

DIOCESAN SYNOD

Title: **REFORM & RENEWAL REPORTS**

Author: **CHIEF EXECUTIVE & DIOCESAN SECRETARY**

Date: **6 JUNE 2015**

I. INTRODUCTION

The package of national church reports that have been grouped under the heading 'Reform & Renewal' were discussed and generally endorsed at the February General Synod. This item in our Diocesan Synod is part of the consultation process on these reports, and an opportunity to both better understand the proposals and offer feedback on them.

2. THE REPORTS

A summary of the reports is attached.

The full reports may be found on the Church of England website - <https://www.churchofengland.org/reform-renewal.aspx>. Hard copies can be arranged for Synod members via Nathan Whitehead at the Diocesan Office.

3. SYNOD PRESENTATION AND DISCUSSION

Dr Philip Giddings, Chair of the House of Laity of the General Synod and member of the Archbishops' Council, and Dr Jacqui Philips, Clerk to the General Synod will be introducing this item with a presentation.

There will then be an opportunity for discussions in small groups and a plenary session to gather feedback and comment.

The General Synod secretariat has suggested that Diocesan Synod members may find it helpful to consider the following questions:

1. What do you think the challenges we've been discussing today and the proposed responses will mean?
2. What 3 things would make the biggest difference here?
3. Are there any gaps/causes for concern in what you've heard today? How should we respond together to these?
4. What do you understand by lay leadership and what can your diocese and the Church nationally do to support it?
5. What should the Church nationally be doing to reach out to the under-30s, particularly in respect of social media/digital?

6. If we need a 50% uplift in ordinands nationally just to meet the sum of diocesan ambitions and replace retirees, what will be most valuable in supporting your diocese in attracting candidates and overcoming financial obstacles?

4. ADDITIONAL CONTEXT

The *Resourcing the Future* report covers the future of the 'Darlow' and Mission Development Funding funding from the national church. Synod members will be aware from the budget papers that the Darlow money totals c£2.5m pa, making Chelmsford diocese one the largest net recipients of national church funding. This funding, which is around 12% of annual income, is passed through the Deanery Share Scheme as ministry support grant to deaneries. The diocese also receives c£0.4m pa in Mission Development Funding, which forms the bulk of the Mission Opportunities Fund. RTF proposes half the national funding to be allocated to support mission in the poorest communities, and half for enhanced strategic development funding for new growth opportunities.

Bishop's Council members had the opportunity to discuss the Reform & Renewal reports at their last meeting, and have been considering the proposals in greater detail.

It should be noted that a focus on Discipleship is presently planned for the November Diocesan Synod, which would provide a further opportunity to discuss the themes in the discipleship report.

GENERAL SYNOD

In Each Generation

A programme for reform and renewal

1. In obedience to the commission that Jesus gave to his disciples the Church's vocation is to proclaim the good news afresh in each generation. As disciples of our Risen Lord we are called to be loyal to the inheritance of faith which we have received and open to God's Spirit so that we can be constantly renewed and reformed for the task entrusted to us.
2. The spiritual challenge of reform and renewal is both personal and institutional. A year ago we encouraged the creation of a number of task groups to discern what has been happening in parishes and dioceses, to ponder the implications of the *From Anecdote to Evidence* findings and to reflect on the experience dioceses have had in developing their mission and ministry. The groups were asked to explore specific aspects of the institutional life of the Church of England, where on the face of it, there appeared to be scope for significant change.
3. The work of these four groups - on the discernment and nurture of those called to posts of wide responsibility, on resourcing ministerial education, on the future deployment of our resources more generally and on simplification - is now being published. It will be the main focus for the February meeting of the General Synod.
4. We are grateful for this opportunity to put on record our thanks to Lord Green, the Bishop of Sheffield, John Spence and the Bishop of Willesden for chairing each of the four groups. We are also grateful to the chief officers of the Archbishops' Council, Church Commissioners and Pensions Board for their review of the work of the National Church Institutions, a copy of which is also being circulated for information.
5. Renewing and reforming aspects of our institutional life is a necessary but far from sufficient response to the challenges facing the Church of England. The recommendations of these four groups have to be seen in a much wider context, as a means not an end. They will be considered at the Synod in the light of a paper that explores what it means for all Christians, lay and ordained, to be a community of missionary disciples.
6. They also need to be approached against the background of the wider range of ongoing work to promote numerical and spiritual growth, contribute to the common good and reimagine ministry. We are continually encouraged in our visits to parishes and dioceses by the many signs of life and growth in the numbers of people coming to faith and growing in faith. General Synod welcomed in November 2013 the creation of an Archbishops' Task Group on Intentional Evangelism. This group will be producing its first report in the next few months.
7. Meanwhile the Church of England continues to have a significant impact in all kinds of positive ways in the life of the nation. There is a remarkable breadth and quality of service and commitment offered through community ventures, food banks, credit unions and many other initiatives through cathedrals, parish churches, and fresh expressions of church. There are sure grounds for hope both in the grace of God and in the dedication of God's people.
8. The urgency of the challenge facing us is not in doubt. Attendance at Church of England services has declined at an average of 1% per annum over recent decades and, in addition, the age profile of our membership has become significantly older than that of the population. Finances have been relatively stable, thanks to increased individual giving. This situation cannot, however, be expected to continue unless the decline in membership is reversed.

