DIOCESE OF CHELMSFORD
DIOCESAN SYNOD

There will be a meeting of the Diocesan Synod via Zoom on Saturday 20 March 2021

Members of the public will be able to view the proceedings of the Synod meeting on the Diocese of Chelmsford’s YouTube channel - https://www.youtube.com/user/chelmsforddiocese

AGENDA

Timings
09:15  MEETING OF HOUSE OF CLERGY
See separate agenda

09:30  OPENING WORSHIP
Led by the Bishop of Bradwell

09:45  1. NOTICES

09:50  2. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING 21 NOVEMBER 2020
Attached

3. PROMULGATION OF AMENDING CANONS NO 40 AND 41
Paper DS(2021)01 attached

09:55  4. PRESIDENTIAL ADDRESS

10.10  5. RACIAL JUSTICE TASK AND FINISH GROUP UPDATE
Paper DS(2021)02 attached

10.20  6. UPDATE ON CLERGY DEPLOYMENT MOTION
Verbal update from the Bishop of Barking

10.30  BREAK

10.40  7. INTERIM MINISTRY REPORT
Presentation from the Revd Helen Georgiou Gould (Interim Ministry and Vacancy Advisor)

11.00  8. QUESTIONS see notes for details
9. **LIVING IN LOVE AND FAITH**  
   Paper DS(2021)03 attached

11:40 **BREAK**

11:50 10. **CHURCH PLANTING AND PIONEER MINISTRY**  
   Presentation led by the Revd Canon Dave Wade (Head of New Christian Communities)

12:35 11. **QUINQUENNIAL INSPECTION SCHEME**  
   Paper DS(2021)04 attached

   The Chair to move that:

   ‘This Synod, in accordance with the Ecclesiastical Jurisdiction and Care of Churches Measure 2018 as amended by the Church of England (Miscellaneous Provisions) (No.2) Measure 2019, approve the Diocesan Quinquennial Inspection Scheme as set out in paper DS(2021)04.’

12:45 12. **BISHOP'S COUNCIL, DMPC AND FINANCE COMMITTEE REPORTS**  
   Paper DS(2021)05 attached

12:50 **CLOSE**

**NOTES**

**Questions:** In accordance with Standing Order 29 five days prior notice is required. Questions must be received no later than 9am on 15 March 2021 by email only to nwhitehead@chelmsford.anglican.org

In accordance with Standing Orders 74 and 75, members are encouraged to use this opportunity to seek information from any officer of the Synod or senior member of Diocesan staff relating to their duties or from the President of Synod or the Chair of any body constituted by the Synod or on which it is represented. Questions shall relate to the duties assigned to officers, or in the case of the Chair of any body, to the business of that body. Questions shall not ask for an expression of opinion or for the solution of an abstract legal question or a hypothetical problem.

In accordance with Standing Order 74, a member may ask up to two original questions at one meeting. Any member may ask a supplementary question in relation to the original question; the Chair may allow up to three supplementary questions, giving the member who tabled the original question preference.

Questions for written answer are also possible, and are often the best way of; obtaining a detailed response, particularly on a complex issue: answers will be given to the questioner within 24 days of the Synod and will be reported in the Minutes.

**Speeches** – members are requested to announce their name and deanery before they address Synod.

Please forward apologies to Nathan Whitehead tel. no. 01245 294412 or nwhitehead@chelmsford.anglican.org
PRESENT : The President and 125 Members

The Bishop of Colchester led the opening worship.

1. NOTICES

The Chair highlighted the following points on the day paper:

- A note on the appropriate use of the Zoom chat function.
- A proposed motion from Braintree Deanery Synod, which members were being asked to confirm whether they support.
- A reminder that the meeting was being livestreamed.
- The 2021 Diocesan Synod meeting dates.

2. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING

The minutes of the previous meeting were approved subject to an amendment under page 10 bullet point 3, deleting the word ‘incorrect’ and replace with ‘a bit high’.

3. PRESIDENTIAL ADDRESS

The Acting Bishop of Chelmsford delivered his Presidential Address. The text and video of the address can be downloaded here:


4. RACIAL JUSTICE TASK GROUP UPDATE

The Bishop of Colchester confirmed that this group had met a couple of times. The National Task Group had also met a few times. The National Task Group had identified five key areas to focus their work around. The Diocesan Group has identified slightly different areas of focus, but there is some overlap.

The National Task Group has compiled a long list of all the recommendations produced in the area of racial justice since 1985. It showed that little action had been taken and this is sobering. The group are mindful of other projects ongoing, such as St Paul’s Cathedral’s project on monuments and memorials. We will be considering what we do with historic issues.
There is a real hope that the level of engagement will be so high this time round that we will see significant changes.

