support it and to make it a reality. But it may need not be just opposed with parish share or common fund or whatever name we give it in the future because we know that it the larger Diocese that is used in relation to paying clergy stipends, paying council tax, we also pay for housing, repair housing and all those things so it is not an either or and yes I believe generosity is vital.

DK: we've got unrestricted funds but we are going to use them, they are not sitting there doing nothing. As far as the review is concerned of course we should not do it as the review is going to happen at a national level. I just want to make a small point based on experience, in the early months of 2024 we shall have a new diocesan secretary, a new financial director and a new financial controller, I think they are going to have enough to do without worrying about the parish share review.

Jeremy Worthen, Ashford Deanery: I can sense the mood in the room but I do want to remind my fellow members of Synod that in July we voted by an overwhelming majority that the Archbishop's Council should bring to this Synod in November a proper proposal for review of parish share in its entirety. That was voted on by an overwhelming majority of people and it seems to me that people have now changed their mind. The Archbishop's Council is trying to do its work and bring what you asked for. In light of the motion that we have just agreed in terms of the budget it doesn't seem to me to make much sense to do a review of parish share in isolation from that wider exercise in looking at sustainability and therefore I would suggest that this is something that we ask to be wrapped up into that wider financial review about sustainability and report back and if there are any specific recommendations coming out of that around parish share that should be picked up then. I do think we should just try and ensure that we are being consistent about how we are acting and thinking as a collective body.

The Chair referred to the three proposed options for a parish share review A, B, C and that they would be voted on individually. Macolm Gavin, Dover deanery raised a point of order would it not make more sense to vote on Option C first – No review.

A revised vote was taken for Option C. The Chair confirmed that the vote was clearly carried, there will not be a vote on Options A and B.

13. Promulgation of Amending Canon No. 42

The Chair read the following:

I give notice that, at its July 2023 group of sessions, the General Synod resolved that Amending Canon No. 42 be made, promulgated and executed.

Amending Canon No. 42 amends Canon C 30 by replacing the requirement for the bishop of each diocese to appoint a Diocesan Safeguarding Adviser (DSA) with a requirement for the bishop to appoint a Diocesan Safeguarding Officer (DSO) with responsibility in the diocese, independent of the bishop, for professional leadership on and management of safeguarding matters. The Canon also provides for the professional supervision of DSOs and for the quality assurance of their work by the National Safeguarding Team. The changes will come into force diocese by diocese upon certification by the Archbishops' Council.

14. Notification of an Election Deanery Synod

ST reported that the updated rules were passed in July with the request that we bring the tidied-up version to you here which we have. There is however, a vote amendment that relates to section which covers the lay chairs of deanery synods reflecting perhaps the churchwardens measure if the time allocation runs out then this allows for some exceptions with the Archdeacons giving permission. Harry Macdonald is proposing this motion to propose replacing

(a) *"No person shall be eligible to stand for this office if at any point in the preceding 6 year period as chair of that deanery Synod has ended. In any event the term of office will cease after 6 consecutive years in post"*

with

(b) *"No person shall be eligible to hold the office of Lay Chair if they have held the post for more than 6 years in the preceding 12 years. This rule may be waived with the permission of the Archdeacon but such permission must be renewed annually"*

Harry Macdonald, Canterbury Deanery commented that the reason for the amendment is that he did not understand sentence (a) and sentence (b) starts by reflecting what I think they are trying to say but I also want to address the issue about what happens if nobody else can be found, implication no lay chair does that mean no DMMC, and hence no deanery Synod. I just didn't know so I propose the possibility of waiving the rule, the Archdeacon would seemingly consult with the rural dean and deanery champion and come to some sensible temporary arrangement to allow that work to continue.

Will Adam, Archdeacon of Canterbury responded: *What we are dealing with here is the representation of laity and business of the House of Laity for deanery Synod, so I am slightly uncomfortable being given the authority to permit that. I agree with Harry that sentence is not comprehensible as it stands and if so, I think that the variation of the rule should be within the confines of the House of Laity for deanery Synod without the intervention of the Archdeacon.*

Darren Miller, Archdeacon of Ashford and General Synod, added the reason he had resisted the amendment, the sentence around *having held the post for more than 6 years in the preceding 12 years you are actually excluded by how that is worded and I agree with my colleague of Canterbury that if a change is needed then it needs to be changed within the first sentence and actually within the of the House of Laity. I think the amendment is needed but will probably cause more issues going forward.*

The Chair proposed that we send this back to Registrar to tidy this up and bring this back to Synod.