9. The age profile of our clergy has also been increasing. Around 40% of parish clergy are due to retire over the next decade or so. And while ordination rates have held up well over recent years they continue to be well below what would be needed to maintain current clergy numbers and meet diocesan ambitions.
10. The burden of church buildings weighs heavily and reorganisation at parish level is complicated by current procedures. The Sheffield formula allocation of priests is no longer generally observed, while the distribution of funds under the Darlow Formula has no emphasis on growth, has no relationship to deprivation and involves no mutual accountability. There is no central investment in reaching out into the digital and social media world. If the Church of England is to return to growth, there is a compelling need to realign resources and work carefully to ensure that scarce funds are used to best effect.
11. The four task groups whose reports are now being published each identifies changes which are designed to enable the Church of England to be better equipped for meeting the challenges that it faces.
12. The report on the discernment and nurture of those whom the church identifies as called to posts of wide responsibility has a number of aims. It seeks to ensure proper care for those involved, a genuine diversity in those available for appointment, excellent theological and spiritual preparation and a familiarity with the key elements necessary for day to day working.
13. The Resourcing Ministerial Education report explains why we must also be more prayerful and proactive in our approach to promoting vocations to full time ministry - lay and ordained. That includes seeking a significant and sustained increase in the numbers of those coming forward for full time ordained ministry.
14. The report sets out proposals for continuing to grow the number and quality of candidates, for improving their formation - both pre - and post-ordination - and for sustaining them in the ministry to which God has called them. We need to make it easier to enable a proper diversity of candidates to be identified and called. New investment in lay ministry and leadership is essential. To support parish and diocesan efforts, we must consider national initiatives for lay development.
15. There can be no single strategy for the Church of England's mission and ministry. The proposals have been developed in the light of what bishops and dioceses said when consulted. There will continue to be 42 diocesan strategies, each of which are entitled to national support. In developing and supporting leaders, we must ensure they are equipped and can call on the expertise they need. We want to consider how funds might be made available which dioceses can use to further their plans to achieve numerical and spiritual growth.
16. As the Resourcing the Future report explains, church funds distributed from the nationally managed endowment are a small part of total church resources. But they still need to be used for critical impact. The report proposes the replacement of the Darlow Formula with allocations based on population, income and deprivation levels, and the creation of a new funding stream available for growth initiatives. In short, such funds will have a bias to the poor and a commitment to spiritual and numerical growth.
17. The fostering of mutual support and mutual accountability is at the heart of the proposals. The release of funds is linked to clear plans for their use and clear eyed review of their impact, as judged and monitored by peer groups. The report notes that, while the Sheffield Formula no longer works, there will continue to be a need for arrangements to ensure an equitable distribution of stipendiary curates.
18. The Simplification report identifies specific legislative changes which are needed to remove hindrances to mission in relation to pastoral reorganisation and clergy deployment, to

streamline processes and to tackle redundant paperwork. The recommendations take account of a widespread consultation process.

19. If all the above has to be done within the confines of current funding there will be a long period before its impact can be real, not least given the need to support dioceses through the transition from the present way in which national funds are distributed. We are, therefore, grateful to the Church Commissioners for being willing to produce a report that opens up the issues around whether, for a period, they might be prepared to modify the way in which they currently seek to ensure inter-generational equity when determining what level of funding to make available from their permanent endowment.
20. These four Task Group reports, the report on discipleship and the document from the Commissioners cover a wide range of issues, some of them complex. We are grateful to the Business Committee for being willing to make significant time available in February for engagement with them. It is particularly welcome that as well as debates there will be the opportunity for questions and discussion in groups.
21. The decision making processes and timescales vary as between each of the reports and this is reflected in the texts of the motions before the Synod. They have been prepared in the light of the supportive discussions at the Archbishops' Council, the House of Bishops and the Board of Governors of the Church Commissioners.
22. At this stage the motions focus primarily on vision, principles and next steps. Further development is still needed on some of the proposals and consultation required on many of the detailed outworkings before the relevant bodies, which on matters involving legislation includes the Synod itself, can reach conclusions. We hope, therefore, that Synod members might be prepared to resist the temptation to overload the motions with a large number of amendments on points of detail.
23. In a few months' time the life of this General Synod will come to an end and fresh elections will take place in readiness for the first meeting of the new Synod in November. This is, therefore, a good moment for taking stock of the challenges and opportunities facing us. We believe that these reports, to be discussed in February, provide a basis for developing and delivering a major programme of renewal and reform within the Church of England as a matter of urgency.

“Now to him who is able to do immeasurably more than all we can ask or conceive, by the power which is at work among us, to him be glory in the church and in Christ Jesus to all generations for ever and ever. Amen.”

✠ Justin Cantuar:

✠ Sentamu Eboracensis

January 2015

Report of the Task Force on Resourcing the Future of the Church of England

Summary

4. **The Task Force proposes a fundamental shift: removing the current formula systems which provide mechanical, ineffective subsidy and replacing them with investment focused on fulfilling dioceses' strategic plans for growth, and with a strong bias towards the poor:**
- There is a widespread desire among dioceses to have more leaders (lay and ordained) and to make other changes which will facilitate the Church's mission and growth.
 - The current ways by which the Church's national funding is distributed have only a superficial link to growth and have failed the poorest communities. A large amount of money is subsidising decline.
 - In future, all of the funding distributed to dioceses should be investment for mission and growth. Half of the sum available should be earmarked for the support and development of mission in the poorest communities. Half should be for the pro-active investment in new growth opportunities.
 - The funding to support and develop mission in deprived communities should be distributed to dioceses through a process involving objective measures of need and through conversations with dioceses. This will ensure targeting on the poorest and effective cohesion with diocesan plans.
 - The funding for pro-active investment in growth should be available for all dioceses to apply for, on a matched funding basis, with a bias in the distribution to the poorest.
 - The transition to the new funding arrangements should be done carefully over a ten year period, but we hope that additional distributions from the Church Commissioners can be found to accelerate the build-up of funding available for proactive investment in growth.
 - We hope also that additional national funding can be made available to provide extra investment across the Church for recruiting and training church leaders. In addition there should be greater investment in national Church infrastructure and activity which can improve the mission of the whole Church.