5. REFLECTIONS ON 2020 FROM THE YOUTH SYNOD

The Chair invited Hannah Mickleburg-Gardham to share reflections from the Youth Synod and their reflections upon this year (for full contribution please see appended document). These included:

- Different impacts which the pandemic and lockdown had had on people, particularly the more vulnerable.
- Some members had lost contact with their Church, others were still engaged, although all found it difficult to have conversations from afar.
- One youth synod member commented that this is a time when we understand who we are.
- There were stresses with exams and school work, many had struggled to engage.
- In some cases the distance has strengthened relationships with others.
- There are constant changes and most felt it was good to have structure to some extent.
- The Church can best engage with young people in these challenges.
- Hannah shared personal experience of working with Ambulance Services and the impact the pandemic and lockdown had on mental health and the isolation some experienced, particularly people in care homes.

The Chair thanked Hannah for the reflections and asked her to pass the thanks on to the Youth Synod.

6. QUESTIONS

Q.1: Revd James Rodley (Harlow) to ask the Chief Executive and Diocesan Secretary:

With regard to the proposal “THE DEPLOYMENT AND AFFORDABILITY OF STIPENDIARY INCUMBENTS”:

(a) - why is it thought appropriate, both legally and morally, to use "Transition Funding" from the Church Commissioners to pay for the process by which clergy are deprived of their posts, but not to use this funding to support them in that ministry, even for an interim period?

(b) - of the approximately 31 clergy (2019 figures as supplied to Synod) in the Diocese who still have freehold of their posts, how many of them have freehold of posts that are now categorised as "red" or "amber", potentially rendering thereby inaccurate the analysis of posts submitted in this proposal to this Synod?
A.  
(a) It is inappropriate to give an opinion on the question. The Archbishops’ Council has made Strategic Transformation Funding available to support restructuring initiatives in dioceses. The aim is to support dioceses as they undertake restructuring to provide a platform for growth with sustainable financial and clergy deployment plans. To continue to fund posts that are being restructured, even on an interim basis, is unfortunately not sustainable and the Strategic Transformation Fund could not be used for this purpose.

(b) Given the relatively small number of our incumbents who retain Freehold, it would be inappropriate to provide a detailed answer until all post-holders are informed of their RAG coding. However, I can confirm that the percentages in each category are similar between Freehold and Common Tenure post-holders. While there are different rights and responsibilities associated with appointments held under Freehold and Common Tenure, we are not approaching the task of reducing clergy numbers through a legislative process. The closing or restructuring of posts will be made by mutual consent and those clergy holding office under Freehold will be treated in the same pastoral and vocational way as those under Common Tenure.

Supplementary questions

Q. Will consideration be given to the use of the transition funding in rural areas as well as urban?

A. This is a matter for Archbishops’ Council to decide.

Q. Is the process for dispossession more onerous than other options?

A. The Chief Executive stated that he had answered the question earlier but would need to take legal advice if a more detailed answer was to be given.

Q2. Revd Canon David Banting (General Synod) to ask the Acting Bishop of Chelmsford:

In the event of that there is a woman Bishop in the Diocese of Chelmsford what preparations are being made by the senior leadership in the diocese to consult with the Bishop of Maidstone (also an Assistant Bishop in this diocese) about the use and development of his role in serving those parishes who have in good and respected conscience petitioned the Ordinary under the House of Bishops Declaration to provide episcopal arrangements according to their theological convictions and in helping facilitate the transition of good relationships, in the spirit and framework of the Five Guiding Principles and this diocese’s ‘clear commitment to Mutual Flourishing’?

A.  
While no such preparations have as yet been made, this diocese and its senior leadership remain committed to mutual flourishing within the framework of the Five Guiding Principles. We are very aware that, in the event of the appointment of a woman bishop, we will need to take advantage of the ministry of the Bishop of
Maidstone in providing pastoral oversight for those parishes who have in good conscience petitioned the Ordinary under the House of Bishops Declaration and according to their theological convictions.

Supplementary question

Q. As Bishops are gatekeepers will an assurance be given that parishes who have petitioned will have access to the Bishop of Maidstone?

A. The Diocese is fully committed to the framework so the answer is yes. Parishes who have petitioned will have the pastoral oversight of the Bishop of Maidstone.

Q3. John Bloomer (Chelmsford North) to ask the Chief Executive and Diocesan Secretary:

DS(2020)13: Under “Implications for Benefices” it is highlighted that the effects on mission and ministry of the reduction in stipendiary clergy numbers will be planned for "in, and between, deaneries and especially in each Mission and Ministry Unit". How will MMUs be enabled to do this from a process and also a legal perspective, for example via provision of appropriate delegated authorities?