Amanda Boucherat, Reculver Deanery, *agreed it should be sent back but the big issue is that if we have the ability to waive the rule, which I think we should, that should rest with the deanery House of Laity and not the Archdeacon surely, I think that is really important.*

15. Election for a Casual Vacancy in the House of Laity on General Synod

ST reported that Holly Adams had stepped down from General Synod which therefore created a casual vacancy in the House of Laity. The election timetable will commence from 4 December when a notice will be sent to all House of Laity electors and this will invite nominations. The timetable would allow for the successful candidate to attend General Synod in February. Civica have been commissioned to manage the process electronically, it will be largely online with the exception of those members who do not use email.

16. Members Questions and Answers (see attached)

Supplementary Questions

Neil Logan-Green, General Synod Canterbury Deanery supplementary to question 1

In the light of the matters which we have just debated and agreed. You will have seen that I have posed a number of questions, I will leave comment on those questions as they relate to our budget going forward.

David Kemp, General Synod Reculver Deanery supplementary question 10

Part of this question had not been answered by Colin. "Looking at the youth ministers on page 13 the first tranche of the grants for St. Luke's Maidstone, All Saints Loose, Holy Trinity Sittingbourne, St. George's Deal, St. Mary's Goudhurst, St. John the Baptist Folkestone and St. Alphege Seasalter we would like to know when we are going to get the money because we can't seem to get an answer from anyone for when this money will eventually arrive?"

Rachel Webbley, General Synod Reculver Deanery supplementary to question 14

There is a table which shows the spread of the roadshows by deanery, I think that would be really helpful to circulate to Diocesan Synod just we are aware of what information has been shared through the deaneries.

17. Election of Members to Diocesan Synod

ST was asked to brief Synod on the elections that would be taking place as we come to the end of the current triennium. There will be one additional factor which is the Deanery of Romney & Tenterden will dissolve at the end of this month and two new deaneries will be created so the formular will change to accommodate 2 area deans, 2 lay chairs and their subsequent representation. So although it is right at the time of going to press there will be a slight change when we issue instructions for nominating people for Diocesan Synod all the numbers will be up to date.

Before the formal business drew to a close Peter Wyllie and Bishop Rose paid thanks to Doug Gibb, Director of Finance, for his service to the Diocese and Diocesan Synod as Doug prepares to retire at the end of the month.

MEMBERS' QUESTIONS

Question 1

Neil Logan-Green – General Synod Representative House of Laity (Canterbury Deanery) asks the following question:

How many FTE stipendiary clergy in parishes?

Michael Keeler-Walker, Head of People Services and Operations and Doug Gibb, Director of Finance respond:

For the 2024 Budget:

- a. There is provision for 112.20 FTE stipendiary parish clergy posts.
- b. This is made up of 99.37 FTE incumbents and an average of 12.83 training curates.

MEMBERS' QUESTIONS

Question 2

Neil Logan-Green – General Synod Representative House of Laity (Canterbury Deanery) asks the following question:

How many clergy in central office, non parish roles, whether full time or part-time?

Michael Keeler-Walker, Head of People Services and Operations and Doug Gibb, Director of Finance respond:

At November 2023:

- a. There are 4.5 employees who are also ordained that are based from Diocesan House.
- b. 1 FTE x Diocesan Secretary
- c. 1 FTE x Mission and Growth Advisor
- d. 1 FTE x Diocesan Director of Ordinands
- e. 0.5 FTE x Generous Giving Advisor
- f. 1 FTE x Director of the Social Justice Network

MEMBERS' QUESTIONS

Question 3

Neil Logan-Green – General Synod Representative House of Laity (Canterbury Deanery)
asks the following question:

How many diocesan salaried staff? Explain full or part-time.