SOME QUESTIONS WE HAVE BEEN ASKED

The Resourcing the Future report has to date been considered by the House of Bishops' Standing Committee, the Church Commissioners' Board of Governors, the Archbishops' Council and the House of Bishops. All have supported the report's proposals. Here are some of the questions that have been asked of the report and the answers given in response.

Can money alone turn around the Church's decline?

No. But decisions about funding need to be part of the solution. Money enables mission activity to take place. Church growth often costs money to sustain and develop. Spending less on supporting activities associated with decline liberates funds for intentional investment and encourages fresh thinking about how to advance mission and growth.

Will the funding changes benefit the poorest communities?

Yes. The present formula takes no account of deprivation. Moreover, the evidence shows that the national funding currently given to 'poorer dioceses' (in the form of the 'Darlow funding') does not consistently find its way to the poorest communities in those dioceses. A significant amount of the funding goes to support parishes which are not poor but which cannot afford their ministry costs because they are in decline. Our very broad estimate is that only a third of the total funding currently allocated to dioceses goes to the poorest communities. Our proposals will increase this to 50%. Further, the other 50%, which will be for proactive investment in growth across the country, also has a bias to the poor.

Will the new measure of need used to distribute funding to dioceses for the support of mission in the poorest communities disadvantage rural areas?

No. The measure of need is centred on the average income of the residents in the diocese, with a small modification to give extra help to dioceses with significant pockets of low income. The less income an area has, the less likely its churches will have sufficient resources to undertake their mission. Assessing average residents' income will enable an objective comparison of need across all areas of the country – urban and rural.

Why does the calculation for allocating funding between dioceses for mission in the poorest communities take no account of diocesan wealth or investment income?

The funding for mission in poorest communities aims to do exactly what it says – fund mission in the poorest communities. The previous formula took into account a number of church-related factors, with the result that it was never clear whether a diocese was receiving funding because it ministered to poor communities, or because of issues relating to its own management. (The more ineffective a diocese was in managing its resources the more funding the previous formula would give it.). The new allocation system will mean that the Church can be sure that funding is allocated to the most deprived communities. Investment income will continue to be taken into account in the formula system which apportions national Church expenditure between dioceses, and the funding for proactive investment in growth opportunities will take note of the other funds available to dioceses, to ensure the funding awarded is demonstrably providing additional value.

Why are there no proposals to direct funding towards areas where it is hard to sustain mission and ministry for reasons other than poverty (e.g. areas where there are significant numbers of other faiths)?

It is for dioceses to make detailed decisions about which of their parishes need financial support. The national funding represents only a small proportion of most dioceses' total

income, and we believe that the greatest impact national funds can provide is for mission in the poorest communities.

Should the national funding have greater emphasis on investment in growth in view of the Church's persistent decline? Why should national funding support mission in the poorest communities? Isn't that the responsibility of dioceses?

We believe all the national funding distributed to dioceses is investment in growth, with some earmarked to support mission in the poorest communities and some used in other parts of the country where there are opportunities for growth. This reflects the Church's 'bias to the poor' and recognises the challenges of undertaking mission in the poorest communities. Sustainable growth must include growth in the poorest communities.

There is a welcome emphasis on greater mutual accountability between dioceses – how exactly will this work?

The detail will be discussed with dioceses themselves but we envisage a process for distributing the funding for mission in the poorest communities whereby: a) dioceses are given an indication of their funding; b) they decide their plans for spending it; c) they share their ideas with other dioceses as part of a peer review process to help reach a common understanding of the desired outcomes of the funding; d) the money is allocated and spent; and e) subsequently dioceses share learning on their use of their funding. Money would only be withheld from a diocese if there were serious concerns about its failure to achieve what it planned to do or if there was a lack of evidence that the monies were being directed to the poorest communities.

Is there a risk that the proposals about accountability will lead to a more 'centralist' approach?

The aim of our proposals is to support dioceses' plans for mission and growth. This involves dismantling the current central planning systems which have influenced national funding decisions. There is not a 'Church of England' strategy; there are 42 diocesan strategies. Our proposals will ensure national funding supports those strategies where there is most need and opportunity. The evaluation of dioceses' use of funding will be undertaken by peer review so that dioceses can learn from each other how they are deploying the Church's resources and so develop stronger mutual accountability.

Does the funding earmarked for proactive investment in growth opportunities also have to be used in the poorest communities?

No. Dioceses should support their greatest growth opportunities wherever they are. However, we believe there should be some bias to the poor in the distribution of national funding – and wherever financial support is provided care is taken to ensure that it genuinely supplements local resources.

What do you mean by 'proactive investment in new growth opportunities'?

It will be for dioceses to decide. It is not a push towards 'novelty'; tried and tested mission activity will be supported, for example, where there is opportunity to support it in new settings (e.g. as a result of population shifts). The focus is on extending the Church's reach – in whatever form and in whatever setting that dioceses believe will make a significant difference to the Church's mission. "New opportunities" needs to be taken in the broadest sense; they could include major expansion at an existing church whose ambition is being limited by finance.

Is this the national church pushing an agenda on dioceses to conform mission to certain activity?

No. There is no such agenda in the national church. These changes will help dioceses take control and pursue their own visions, whatever that may be. Dioceses will be able, in each funding stream, to receive funds which fit with their own strategic priorities. This may include support for mission enablers, administrators, prophets, pastors, evangelists, visionaries, risk-takers, apologists and pioneers.

Will the focus on evaluation mean that the riskier projects are cut out? What about those with benefits which are hard to measure, or mainly have benefits in the long term? Or indeed initiatives where God may surprise us?

The focus on evaluation will mean that the Church can have confidence that its mutually shared resources are being stewarded effectively. High risk and long-term projects can receive funds if the potential benefit can be shown to be worth the risk. Funding decisions need to be informed by a clear view of what it is hoped will be achieved, acknowledging that God can always surprise us.