A.
I am grateful for John’s questions and want to celebrate the collaborative missional approach to ministry that is being demonstrated in so many of the Mission and Ministry Units that have been formed across the diocese. The “Implications for Benefices” paragraph in the paper is simply recognising that although overall numbers have to be set across the diocese, decisions on deployment of available ministerial resources are best determined locally in a process involving MMUs, deaneries and AMPCs. This is a continuation of the consultative and collaborative process started in 2012 and no new legislative provisions are needed.

Q4. John Bloomer (Chelmsford North) to ask the Chief Executive and Diocesan Secretary:

DS(2020)13: Cognisant of Bishop Stephen’s words from his Simple Guide to MMUs that they are an alternative to “simply forming larger and larger team ministries or benefices” (which has not been successful), can we be reassured that pastoral reorganisation to form yet larger shared benefices will be avoided if an MMU can provide collaborative arrangements for oversight and mission and ministry that are sustainable from a financial and personal/wellbeing perspective?

A.
The answer is yes, but! The aim is certainly that MMUs “provide collaborative arrangements for oversight of mission and ministry that are sustainable”. The ‘but’ arises simply because MMUs are not legal entities and ministers can only be licensed to a benefice. Therefore, it is the collaborative and missional focus of the MMU that is vital, not the size of the individual benefices that make up the MMU.
Q5. Revd Dan Pierce (Chelmsford North) to ask the Acting Diocesan Bishop:

DS(2020)13: While our current focus has been on reduction of stipendiary clergy numbers and improved stewardship, and while we recognise that we are awaiting the appointment of our new Bishop, would it be possible to establish a group to begin to develop and communicate a positive and hopeful narrative about the future life within the Diocese to counterbalance the dominant messaging regarding our short/mid term financial position? Approaching matters of change not "because" times are troubled but "in order to..." be more discerning, resourceful, resilient, strategic, accessible. This could perhaps integrate lessons learned from the lockdown, and include both laity and clergy.

A.
The point is well made and understood: balance in this is not easy.

Our necessary focus on finance, stewardship and clergy deployment in recent months has not diminished our commitment to and appreciation of transformative mission action that has continued across the diocese in these challenging times. Many good news stories of such action in our churches and communities have been profiled on our website and in diocesan communications such as ‘The View’ and ‘We Pray’. You will also see that at the heart of the messaging for the Generous God, Generous Disciples stewardship initiative, there will be a focus on how our giving resources flourishing mission and ministry.

Rather than the responsibility falling on a particular group, I believe such a positive approach to our diocesan missional future is a corporate responsibility shared by the whole people of God. As Advent hope beckons, a Covid vaccine is on the horizon, and a new Bishop is likely to be announced, we are all called afresh to spiritual renewal, and a Godly and resourceful future. We are in this together.

Supplementary questions

Q. What examples can we draw on that suggest that stewardship and clergy reductions will bring about the change that needs to happen?

A. The Biblical need for sacrificial giving is always with us. The Acting Bishop of Chelmsford gave his personal experience of the transformational nature of generous giving. In terms of reductions on stipendiary posts that is a difficult question, but the bottom line is that need has to match reality. We are not a rich diocese and unless we remedy this situation we will not be able to survive. We have to review and refocus in order to grow.

Q. Can we have the answers to the formal questions in advance of the Synod?

A. This question was ruled out of order as it did not relate to the original question.
7. THE DEPLOYMENT AND AFFORDABILITY OF STIPENDIARY INCUMBENTS

The Chair invited the Interim Chief Executive to speak to paper DS(2020)13. The Interim Chief Executive highlighted three points:

1. This is not the last word on the subject. The paper sets out a direction of travel and recommended next steps. There is a greater deal of confidence following conversations since the previous Synod meeting, however the world in which we live will continue to flex and adapt. We need to consider our work alongside finances and generosity. This is not work in isolation.

2. This is primarily a strategic paper, not a pastoral one. However, it was acknowledged that significant pastoral issues are involved so there will be additional work for senior staff. This needs to be held in mind to make sure we are moving at the right pace and not overwhelming people.

3. The paper is not a theological paper, the underpinnings of Transforming Presence still apply. One key theological point is the inevitability of change, the loss of old things and arrival of the new. The Church is experienced in helping people through bereavement so we will need to apply those skills. However, we also believe in a God who gives new beginnings. We should have a profound sense of hope that God has not finished with us yet.

The Interim Chief Executive commented that he wished to amend recommendation two. The intention is that conversations will have started by the date indicated. If pastoral reorganisation is required then the changes will take much longer.