Michael Keeler-Walker, Head of People Services and Operations and Doug Gibb, Director of Finance respond:

At November 2023:

FTE Staff

Finance, DAC & Property 11 FTE

Communications 2.5 FTE

Mission Ministry & Training 7.9 FTE

Safeguarding 3.4 FTE

Governance, Operational Support & HR 7.7 FTE

Social Justice Network 1.6 FTE

Church Schools 6.3 FTE

Parish Share Funded Headcount (not FTE, see above)

17 Part Time Staff

26 Full Time Staff

MEMBERS' QUESTIONS**Question 4**

Neil Logan-Green – General Synod Representative House of Laity (Canterbury Deanery)

asks the following question:

For all non parish roles, separating administrative staff from clergy set out salaries by band anonymised:

1. *Those FTE paid less than a parish priest*
 2. *A band from £31,000 to £50,000*
 3. *A band above £50,000*
-

Michael Keeler-Walker, Head of People Services and Operations and Doug Gibb, Director of Finance respond:

At November 2023:

1. *Those FTE paid less than a parish priest:*
There are 20 staff funded from parish share who are paid an FTE less than £30,000
2. *A band from £31,000 to £50,000*
There are 17 staff funded from parish share who are paid are paid between £30,001 to £50,000
3. *A band above £50,000*
There are 6 staff funded from parish share who are paid above £50,000.

MEMBERS' QUESTIONS

Question 5

Neil Logan-Green – General Synod Representative House of Laity (Canterbury Deanery)
asks the following question:

The running costs of the Diocesan office broken down in the manner you record this data with an adequate description.

Doug Gibb, Director of Finance responds:

Non staff Diocesan house costs were £375,493 in 2022. This includes all IT costs, staff travel, venue hire, hospitality, premises maintenance, heating, cleaning, etc.

MEMBERS' QUESTIONSQuestion 6

Neil Logan-Green – General Synod Representative House of Laity (Canterbury Deanery)
asks the following question:

I understand you actually use a variant to IMD- artefact IMD. Please show the differences between each basis.

Please explain, as a taken example the difference in Canterbury deanery between SMB on 11.047 and SMAA on 10.563.

Please also explain the difference between the neighbouring parishes of SMB and Martins/St Pauls at respectively 11.047 and 9.894. What data exists to demonstrate such a difference?

Doug Gibb, Director of Finance responds:

The Church of England provide the IMD scores for each parish based on HMG data ("original" IMD score) which in our diocese range from just over 5 (least deprived) to just over 60 (most deprived).

We then use a formula to calculate the IMD we use which ranges from 12 (least deprived) to 5 most deprived.

The differences between SMB and St Michael and All Angels and St Martin & St Paul depends on the factor calculated above. SMB therefore has a lower original IMD score than St Michael and All Angels and in turn St Michael and All Angels was a lower original IMD score than St Martin & St Paul

Canterbury SMB

IMD score provide by National Church <u>for the Parish</u>	13.123
--	--------

Lowest Parish IMD score provided by national church (in our diocese) (ie least deprived areas)	5.685
--	-------

Variance to lowest IMD score	7.438
------------------------------	-------

Multiply result by 7 (Diocesan range 12-5)	52.066
--	--------

Result/(highest Parish IMD score provided by national church in our diocese-lowest Parish IMD score provided by national church in our diocese)

$$=52.066/(60.341-5.685)$$

$$=52.066/54.656$$

$$=0.953$$

Deduct result above from 12:

$$12-0.953=11.047$$

11.047 is the calculated IMD for Canterbury SMB

The range 12-5 was decided before I became involved with Parish Share

The figures for parish data are available at:

[Data Services | The Church of England](#)

Our data above uses the 2019 deprivation indices which show SMB as 8010 as shown on the link above.

However, the CUF website shows the deprivation figure for SMB as 8067.

[Canterbury: St Mary Bredin - Parish Data - CUF](#)

MEMBERS' QUESTIONS**Question 7**

Neil Logan-Green – General Synod Representative House of Laity (Canterbury Deanery)
asks the following question:

(a) Please break down ministry cost of £50,708 into its constituent elements.

Michael Keeler-Walker, Head of People Services and Operations and Doug Gibb, Director of Finance respond:

For the 2024 budget:

Ministry Cost £36,720

Housing Cost £13,988

Ministry cost:

Stipend £30,002

Employment taxes £2,700

Pension £7,413

Saving from average 10 FTE vacancies (£4,024)

Resettlement grants, removal costs, clergy fees in vacancies £629

Housing cost:

Maintenance £10,985

Council tax and water rates £3,003

MEMBERS' QUESTIONS

Question 8

Neil Logan-Green – General Synod Representative House of Laity (Canterbury Deanery)
asks the following question:

Please provide the PS data for all the deaneries in the format I have seen it for Canterbury?

Doug Gibb, Director of Finance responds:

Please see attached 2024 Indicative Parish Share by Benefice*

*This is illustrative for the purpose of answering the question and should not be taken by any Benefice as the Finance communication to them. Most recent version attached as at 13 November 2023.