Does the Church know enough about the causes of church growth to ensure that any significant investment in funding is well-spent?

The evidence base relating to church growth has increased significantly over recent years as a result of the church growth research programme (<http://www.churchgrowthresearch.org.uk/>). Nobody pretends that there is a simple relationship between cause and effect but there is a growing amount of information about what is likely to support growth – or likely to maintain decline. Funding decisions can and should be informed by this information so that the Church's money is put to best effect.

Will the prospect of the Church Commissioners making more money available for distribution risk creating more financial dependency and reducing giving levels?

Our proposals involve a shift from a formulaic subsidy system to one which directs funding to where there is genuine need to support mission in the poorest communities. The peer review process governing the distribution of funding to dioceses for this purpose will have the specific aim of promoting dioceses' financial strength and sustainability. The funding given to dioceses for proactive investment in growth will be distributed on a matched funding basis so that there is a commitment at the outset to the financial sustainability of any new mission work supported.

Do dioceses have the capacity to take forward their ambitions to increase their number of ministers and make other necessary changes to advance their mission and growth?

A number of diocesan leadership teams have expressed a desire to improve their capacity to be strategic about their mission activity and leadership requirements, given the huge range of day-to-day issues that face them. We propose that some national funding should be earmarked to support diocesan teams so they have increased capacity to develop and deliver their plans for change. There will need to be discussions with dioceses about what would best help them.

Is the transition to the new funding arrangement too long in view of the seriousness of the Church's decline?

An orderly transition is required so that dioceses do not face sudden large swings in their funding levels which will undermine their mission and growth plans. Most dioceses will face minor

changes; the ten year period allows an orderly transition for all. The ‘cost’ of the transition arrangements, if no extra funding is available, is that there will be not be as much money available as we would like in the short-term for proactive investment in new growth opportunities. We hope therefore that the Church Commissioners will be able to make some more money available to help speed up the pace of change.

Resourcing Ministerial Education in the Church of England

A report from the Task Group

8. Our vision as a Task Group is of a growing church with a flourishing ministry. We hope therefore to see
- **every minister equipped to offer collaborative leadership in mission and to be adaptable in a rapidly changing context**
 - **a cohort of candidates for ministry who are younger, more diverse and with a wider range of gifts to serve God's mission**
 - **an increase of at least 50% in ordinations on 2013 figures sustained annually from 2020**
 - **the rapid development of lay ministries**
 - **a continued commitment to an ordained and lay ministry which serves the whole Church both geographically and in terms of church tradition.**

How should selection and training be reimaged and reshaped?

33. The Task Group offers a range of 12 specific proposals for testing and refinement, first in dialogue with the General Synod and then in wider consultation with Dioceses and training institutions. These proposals relate to every stage from selection to taking the role of responsibility and leadership, since the stages are linked and together sustain the value of the whole process. Some of the proposals are concerned with improvement in quality of selection and training. Others form the basis for a significant change in the way ministerial education is funded which is aimed at encouraging growth in numbers of ministers.

Proposal 1: Criteria, Reporting and Assessment

34. In order to ensure high standard outcomes, the **selection criteria and the selection process will be reviewed** in the light of current and future needs for ministry. **Reporting and assessment processes** from selection through IME Phases 1 and 2 need also to be reviewed to support the development of candidates and to ensure consistency all through the formation process.

Proposal 2: Personal Learning Plans and Bishops' Guidelines

35. All candidates will have a **personal learning plan** agreed with the diocese and covering the whole of IME to provide a flexible programme geared to individual need. **Bishops Regulations for training will be replaced with flexible, indicative norms (Bishops Guidelines)**. The plan would be drafted as part of the selection papers and then reviewed at key points during IME.

Proposal 3: Priority national funding

36. **Special national funds** are proposed to continue to resource gifted individuals in training to prepare for strategic roles, for example in foundational theological work leading to teaching or research, as missional leaders, as those committed to serve in poorer dioceses including

those in context based training in poorer parishes. These would supplement the standard grant (see Proposal 6 below) and be administered nationally.

Proposal 4: September Ordinations

37. In order to make the most of the investment in IME, it is proposed that **ordinations will be moved to September each year**. This will provide more time available for formation and study and adds to the educational and training value of the final year of training by as much as one third.

Proposal 5: Investment in candidates after ordination

38. In contrast to the present restriction on the use of Vote 1, it is proposed that funds may be **invested in candidates after as well as before ordination**, opening up the possibility of “Teach First” type schemes for ordination training and creating the option of accelerating the vocational process in the case of candidates suited to this.

Proposal 6: A standard level of grant for tuition

39. In place of the current Vote 1 system and Bishops’ Regulations, decisions about training pathways for individuals should be made in the diocese, in consultation with the candidate. **Each recommended candidate will attract a standard level of grant for tuition from a central fund to which all dioceses contribute in a similar way to the present Vote 1**. The grant may be used in a range of ways as the diocese sees fit, provided the training is from an approved provider. The diocese will decide whether resources additional to the standard grant need to be invested in the candidate’s future ministry, in each case according to need. No recommendation has been made at this stage about the level at which the standard grant should be set, though it is envisaged that it will be sufficient to enable a candidate to pursue an IME pathway leading to ordination.

Proposal 7: Pooling of maintenance grants

40. The **pooling of grants for maintenance** of candidates families during training will be **discontinued** and each diocese will cover these costs for its sponsored candidates. We believe this will give the dioceses freedom to determine how much of their training budget should be invested directly in ministerial education and how much in the support of candidates families.

Proposal 8: Candidates over 50

41. Candidates who will be under 50 at ordination will continue to attend a BAP, to ensure national commonality of standards. Candidates over the age of 50 at ordination **will be selected locally by the bishop**. Candidates over 50 at ordination will not receive the standard pooled grant: **the cost of their training** will fall directly to the diocese.