The Chair invited members questions for clarification:

Philip Carnelley (Redbridge)
Rvd Dr Susan Lucas (Newham)
Piers Northam (Harlow)
Colin Setchfield (Waltham Forest)
Rvd Ernie Guest (Rochford)
Rvd Helen Gheorghiu Gould (Harlow)
Rvd Canon Darren Barlow (Thurrock)

The questions were:

- House for Duty posts are included at 0.2 cost, what are these costs? The Interim Chief Executive responded that this included the house provided by the Diocese and CMD support. There is a note in the paper that acknowledges that the simple figure used in the past needs to be updated.
- Where in the diocesan budget is the money for redundancies that these proposals will result in? The Interim Chief Executive responded that the money is not in the budget and that is why we are exploring support from the Church Commissioners.
- If giving does increase, how will this change things? Can we target getting people to increase their giving? The Interim Chief Executive replied that if giving increases we will still need to adjust stipendiary figures in accordance with
availability so it is almost inevitable we would still need to hit the 2025 target. If giving improves we will not have to reduce clergy numbers below the 2025 figures.

- Does the choice of the word ‘benefice’ mean that the coding conversation will be with clergy only? The Interim Chief Executive confirmed that the process will include the laity.
- How many Mission and Ministry Units are there approved and commissioned? Are we really in a strong position? It was noted that there were currently 31 MMUs approved by AMPCs.
- We cannot control change, but we work in response to it. We are applying for transitional funding. What scope is there for inclusion of work alongside parishes in transition? How do we draw on our skills in a positive and sustainable way? The Interim Chief Executive commented that this is an interesting question and he will consider this further.
- Is there an additional line missing from the table? Are we reviewing and reducing number of senior posts in the Diocese? The Interim Chief Executive confirmed that there was no line missing from the table.

The Acting Bishop of Chelmsford moved the motion:

‘That this Synod approve the recommended next steps set out in paper DS(2020)13’

Revd Brenda Wallace (General Synod)
Revd James Rodley (Harlow)
Colin Setchfield (Waltham Forest)
Revd Martin Bailey (Havering)
John Bloomer (Chelmsford North)
Paul Hamilton (Brentwood)
Mary Durlacher (General Synod)
Revd Canon Jeremy Fraser (Newham)
Hannah Mickleburg Gardham (Co-opted)
Revd Ernie Guest (Rochford)
Nick Ellis (Hinckford)
Revd Dr Jack Dunn (Redbridge)
Pat Bash (Braintree)
Revd Canon Jane Richards (Basildon)
Piers Northam (Harlow)
Revd Canon Simon Law (Basildon)
Canon Wendy King (St Osyth)
Revd Margaret Davis (Saffron Walden)
Wendy Boenke (Barking and Dagenham)
Revd Mick Scotchmer (Waltham Forest)
Philip Carnelley (Redbridge)
Revd Susan Iskander (Chelmsford North)
Canon Vevet Deer (Waltham Forest)
Revd Michael Hall (Basildon)
Revd Dan Pierce (Chelmsford North)
Revd Canon Darren Barlow (Thurrock)
Revd Canon David Banting (General Synod)
The questions and comments were as follows:

- It would be good to see something in writing about the impact this will have on the wellbeing of clergy and their families included in this work.
- The more a decision involves money the more people will be inclined to vote for a proposal. Hopefully Synod knows the gravity of the decision it is being asked. The proposals could result in almost half the clergy posts in the Diocese being cut. The proposal is flawed. There are practical issues, for example the RAG rating conversations have started in some places and not others. If this were a company this would be a breach of collective redundancy process. The Synod does not have the information on the full costs of clergy compensation for dispossession of posts. There are also principle objections. Stipendiary clergy are being seen as a cost, not a blessing. This is a significant injustice. How can it be right not to mention cutting of other posts? The advertisement for the Dean of Mission, Ministry and Education was highlighted. The speaker further commented that it is not clear that the proposals will it actually work.
- If we currently have 277 posts and are reducing to 215 this will be a 22% reduction in stipendiary posts. Will we see a similar reduction in management? Will the number of Archdeacons be reduced to 5 and a part time post. Do we need to keep the number of Archdeacon to current levels as parish clergy cannot offer support on a wider basis?
- In the recommended steps there should be a level of consistency between Archdeaconries. The potential for different processes seems very wrong.
- One of the reasons for high tension about this subject is that it does not come across as pastoral. There is a problem in communication of the coding. The criteria for the coding had not been set out in detail so it comes over as a fait accompli. How can that be better shaped? The proposal is putting clergy into a vulnerable position, it is also putting the parish in a vulnerable position and laity have not been given sufficient representation.
- If change is needed can it look more positive? We need fast and consistent communication; clear support for those impacted and transition funding used to facilitate change, especially to support other types of ministry.
- Change is needed, but so is transparency. The management question is often dodged.
- The paper is a practical one, but we need principles for this strategy. The laity have not been consulted, the criteria is not clear and there is a lack of trust. This is a financial crisis, but good leadership can turn the position round. We need to consult more widely. We are appointed by God to be ambassadors.
- We have been having this debate for seven years. Even if we had all the money in the world, we would still have the challenge of the availability of clergy. People are offering objections but not an alternative. Please offer alternatives rather than saying no. We are still in the same position after much discussion.
- The Youth Synod had discussed the proposal. There reflections were that the Church is like a set of cogs. The most important part is those who attend Church. Clergy and congregation should be a team. You don’t need a leader for a community to work. Maybe Church needs to engage in change to grow, such as lay led eucharist, although everyone could lead communion then that may make it less special. The size of congregation is not the most important factor in deployment. We need to be welcoming and accepting to those who have been
turned away elsewhere. Change must not stop us from treating others as they should be treated. Those in well off areas should support the deprived. This will lead to more diversity and the need to share resources. We need to reduce dependency on clergy and look at the bigger picture, not just the parish. (for full contribution please see appended document)