MEMBERS' QUESTIONS**Question 9**

Neil Logan-Green – General Synod Representative House of Laity (Canterbury Deanery)
asks the following question:

*Please show the actual cost of repair to Parsonage houses.
Please provide total sum and indicate the numbers of houses where repair cost was expended.*

Doug Gibb, Director of Finance responds:

The budgeted amount allocated to the repair of parsonage houses in 2022 was £619k but actual expenditure in 2022 was £857k. Property maintenance costs are one of our main financial challenges and the budget was increased to £900k in 2023 to cover the maintenance of our properties. We maintain 163 parsonages.

The property maintenance budget for 2024 is £945k.

MEMBERS' QUESTIONS

Question 10

David Kemp – General Synod Representative House of Laity (Reculver Deanery)

asks Colin Evans, Strategic Programme Manager the following question:

I confess to being confused by the various bodies such as the National Church and the Church Commissioners apparently queuing up to pour money into the laps of dioceses and parishes to facilitate mission and, in our case, the achievement of the Three Bold Outcomes. Could you please provide:-

- a) a comprehensive list of the various schemes wishing to fund diocesan and parish mission, and under each scheme a list of the parishes and schemes in the Diocese which have had an application approved, or who are in the process of applying, the nature of the work or project which requires funding, together with the amount of money involved in each case, and when that money is expected to be distributed*
- b) full details of how the money announced orally by your good self at the July Synod meeting (Item 9 Minutes), namely £560,000 and £460,000, is being spent.*

Colin Evans, Strategic Programme Manager, responds:

Strategic Mission and Ministry Investment (SMMI)

When we refer to “Church Commissioner” funding we are referring to that funding that is made available to national church to support various programmes of activity across all dioceses. These funds are distributed through national church, albeit through several different streams. The question primarily relates to funding available through *Strategic Mission and Ministry Investment (SMMI)*. However, there are other national funding streams such as Net Zero Carbon, Buildings for Mission, Lower Income Communities funding etc. The following is an extract from the Church of England website “Funding Strategic Mission and Ministry” page:

“In the summer of 2022, the national Church agreed and announced its 2023-31 spending plans. These plans include the creation of Strategic Mission and Ministry Investment (SMMI), which is to enable the strategic priorities and the bold outcomes of the Church of England’s Vision and Strategy for the 2020s.

SMMI is an ongoing commitment over nine years. The vast majority of this funding will go directly to dioceses to advance their plans for the Vision and Strategy in local parishes and communities across the country, called the Diocesan Investment Programme.

A second stream of People and Partnerships Funding will supplement the direct investment provided to dioceses to frontline mission and ministry, with the intention to address key gaps the Church as a whole is facing to deliver the Church's Vision and Strategy and includes a small level of grants in the form of partnership, innovation and research funding.”

Applications for SMMI must be made by dioceses and demonstrate how they will contribute to the achievement of the national vision and strategy. Our own three bold outcomes for 2030 are our local expression of the national vision and strategy.

Our First Request for Strategic Mission and Ministry Investment

In March we successfully submitted our first funding request for SMMI for c£1m. Other requests will follow when we are ready to apply and will represent a multi-million-pound investment over the next five years.

Our first funding request, which was constrained to the current funding triennium 2023 - 2025, covered three main areas:

1. Securing continuing funding to ensure that we can manage our strategic programme, prepare future funding requests etc – Programme Office
2. Support for a first tranche of seven youth ministers – the only project at the time that we were in a position to apply for funding for
3. Securing agreement in principle to fund a church plant (sometimes referred to as resource church)

Programme Office

The request was broken down as follows:

Component	3-year Funding (FTE)	Primary Function	Notes
Core Programme Office	£285K (1.2 FTE)	Expertise in programme and project management Management of investment programme Preparation of funding requests	Our existing Programme Office has been funded over the last five years entirely by a previous national funding stream known as Strategic Capacity Funding. This ended in March 2023. Securing ongoing support for the Programme Office was therefore time-critical.
Change Readiness	£51K	Capacity to support deaneries to develop deanery mission plans	Making additional capability and capacity available beyond that available from the core Programme Office and other diocesan staff
Strategic Communications	£63K (0.5 FTE)	Engagement with our key stakeholders Story-telling, sharing encouragement, strong and clear messaging to develop buy-in and alignment	A focus on building strong engagement across our diocese and learning from one another. Budget constraints would otherwise have required a reduction in capacity in this important function.
Data & Measurement	£118K (1.0 FTE)	Informing key projects to ensure that they are evidence-based Implementing a measurement & learning framework to monitor progress towards our bold outcomes	The diocese has not been able to afford a data analyst for some time due to budget constraints. This restores that capability. It further adds capability and capacity to measure our progress against our bold outcomes.