Proposal 9: Transfer of Sponsorship

42. The Task Group proposes also to explore ways to facilitate through financial and other means the **transfer of sponsorship of candidates** at the time of selection to dioceses where ministers are needed, and in particular to poorer dioceses.

Proposal 10: Increasing investment in IME 2 and CMD

43. To sustain the effectiveness of IME 1 into the first appointment and beyond, **the quality of IME Phase 2 and CMD provision need significant overall improvement**. The Task group proposes a development fund providing a substantial sum per annum to which dioceses can apply for matched funding to provide leadership development in preparation for posts of first responsibility. Similar provision of a fund for training for ministers in subsequent posts of responsibility is also proposed in order to sustain the effectiveness of IME. Grants would be made to kite marked schemes which can demonstrate high quality outcomes.

Proposal 11: Length of training posts

44. We propose to explore **benchmarking training posts to three years** as a norm rather than four as at present, though it would be open to dioceses to chose a longer period or indeed a shorter one for an individual candidate. The length of curacy should be determined by the time the candidate needs to meet the Formation Criteria. On the basis of the RME research we believe this will not significantly reduce the effectiveness of IME Phase 2.

Proposal 12: Candidates for Lay Ministry

45. In the Resourcing the Future Report, lay ministry plays a very significant part in the vision for future ministry articulated by dioceses. Overall, there is an aspiration to see numbers of volunteer lay ministers of different kinds grow by 48% (to over 17,500) and of paid lay ministers grow by 69% (to over 2,000). Further work will be done over the coming months to explore how dioceses envisage the development of lay ministry in more detail. We propose the application of **additional national funding to education for lay ministry** in three streams:

- Creating the possibility of the recognition of candidates for particular lay ministries through a national selection process and the funding of their training in a similar way to ordinands
- Matched funding available to dioceses to enhance their provision for lay ministry development (in parallel with Proposal 10 above)
- Funding to ensure that the Church maximises the value of the Common Awards for lay education and training in dioceses.

Report of the Simplification Task Group

Summary of Key Recommendations

Clergy (Terms of Service) Measure 2009 and Regulations

Regulation 29 and short-term appointments

1. Amend Regulation 29 to extend the circumstances in which offices under common tenure may be held for a fixed or limited term by allowing:
 - a. Extension (for no more than a year) of the short-term licence of a curate who has satisfactorily completed IME 4-7 but is still looking for a post of first responsibility.
 - b. Appointment of an assistant curate as a locally supported minister provided he or she is not priest-in-charge of the benefice.
 - c. Appointment to interim or turnaround posts for three years (renewable once only). Before designating a post as an interim appointment the Bishop must obtain the consent of the DMPC, office holder (if any) and PCC.
2. The Archbishops' Council to issue guidance on the designation of posts as interim posts.

(Paragraphs 15 to 26)

Statements of Particulars

3. Streamline Statements of Particulars (SoPS) for Self-Supporting Ministers, including by:
 - a. Simplifying arrangements for sickness reporting and time off.
 - b. Amending Regulation 27 so that the need to provide a medical certificate applies only to clergy in receipt of a stipend.

(Paragraphs 27 to 29)

Capability Procedure

4. We do not propose changes to the capability procedure, which rightly reflects best practice in the modern world. The accompanying guidance, however, needs to be revised to emphasise that:
 - The periods for improvement (as distinct from the expiry of warnings) do not have to be lengthy
 - Using the procedure should be a last resort
 - Full use needs to be made of other ways of helping clergy to be more effective such as MDR.

(Paragraphs 30 to 34)

Mission and Pastoral Measure 2011

Pastoral Reorganisation

New form of Bishop's Pastoral Order

5. Introduce a new class of Bishop's Pastoral Order covering a range of "administrative" decisions which do not significantly impact on the legal rights of individuals or the status of churches (e.g. creation or alteration of archdeaconries or deaneries, dissolution of vacant archdeaconry, alteration of benefice or parish names, termination of group ministries).

Remove the right of statutory interested parties to be consulted about such decisions and to make representations to the Church Commissioners.

(Paragraphs 41 to 43)

Streamlined consultation on draft Schemes and other Pastoral Orders

6. Streamline consultation of statutory interested parties on substantive pastoral reorganisation, limiting this to two stages: initial consultation on the issues, followed by consultation on proposals in the form of a draft Scheme or Order.

(Paragraphs 44 to 45)

Proposals implementing a deanery plan

7. A statutory presumption in favour of proposals to implement a Deanery Plan validated by the DMPC unless material considerations dictate otherwise. For such proposals consultation should be on the draft scheme only (initial consultation stage on the issues is not required).

(Paragraphs 46 to 48)

Arrangements for drafting and publishing draft schemes

8. Drafting, publishing and consulting on draft schemes to be undertaken either by the Diocese or the Church Commissioners, as the Bishop desires.

(Paragraph 49)

Mode of consultation

9. Provide for notices to be read out at services in affected parishes, and draft schemes publicised on the Church of England website (with links on diocesan websites), to improve consultation and engagement.

(Paragraph 50 to 51)

Representations and Public Hearings

10. Simplify arrangements for dealing with representations in respect of draft Schemes and Orders by:
 - a. Endorsing the Church Commissioners' emerging proposal to simplify its public hearing process through a pre-hearing sift to determine cases which can be dealt with on the paperwork.
 - b. Giving the Commissioners a power, exercisable with the Bishop's consent, to amend a Scheme or Order, having considered representations, and to determine whether a further second-stage consultation is required.