- The Synod is here to scrutinise. We have done a lot of work knowing there will be a reduction in clergy. The numbers have changed but we can’t agree how we get there. Are we the Church of God? The Stewardship Task Group have already lost the confidence in those who are working on this.
- There is a paragraph missing on infrastructure and support. What will happen to clergy houses? We could sell off for short term gain but may need to buy houses back in some places, such as amber posts and need to recognise the cost of that. It also doesn’t acknowledge the cost of the Church building. What will happen in rural areas?
- There is a ‘tin ear’ in the diocese. People are very reluctant to increase giving until this is resolved. There should be a hiring freeze and there does need to be much more transparency. We need more creativity with appointments such as House for Duty Archdeacons and Bishops and increased lay involvement. There has not been enough lay involvement. On racial justice, when cuts happen they will impact black majority areas most acutely.
- When such changes occur it usually means fewer people take on more work and will lead to concern for their welfare. More work will fall to the laity, how long can they sustain this? Where is God in all this? Let’s find the silver lining, we have seen an increase in number attending online.
- There is work being done on stress, burnout and wellbeing in ministry. This is vital. There is a great burden on self supporting ministers who are taking on huge amounts of work. In the secular world upskilling takes investment. If we want to encourage lay involvement then clergy need to learn how to share and empower people to realise their gifts.
- We need to take our relationship with one another seriously. Collaboration between ordained and lay is essential. The less successful parishes have a greater need for building up and teaching and the RAG will likely lead to those parishes being robbed of leadership result in a downward spiral.
- We need to give sacrificially, until it hurts. Synod can start this and lead. If we did this, we would solve our problem.
- How likely is it that if we move clergy on how long will they be there until they move on again?
- Do Churches realise that giving is dependant that keeping churches open?
- In Saffron Walden Deanery the coding work was discussed with clergy and Lay Chair. They did consider principles. Whichever way they looked at this they could not identify a red post without exposing an area to risk, so the Deanery have not categorised posts.
- Now may not be the time to cut posts given the increased interest resulting from the online presence in the Church. If we nurture relationships this will lead to a growth in giving.
- If we have not got an idea on criteria and confirmation of a consistent approach how can we be sure this will work? We will just be reducing posts to meet our income. If we are going to cut stipendiary posts by 20% there will be a significant number of parishes not making contribution for clergy. This will be divisive.
• The paper under item 8 implies the number on Electoral Rolls has declined by 25-30%. If that is the case this is very profound. Something needs to be done, either growth or cutting our cloth. The status quo is not possible.
• Waiting until March for the coding conversations is unreasonable. Everyone should have personal letter now. We have already made that decision already within the budget.
• Administrators are undervalued, how do we balance the skill mix?
• We need more involvement with the laity in these discussions. The red posts give the indication that clergy are not working hard enough, but they are. What will happen to parishes when churches are closed? Could have another category in addition to the red, amber and green?
• It is hard to distinguish between people and posts. We should look at this more closely.
• Cutting posts does not work. Each MMU should ask what it can give up. Less is the answer.
• Prayer is essential in this process.
• The impact on clergy morale has been raised numerous times, but no strategic response has been offered. Parish clergy have kept the ship afloat during the pandemic. Confidence and morale are very low. The Christian presence in every community will probably need to be rewritten.
• A member suggested that the Synod break in to three houses for the vote. The Chair pointed out this will need to be moved after the debate.
• There is no alternative proposal, the appeal for Christian giving is to be commended. The treasure and heart are linked. We need to call our own bluff. We have a total electoral roll of 30,000 in the Diocese. Why don’t we take a lead in upping giving and take a pledge?