Within the context of tight diocesan finances, this funding enables us to support our strategic programme without impacting Parish Share.

Any further SMMI funding requests within this triennium would not need to include additional Programme Office funding.

In addition to the above, there was £49K investment to support the running of the Ministry Experience Scheme for two years. This provides young people with an opportunity to experience ministry, with a particular focus on youth ministry. The goal is to increase interest in taking up children/youth/family ministry posts in the future. There is a national shortage of youth ministers.

TOTAL INVESTMENT £566K

Youth Ministers

The £460k funds a first tranche of grants for seven (6.5 FTE) youth minister posts across the diocese. The grants reduce over 5 years to encourage sustainability. The first tranche churches are those with significant children and young people's ministry already and are particularly focused around developing discipleship across the primary to secondary school transition where there is typically a significant drop-off in attendance and engagement. The goal is to double the number of children and young disciples in those churches over 5 years.

Churches identified for a first tranche youth minister are: St. Luke's Maidstone, All Saints Loose, Holy Trinity Sittingbourne, St. George's Deal, St. Mary's Goudhurst, St. John the Baptist Folkestone and St. Alphege Seasalter (supporting transition from 0.5 FTE to 1 FTE youth minister). At the time of writing, 3 are in post and one is out to recruitment. We are also running the first YouthScape LaunchPad cohort for churches with smaller youth ministry or interested in starting one. This is funded nationally and not through a specific grant to the diocese.

TOTAL INVESTMENT £460K

Church Plant

As noted earlier, support was given in principle for an application for SMMI for a church plant. A detailed application was encouraged for "Spring 2024" and this is being developed.

Other Projects

Deaneries continue to work on developing plans that will enable a flourishing and sustainable future and identify how they support working towards the three bold outcomes. The plans also have opportunity to identify where additional support is needed, which could include additional funding. The deanery plans are in varying degrees of development at the present time and support is being offered where additional assistance would be beneficial.

Specifically, we have been working with Ospringe deanery on their proposal for a Deanery Youth Missioner (identified in their deanery plan) to support and encourage volunteers engaged in youth work with a view to doubling the number of children and young disciples across the deanery. The initial proposal has been reviewed by the Children & Young People Framework and was recognised as a pilot of a different approach to developing youth ministry which might be suited to more rural deaneries. Archbishop's Council approved the funding of £150K towards the total cost of the project of c£400K through restricted diocesan funding (not SMMI) subject to a number of conditions. This funding is likely to be required from 2024 for approximately five years. As per the youth ministers' funding, the grant reduces over the funding period to encourage sustainability. Note: Within the context of SMMI, diocese and parishes are expected to make some financial contribution to the total cost of the strategic programme.

In addition, there are several deaneries where there are discussions about the potential for church planting/resource churches. There are no details of potential funding or timing at present.

One other deanery has recently submitted two project funding requests along with their deanery plan. These are being reviewed. The requests are for £100K and £130K with potential grants spread over 4/5 years.

MEMBERS' QUESTIONS**Question 11**

David Kemp – General Synod Representative House of Laity (Reculver Deanery)

asks Stephen Taylor, Diocesan Secretary the following question:

Is it possible for the Diocesan Central Staffing and Benchmarking Summary mentioned at the bottom of page 8 of the Minutes of the meeting of the Archbishop's Council on 7 October to be circulated to Synod members with, if appropriate, a discussion at the next Synod meeting?

Stephen Taylor, Diocesan Secretary, responds:

An attempt was made to do a comparative study of staffing across dioceses and the first iteration of this was shared at Archbishop's Council. It is a complex set of data – which at Archbishop's Council and subsequently across other dioceses it was found the data is inaccurate. Given the errors and gaps in the data it is not as useful as was first hoped to be, but the desirability of such an exercise remains. Sharing of this data to a wider audience, now knowing its flaws, would not at this stage be helpful.