(Paragraphs 52 to 53)

Teams and Groups

11. Streamline the provisions for teams and groups, including removal of enabling provisions for matters more suitably dealt with by licence, and of administrative requirements, such as holding meetings, which do not really belong in legislation.
12. Conduct a wider review of the operation of teams and groups, particularly in the rural context, taking into account other emerging forms of collaborative ministry.

(Paragraphs 54 to 57)

Church Buildings

13. In respect of church buildings:
- a. Amend Canon B14A to enable the Bishop to direct the use of a building for occasional services of worship only to support the concept of “festival churches”.
 - b. Support the establishment of a group to review issues regarding church buildings and, in particular, the options for change on how closed church buildings are dealt with.
 - c. Streamlining the consultation arrangements for draft schemes providing for alternative uses for closed church buildings by removing the need for statutory public consultation on such proposals (except where there are burials within the building or any surrounding churchyard).
 - d. Simplify the provisions dealing with membership of the Churches Conservation Trust to enable the appointment of additional trustees.

(Paragraphs 58 to 64)

Bishops’ Mission Orders

14. Simplify the arrangements for Bishops’ Mission Orders by:
- a. Streamlining the recommended practice on initial exploration to address concerns regarding its complexity.
 - b. Removing the requirement for an initial order to operate for no more than five years.
 - c. Removing much of the prescriptive provision relating to the role of the Visitor.
 - d. Providing additional guidance on matters such as charitable status and representation.
 - e. Serving notice of BMOs on the Church Commissioners to facilitate sharing good practice and collation of statistics.

(Paragraphs 65 to 74)

Compensation for loss of Office (by pastoral reorganisation)

15. Amend the existing provisions for compensation for loss of office as a result of pastoral reorganisation by:
- a. Replacing the existing compensation provisions calculated on future service and financial loss with compensation based on the length of past stipendiary ecclesiastical service in years.
 - b. Providing a lump sum cash payment based on one month’s stipend for every year of service, capped at twenty one months’ stipend in total (but providing for a minimum cash payment of six months stipend regardless of length of service).
 - c. Providing suitable housing for a period of six months.
 - d. Compensating clergy for loss of pensionable service as part of the lump sum.
 - e. Applying the compensation arrangements to all office holders regardless of when they took office including clergy on historic freehold.

(Paragraphs 75 to 84)

Other Measures / Areas

Endowments and Glebe Measure 1976

16. Remove the requirement to consult incumbents and PCCs on glebe transactions.

(Paragraphs 85 to 86)

Patronage (Benefices) Measure 1986

17. In relation to the Patronage (Benefices) Measure 1986:
 - a. Provide for the right of presentation to lapse to the Diocesan Bishop rather than the Archbishop of the Province after nine months.
 - b. Examine the scope for further streamlining of processes and paperwork. Other aspects of the Measure could also be simplified and brought up to date.
 - c. Consider whether a more fundamental review of the Measure should be undertaken.

(Paragraphs 87 to 88)

National Clergy Payroll

18. The Church Commissioners to provide clarification and improved guidance on when a post is an office and thus eligible to be paid through the clergy payroll (in addition to further planned discussions with HMRC on the tax implications of HLC and provided housing where clergy are not full time office holders).

(Paragraphs 89 to 90)

Availability of Guidance

19. Encourage further consideration of how best to publicise the availability of guidance on legislation and encourage greater ease of access through the Church of England website.

(Paragraphs 91 to 92)

Developing Discipleship

What should we then do?

41. Further reflection on discipleship is needed, but where is it to take place and how will it impact the life and the deep culture of the Church of England?
42. There are many things which can be done by individuals and within local churches to strengthen and develop our common understanding of discipleship. This General Synod paper might helpfully be studied by PCC's and small groups as a way of beginning that conversation.
43. This paper outlines three ways of moving forward in dioceses and nationally. Others may emerge from the General Synod debate.

Ten Marks of Developing Disciples

44. The first is to commend to dioceses and parishes the Ten Marks of a Diocese committed to Developing Disciples appended to this paper. They are very much provisional and work in progress. Dioceses are invited to further develop and explore them as a contribution to good practice.
45. These marks have been drawn together by staff of the Education Division, MPA and the Ministry Division. They are drawn out of the research on current good practice across the dioceses in 2013.
46. As presently drafted they describe healthy marks within a diocese. However, all of the marks can and should apply equally to parishes, benefices and fresh expressions of church.

A new theological conversation on discipleship and ministry

As part of re-imagining ministry, the Ministry Council has drawn together a group of theologians, bishops and theological educators to work together to resource a new theological conversation on discipleship and ministry.

This group will prepare the ground for a larger conversation between bishops, theologians and theological educators on these themes in September 2015, as part of the College of Bishops.

It is hoped that following that conversation a group will develop fresh theological resources in this area for the General Synod in the next quinquennium.

A Revised Catechism

- a) The Catechism of the Church of England is an important but neglected document. Little use has been made of the catechism as an aid to teaching or as a resource for lived discipleship for many years (although the Pilgrim material is based to some extent on the catechism).

The present Catechism is a faithful summary of Anglican belief yet is written primarily as a resource for children growing up into the faith in a predominantly Christian society rather than as a resource for children and adults aiming to live out their discipleship in a complex and changing world.

However the Catechism is one very significant place where it is possible for the Church of England to reflect upon and express its common understanding of discipleship and, in commentaries and reflections, to resource this area of Christian life.

The motion before Synod commends to the House of Bishops the need to develop and revise the Catechism in the next five years and to commission resources to help the whole Church explore and live out our common discipleship.

TEN MARKS OF A DIOCESE COMMITTED TO DEVELOPING DISCIPLES

In a diocese committed to developing disciples ...

1. ...A lifelong journey of discipleship and growth in Christian maturity is supported and modelled by all.

The diocese offers opportunities for nurturing faith, prayer and discipleship across all generations, so that all Christians continually grow as followers of Jesus in their understanding and their actions.