The Interim Chief Executive responded to the questions and comments as follows:

• We have the largest vacancy rate we have ever had, because of the availability of stipendiary clergy so we still need to work to the 2025 numbers. If more money is given we will not have to cut further posts beyond the 2025 figures.
• If we don’t do something we will be bankrupt in five years.
• Changing culture is important, what do we need to stop doing?
• The RAG rating exercise was a proof concept. There is good consistency of work at Archdeaconry level and we are responding in suitable way.
• Wellbeing is in huge need of focus, not least because of the impact of COVID 19. Bishop’s Staff have discussed clergy wellbeing and how the new Bishop can be involved in this activity.
• In respect of leadership in Diocese there may well be a case for reduction in senior posts, but it is too early to do this. The provision of pastoral support needs more leadership not less. This will be a major item for the new Bishop to consider.
• In respect of lay involvement there has been involvement of Lay Chairs in conversations and this will need to increase.

The Acting Bishop of Chelmsford added the following comments:
• Voting this proposal down is postponing it. The Synod will be doing this again in a year’s time. It will not go away.
• Sacrificial giving will be key to this working. The Acting Bishop of Chelmsford spoke of personal experience of improving stewardship in the worst of times, miner strikes and closure of mines. It is in our hands if we trust our processes.
• Please don’t think we do not recognise the pain. We need to do this, we don’t want to do this. There is no easy solution and we will be bankrupt if keep going the way we are.
• The recommendations may need to be tweaked and we need to keep this under review.
• There is only really one alternative, increased giving. Discipleship is the key to solving this and turning the Diocese around.
• The management resources in the Diocese are 10% below other dioceses on average. We are under resourced in this area. Archbishop Stephen used to describe the Diocese as a mini province. The Diocese the Acting Bishop of Chelmsford was previously part of, is smaller than any of the three Areas in this Diocese and they had two Archdeacons. There is a huge amount of work on Archdeacons and if we reduce this number it will be very difficult.
• Members were encouraged to trust the motion as it is the best we can do.

The Chair came back to the proposal to vote on the motion by houses. The Chair asked members to indicate if there were enough people to support a vote in houses. More than ten members indicated they were supportive of a vote by houses.

The Chair invited the Revd Canon Darren Barlow to speak to the proposal. He confirmed he had proposed the separate vote as the document primarily impacts on clergy and the vote needs to be understood clearly.

The Chair moved a motion for a vote by houses. The motion was voted down by a small majority.

The Revd Martin Bailey raised a point of order for clarity on what the Synod are being asked to vote on. The Chair confirmed that the Synod were being asked to vote on the six recommended next steps set out in paper DS(2020)13 with the change to the second recommendation as mentioned previously. The Acting Bishop of Chelmsford clarified that most of the points have dates on them, others did not, deliberately so. Tweaks can be made as we proceed with the recommendations and revisions can be brought back to the Synod if required.

The Chair put the motion to the vote. The motion was carried with a clear majority.

8. 2021 DIOCESAN SYNOD ELECTIONS

The Chair invited the Head of Service Delivery to briefly summarise paper DS(2020)14.

The Chair then moved the first motion under this item:
'That this Synod approve the formulae for the allocation of seats in the 2021 Diocesan Synod elections based on the following ratios:

a) The House of Clergy: One seat for every nine clergy in the House of Clergy of the Deanery Synod
b) The House of Laity: One seat for every 550 people on the combined electoral roll in each Deanery'.

The following members spoke in the debate:

Andrew Holt (Witham)
Colin Setchfield (Waltham Forest)
Piers Northam (Harlow)
Canon Roger Ennals (Colchester)

The contributions to the debate were as follows:

- Would it be possible to round up the representatives for Deanery to the nearest whole number? This would reduce an imbalance. The Chair commented that it was not possible to submit amendments to the proposal at this stage and that this should have been notified prior to the meeting.
- There are significant reductions in Electoral Rolls and struggles to fill Deanery complements. Is there a deeper issue here? The Head of Service Delivery commented that this item was about a procedure matter but that the observation on deeper issues was a good one.
- What is the impact on the total number of the Synod? It was noted that this proposal would lead to an overall reduction of the size of the Synod by 38.
- Can we hold off on making a decision? It was confirmed that this needs to be done before the end of the year preceding the election so a decision was required at this meeting.

The Chair called for a vote on the motion. The motion passed with a clear majority.

The Chair then moved motion two under this item:

‘That this Synod approve the simple majority voting system for use in the 2021 Diocesan Synod election.’

An amendment had been notified to the secretary prior to the meeting by John Tipping (Southend)

John Tipping moved the amendment:

“That there shall be substituted for the words “Simple Majority” the following: “Single Transferable Vote”

In speaking to the amendment the proposer made the following points:

- STV is a fairer system than the Simple Majority system.
• A third of Diocese he had written to had confirmed that they use STV in their elections. They had given no negative feedback on the use of this system.
• The feedback from Deaneries is more in favour of moving to STV.
• The relative complexity of process and burden on presiding officers is limited through the computer software available. A Simple majority vote count has to be done manually. The software can be rolled out to Deaneries.