MEMBERS' QUESTIONS**Question 12**

David Kemp – General Synod Representative House of Laity (Reculver Deanery)
asks Doug Gibb, Finance Director the following question:

There is anecdotal evidence that the repair to and maintenance of clergy housing is either not being done or is being delayed because of financial pressures. Has an analysis been done of outstanding repairs and maintenance (in consultation with the clergy involved) and the consequent cost of carrying these out? If not, why not?

Doug Gibb, Finance Director, responds:

A detailed analysis has not been done of outstanding repairs and maintenance in consultation with the clergy involved. Like any responsible landlord we expect the clergy to notify us of any issues. Every year we review all the properties in three deaneries as part of our rolling five year property valuation programme and at that time our property director reviews any external work required and incorporates this in our work programme. Due to the pressure on budgets we focus on the external structure of the building and surrounding grounds, which can often involve additional cost in dealing with issues caused by trees.

MEMBERS' QUESTIONSQuestion 13

David Kemp – General Synod Representative House of Laity (Reculver Deanery)
asks Doug Gibb, Finance Director the following question:

Perhaps the most serious financial issue facing the Diocese at the moment is the very significant shortfall in the payment of Parish Share but, as far as I know, there has never been a detailed analysis of the reasons parishes do not pay their full Parish Share. It seems likely that some parishes cannot pay because they are either too small, or their congregation is too poor; some parishes do not pay because of competing local priorities or ineffective leadership; while a tiny minority will not pay because of political or theological considerations. If we are to consider changing the Parish Share allocation system in the foreseeable future could work be done with Deanery Treasurers and others to discover what is actually going on at the present time with an appropriate report to Synod?

Doug Gibb, Finance Director, responds:

Deanery treasurers generally know what is going on in their deaneries and the reasons why parishes cannot or do not pay parish share. We know the main challenge facing most parishes is declining congregations and deanery treasurers work along with their deanery leadership teams and the diocese to address this issue.

MEMBERS' QUESTIONS

Question 14

**Rachel Webbley – General Synod Representative House of Clergy (Reculver Deanery)
asks the following question:**

*Following the deanery roadshows this year, what was the Spread of Roadshow subject take up
in each Deanery?*

Stephen Taylor, Diocesan Secretary, responds:

Subject Number of deaneries 15 in 14 venues
Towards Carbon net-zero 6
Use of Church Buildings and Creating New Christian Communities 11
Reimagining Ministry 7
Engaging with Financial Planning 10
Including and Welcoming Children and Young people 10

MEMBERS' QUESTIONSQuestion 15

David Kemp – General Synod Representative House of Laity (Reculver Deanery)
asks Doug Gibb, Finance Director the following questions:

- (a) Why is there an increase in the People Services budget (43% in 2 years) when the number of people working in Diocesan House is likely to go down rather than up?*
 - (b) What are the Strategic Projects and why have they increased by 93% over 2 years?*
 - (c) Why is rental income forecast to go up by over 50% over 2 years when we sold a number of houses last year to boost our cash holdings?*
-

Doug Gibb, Finance Director, responds:

- (a) This is due to a reallocation of staff from the office management budget.
- (b) This is the diocesan contribution towards strategy which enables us to unlock significant SMMI (Strategic Mission and Ministry Investment) funding from the national church as part of their Diocesan Investment Programme.
- (c) This is due to a combination of highly effective management of our properties with the majority of parsonages being rented between vacancies when not in ministry use and the increase in market rents of around 20% over the last 2 years.

MEMBERS' QUESTIONS

Question 16

**Rachel Webbley – General Synod Representative House of Clergy (Reculver Deanery)
asks the following question:**

Please can you provide the full list of names of the Finance & Assets Committee.

Stephen Taylor, Diocesan Secretary, responds:

The Finance & Assets Committee membership as at 1st January 2023 is made up as follows:

Peter Wyllie, Chair
Tony Richter, Deputy Chair
Rt Revd Rose Hudson-Wilkin, Bishop of Dover
Venerable Darren Miller, Archdeacon of Ashford
Venerable Will Adam, Archdeacon of Canterbury
Venerable Andrew Sewell, Archdeacon of Maidstone
Shirley Leslie
Caroline Highwood
Revd John Richardson
Jack Fellowes
Chloe Ewen

Normally in attendance:

Stephen Taylor, Diocesan Secretary
Doug Gibb, Director of Finance
Jennifer Mulrooney, Financial Controller
Quentin Roper, Director of Education