2. ...The importance of discipleship in daily life is affirmed.

Events, publications and statements at all levels of diocesan activity highlight and support the role of Christians living out their faith as they seek to build the Kingdom of God in the wider community, workplace and home.

3. ...Gatherings for worship celebrate the discipleship of all the baptised.

The discipleship of the whole people of God is celebrated in the liturgy by word and symbol in the worship of congregations and on diocesan occasions such as the induction of ministers into parishes.

4. ...Disciples are equipped to help others to become followers of Jesus.

The diocese offers deliberate planning and resourcing to enable congregations and individuals in their witness to Christ, and develops support networks with those involved in ministries such as lay evangelists or lay pioneers.

5.Diocesan work on vocations is based on the principle that all the baptised are called into God's service.

Vocations advisers strategically promote opportunities to work with all Christians to discern and develop their calling and ministry in both the world and the church.

6. ...Good practice in facilitating learning and formation is developed.

Laity, clergy and parishes are regularly resourced and equipped with high levels of expertise in using facilitation skills, learning methodologies and approaches to catechesis and formation.

7.Gifts of leadership are recognised and developed among all the baptised.

A share in spiritual leadership, governance and witness in the wider community is affirmed by lay and ordained alike, and such affirmation is embedded in diocesan processes (e.g. Articles of Enquiry, Mission Action Plans and Ministry Development Review).

8. ...Innovation and experiment are encouraged in mission, ministry and discipleship.

The diocese promotes and affirms new developments in forms of church life, in which disciples – lay and ordained alike - grow as they are released into new areas of active service and ministry.

9. ...Specific diocesan policies and plans promote discipleship development

As an integral part of diocesan strategy there are current theologically rooted plans, projects and programmes in place to encourage and resource discipleship development.

10. ...Diocesan resources are committed to the development of the whole people of God. Resources of staff and money and time are allocated, and their effectiveness in enabling discipleship development of all regularly reviewed and assessed.

A Note from the Secretary General following the February 2015 meeting of the General Synod

A Programme for Reform and Renewal – Post-Synod Briefing

At the end of the Group of Sessions last Thursday a member of the Synod asked if a briefing note could be prepared to help Synod members report back to dioceses and deaneries about the Reform and Renewal Programme and what is to happen next. This note has been prepared in response to that request. It has no formal status but can be circulated or drawn on as Synod members find helpful.

What is the aim of the programme?

The programme has emerged from work undertaken by a number of Task Groups. It is designed to enable the Church of England to be better equipped for meeting the significant challenges that it faces as a result of decades of declining church attendance and an increasing age profile. As the Archbishops said in GS 1976, *‘Renewing and reforming aspects of our institutional life is a necessary but far from sufficient response to the challenges facing the Church of England.’*

Last week Synod members engaged with six elements of the emerging programme; a paper on **Developing Discipleship**; a report on **Resourcing Ministerial Education**; a report on **Resourcing the Future**; proposals relating to **Simplification** of the Church’s rulebook; new arrangements for **Discerning and Nurturing Senior Leaders**; and a paper on the possibility of some additional time-limited distributions from **Church Commissioner funds** to help support elements of the programme.

The programme will, in due course, include various other elements including what emerges from the Archbishops’ Task Group on Evangelism, which is due to report in the next few months.

What did Synod decide in February?

Synod spent more than a day engaging with various strands of the programme, with presentations, questions, discussions in small groups and larger groups and four debates. Only a limited number of decisions were taken at this stage. This was partly because further development and consultations with a range of stakeholders are still needed on many of the proposals before final decisions are taken. It was also because Synod is the decision-making body on some issues – most notably those which require legislation – but not on others.

The texts of the four motions that Synod passed on the Wednesday afternoon is attached as an annex. In summary, the Synod:

- Commended the ten marks for developing **Discipleship** set out in GS 1977 and invited the House of Bishops to prepare a Revised Catechism and also to identify and commission other resources;
- Welcomed the objectives and vision in the **Resourcing Ministerial Education and Resourcing the Future reports** (see below) and invited the Archbishops’ Council and the House of Bishops to reach early decisions on the specific recommendations in each report once the current consultation period was over, these decisions then to return to Synod for scrutiny before implementation;
- Welcomed the proposals in the **Simplification** report and, once further comments were received from dioceses and others, asked for the necessary amending legislation to be brought to the Synod for more detailed scrutiny;
- Supported the proposal that the **Church Commissioners** should, for a limited period, release additional funds.

Since they were specifically welcomed in the relevant motion it is worth noting that the objective of the Resourcing the Future report is set out at paragraph 4 of GS 1978 as follows:

‘Removing the current formula systems which provide mechanical, ineffective subsidy and replacing them with investment focussed on fulfilling dioceses’ strategic plans for growth, with a strong bias towards the poor.’

The vision set out in paragraph 8 of the Resourcing Ministerial Education report and welcomed by the Synod is as follows:

- **Every minister equipped to offer collaborative leadership in mission and to be adaptable in a rapidly changing context**
- **A cohort of candidates for ministry who are younger, more diverse and with a wider range of gifts to serve God’s mission**
- **An increase of at least 50% in ordinations on 2013 figures sustained annually from 2020**
- **The rapid development of lay ministries**
- **A continued commitment to an ordained and lay ministry which serves the whole Church both geographically and in terms of church tradition.**

What happens next?

Each of the various strands of work – and also the separate strand on ‘Optimising the Role of the National Church Institutions’ (GS Misc 1094) – has its own work plan, timescales and decision-making processes.

In relation to **Discipleship** the next steps at national level are for the House of Bishops to consider, in May, the proposal to set in hand the preparation of a Revised Catechism. In addition it is proposed that there should be a larger conversation among bishops and others about discipleship and ministry at the September meeting of the College of Bishops. It is also for dioceses to study and reflect on the proposals in the report with a view to developing in each diocese an action plan.