The Chair responded to the debate confirming that the standing committee do not support the amendment as it would place a burden on presiding officers. Whilst software was available it was not the simplest software to use.

The Chair invite members to debate the amendment. The following members contributed to the debate:

Revd Dr Susan Lucas (Newham)
Piers Northam (Harlow)
John Bloomer (Chelmsford North)
Andrew Holt (Witham)
Gwilym Morris (Chelmsford North)
Revd Canon David Banting (General Synod)
Kat D’Arcy Cumber (Thurrock)
Canon Roger Ennals (Colchester)
Nigel Dyson (Harwich)
Canon Vevet Deer (Waltham Forest)

The contributions to the debate were as follows:

• Many elections are uncontested so the benefits of using the STV system are outweighed by pragmatic considerations.
• Life is nuanced and we have paid the price for the Simple Majority system. There is a point of principle and the software is there to assist.
• There are other software systems available to us to make it simpler. The Chair clarified that the designated eSTV software would need to be used.
• There is an element of natural justice. If there are not enough candidates there is not the need for a count either way.
• The STV system is actually quite complicated. If we need a computer system to calculate it does not seem to be a good thing.
• Church has used STV for a very long time. The question about numbers of candidates is a different question. Computers are a secondary issue.
• STV may enable a more diverse Synod.
• The STV process had been used in the Vacancy in See committee and it ran very well. It took a while to get the result but there were a lot of candidates.
• The roll out of the STV system will cost us more. More cost would be wrong.
• There are not enough candidates in these elections to necessitate change.

The Chair called a vote on the proposed amendment. The amendment was carried by a majority.

The amended main motion was then moved by the Chair:
‘That this Synod approve the Single Transferable Vote voting system for use in the 2021 Diocesan Synod election.’

The motion was carried by majority.

9. **BISHOP’S COUNCIL, DMPC AND FINANCE COMMITTEE REPORTS**

Paper DS(2020)15 was received.

**CLOSE**

The Chair thanked members for their patience with what had been a challenging meeting, both in content and procedural terms.

The President thanked members for all their contributions.

The President closed the Synod.
Young People's Experience of 2020

2020 Has certainly been a year like no other. The experiences of this year have had an impact on us all individually, as organisations and communities. We have learnt and used words that we never knew existed – pandemic, PPE, the “new normal”.

When we met as Youth Synod this week we reflected on our experiences of this year and I’d like to share some of the highlights from this conversation with you.

We tried to describe 2020 as a fruit or vegetable. I wonder how you would answer if you were asked this question?

Celery, Brussels Sprouts – ordinary on the outside but when you bite into it it's disgusting.

Grapefruit – sour and horrible, they stick around even though you hate it

Coconut – hard on the outside but some good things on the inside

Edamame – beans in the middle but you can’t eat the outside

2020 has impacted all of us, locally, nationally and globally. No one has gone without feeling the impact of COVID in some way. We have heard people say that we are all in this together … but, are we?

Although we are all experiencing the same threat, everyone has their own experience of it and their own way of dealing with it. COVID has affected people differently and for some it has been more difficult than others. The virus has highlighted even more who the most vulnerable people are in our communities.

We spoke about our experience of church during this year. Many of us have lost the little contact we had with church. For others things hadn’t changed too much. Their youth group only met once a month before. They now only meet on zoom. It’s good to catch up with everyone on zoom but it’s harder to have conversations in the same way as usual. Sometimes no one will talk.
So what was the overall impact of 2020 for us as young people?

It’s impacted a lot of us very widely. We have noticed that many people are more cautious to interact with others. Although, for young people that isn’t really the case as much.

One member of youth synod highlighted that this is the time of our lives when we figure out who we are - and that happens when we meet with others. Before lockdown her friendship group was changing because lots of them were arguing, and so maintaining links with those people during lockdown was difficult. She only stayed in touch with one or two other people. This took some time to adjust to. However, she also feels much closer now with one of the friends who she stuck with.

Going back to school after the summer holidays is always nerve-wrecking after a long time off but it was even worse this year. Those who were going into their GCSE year got to drop some subjects which took the pressure off a little bit but there are also other young people who had a really stressful experience feeling like they had to catch up so much and like they didn’t understand everything they needed to.

We did as much of our school work as we could during lockdown when we couldn’t go to school but many of us struggled to understand. It was nice to go back at school and at the same time it wasn’t. It was scary going back to start but then it turned out ok. Some of us were also surprises – we realised that we’re still friends with people who we thought would grow distant. With some people we’re even closer. Maybe we needed a break.

It felt like starting secondary school all over again when we went back to school in September. Doing work from home made us feel alone and sad. We got used to doing work with friends via zoom or face time. When we then started school again in September, it felt like we forgot what school was like.