In relation to the **Development and Nurturing of Senior Leaders**, the Archbishops and the House of Bishops have agreed an implementation plan, as set out in GS 1982. The first programme for the mini-MBA is being held next month and arrangements are underway for identifying the participants for the Leadership Development Programme. The Archbishop’s Review Group, which has met for the first time this week, and the House of Bishops’ Development and Appointments Group will be overseeing the new arrangements.

The Archbishops agreed that there needed to be further reporting back to Synod and the opportunity for further engagement. A Private Member’s Motion designed to give the Synod the opportunity to take note of the related Faith and Order Commission report on Senior Church Leadership has attracted sufficient signatures for debate and it will be for the Business Committee to decide whether this should be scheduled for July.

There will now be extensive consultation with diocesan teams in the coming months over the implications of both the **Resourcing the Future** and **Resourcing Ministerial Education** reports. In the case of the latter there will also be careful discussion with the Theological Education Institutions.

There are still many detailed matters to be settled about the implementation of the new funding formula for distributing resources to dioceses, the transitional arrangements and the criteria for allocating money in support of dioceses’ strategic plans for growth. The intention is that these new funding arrangements would start to operate from the beginning of 2017.

That means the Archbishops' Council will be taking decisions late this year or early next, though precise figures would not be available until after the Commissioners' actuarial valuation in spring 2016. The most likely timing of a Synod debate to scrutinise the Council's decisions before they are implemented is, therefore, next February.

In the case of the **Resourcing Ministerial Education** report the expectation is that the first cohort that might be affected by the specific proposals coming out of the review would be that starting training in September 2017. That means that it would be the budget coming to the Synod in July 2016 which would be the first to be set reflecting any new agreed arrangements. Again, therefore, the likelihood is that decisions will be taken by the Archbishops' Council and the House of Bishops when they each meet this December, in the light of the extensive consultations over the coming months. These too would then be the subject of Synodical scrutiny next February.

The **Simplification** report proposes a wide range of changes to the Church's rule-book. It will be for the Archbishops' Council and the House of Bishops to decide in May whether to bring to Synod in July the proposed amendment of Regulation 29, to make it easier for short-term appointments to be made under Common Tenure.

The more wide-ranging changes proposed to the Mission and Pastoral Measure will require fresh primary legislation which cannot, in practice, be introduced until early in the life of the Synod which will meet for the first time in November. The proposals in the report will be the subject of detailed consultation over the coming months before the draft legislation is prepared.

In addition the Optimising the Role of the NCIs report canvassed the idea of a new enabling measure which would make it significantly easier in future to change Church legislation. The Archbishops' Council will be considering this proposal in more detail in March and is likely to issue a consultation document with a view to taking decisions in the autumn. Any such enabling measure would potentially be for introduction early in the life of the new Synod.

It is now for the **Church Commissioners** to consider the basis on which they might, for a period, be prepared to release additional funds over and above the normal amount which they make available for distribution. Specific requests for additional funding would need to be made by the Archbishops' Council, in consultation with the House of Bishops and the dioceses in the light of the emerging conclusions on the various elements of the reform programme.

How can people keep in touch with what is happening?

There will, as set out above, be specific consultations on various elements of the programme. In addition, all dioceses have been offered the opportunity of an engagement event over the next few months to draw into the discussion a wider range of people than the diocesan senior team. A number of members of the Archbishops' Council have agreed to make themselves available to take part in these events. In addition there will be progress reports in advance of each group of session and in some cases further debates.

William Fittall
Secretary General
17 February 2015

DISCIPLESHIP (GS 1977)

‘That this Synod, mindful that the Church of Jesus Christ inspired by the glory and grace of God shown in the face of Jesus Christ and is called to be a community of missionary disciples and in view of its resolution of November 2013 which highlighted the priority of evangelism and making new disciples:

- (a) commend the Ten Marks for Developing Discipleship for further study and reflection with a view to the development in each diocese of an action plan for implementation at diocesan, deanery and parochial level; and
- (b) invite the House of Bishops:
 - (i) to prepare a new Revised Catechism with a view to its approval by the General Synod under Canon B 2; and
 - (ii) to identify and commission other resources to help the whole Church to live out our common discipleship.’

RESOURCING THE FUTURE (GS 1978) AND RESOURCING MINISTERIAL EDUCATION (GS 1979)

‘That this Synod,

welcoming the objective set out in paragraph 4 of **GS 1978** of investment focused on dioceses’ strategic plans for growth, and with a strong bias to the poor; and

the vision set out in paragraph 8 of **GS 1979**,

invite the Archbishops’ Council and the House of Bishops to reach early decisions on the specific recommendations in the two reports once the current consultation period with dioceses, theological training institutions and others is concluded and bring those decisions back to Synod for more detailed scrutiny before implementation.’

SIMPLIFICATION (GS 1980)

‘That this Synod, welcoming the proposals in **GS 1980** and noting the support that the Archbishops’ Council, the Church Commissioners and the House of Bishops have given them, invite the Archbishops’ Council and the Business Committee, in the light of any comments from dioceses and others, to bring the necessary amending legislation to the Synod for more detailed scrutiny.’

CHURCH COMMISSIONERS’ FUNDS AND INTER-GENERATIONAL EQUITY (GS 1981)

‘That this Synod,

welcoming **GS 1981**; and

noting that the funds of the Church Commissioners are a permanent endowment, held in perpetuity to support the Church of England as it seeks to proclaim the faith afresh in each generation,

support the Commissioners, in consultation with the House of Bishops and the Archbishops’ Council, giving consideration to the basis on which they might, for a limited period, release additional funds in order to support changes that will equip the Church of England more effectively for sustainable mission and ministry over the coming generations.’