Going back to school was disorientating for many young people initially. School shuffled around our form rooms and so it was very confusing to start, new rooms and lots of different pupils. Some schools repurposed art and music rooms so students haven’t fully been able to enjoy the full range of learning. It feels better now that they know what’s going on but it’s been a big change.

It’s also confusing. Although there is a lockdown, those of us who still go to school are still meeting hundreds of young people every day but then we can’t socialise outside of school.
Everything is also always changing and we constantly have to figure out what we can and cannot do.

It’s been good to have some structure again with going back to school. Learning isn’t the same and the routine is different but it is good to see friends again and socialise with others. Although on the whole we can say that some good things have come out of this year, overall it feels like the impact has been negative.

When we met this week, we spent some time thinking about how the pandemic has impacted our faith and our interactions with church. Many of us have become even more aware of the vulnerable people in our communities and it’s important that the church makes a special effort to support them. However, our conversation very quickly turned to the many other experiences which have had a huge impact on us this year – changes in friendships, home learning, going back to school, feeling confused by the rules changing all the time. Maybe that says something about how much (or how little) of a part the church has played in our lives this year. Also, the day-to-day demands of our lives are overwhelming and that is where the church can best engage with young people – at our level.

Input for Clergy Deployment Debate

We discussed the issue of clergy deployment at our youth synod meeting this week.

Church is like different cogs working together, everyone plays a part and the clergy are an important part of the mechanism. However, the most important part of the church are the people that attend, otherwise no one is worshipping God. They are the ones who gain the most from being part of church. They are the treasures of the church.

Clergy and congregation are supposed to be a team working together. If there’s a clear division it’s not really a team. You don’t necessarily need a leader for a community to work but you need someone to guide others and send them in a right direction. They need to understand that they are equal to other members of the community. We do need more experienced members in the community to guide us.

Without clergy it would be hard to understand the Bible. They lead our worship. Communion is a really important part of worship and we can’t do it without them. We discussed that maybe the church needs to engage in some change, in order to grow. What if members of the congregation could perform eucharist as well? We were unsure what the best way forward is on this. If everyone could lead communion it may no longer be as special. However, if you limit a role so that only some people can do it, you create division.
The church is a community. Community and God are the most important part of the church. If we elevate some people over others it might stop us from being a community. A lack of change might be limiting us and stop the church from growing and developing.

When deciding on the areas in which to deploy clergy, we believe that the size of a congregation isn’t the most important thing to look at. However, here are the issues which are important to us:

It’s important to be accepting of other people’s views and welcoming to even those who the rest of the community turned away. That is following Jesus’ example who taught us to welcome those who are outcast and love them unconditionally. This includes the poor and the needy, the disabled, geeks, members of the LGBT community, those of other ethnicities. The church needs to engage effectively with these issues in order to make progress and grow. We accept that people can have their own views and opinions but that mustn’t stop us from treating those who are different in the way which we would like to be treated.

It’s important to have a priest leading a congregation especially in areas of deprivation. The better off churches should be giving to those more deprived – either by sharing clergy or by accepting that they might be more equipped to thrive without a vicar than those who are in less well-off areas. It’s important that everyone feels happy at their church. Yet, if there are limited resources in one church then perhaps you can combine them. This will also lead to more diversity. We need to encourage churches to work together more and share resources with each other.

More should be done to encourage the whole congregation to volunteer and use their gifts, not just rely on the vicar.

Although growing churches may not have the most amount of people, they are important because they are changing and adapting with the times. Growing churches are key because they are improving constantly. We should invest our resources in churches which are keeping an open mind and are willing to change in a way which is inclusive and allows the whole community to thrive.

Please be open minded in the choices and decisions you make. Make sure to look at the bigger picture and not just focus on individual parishes. How can we work best together as a whole rather than just individually?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>November 2020 Diocesan Synod attendance</th>
<th>(P) Present</th>
<th>(A) Apologies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mrs Isabel Adcock</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>The Revd Canon Jeremy Fraser</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Revd David Anderton</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Mr Richard Freeman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Revd Christiana Asinugo</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>The Revd John Fry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Revd Faye Bailey</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Mr David Gentry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Revd Martin Bailey</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>The Revd Helen Gheorghiu Gould</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Revd Colin Baldwin</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>The Revd Ray Gibbs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs Christine Ballard</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>The Revd James Gilder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Revd Canon David Banting</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Canon Dean Gillespie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Revd Canon Darren Barlow</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>The Revd Stephanie Gillingham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr John Barnes</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>The Revd Ernie Guest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs Patricia Bash</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>The Revd Canon David Hague</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Revd Canon Lee Batson</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>The Revd Michael Hall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs Diana Benge-Abbott</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Mr Michael Hall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canon Lynne Bennett</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>The Revd Stuart Halstead</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs Maureen Best</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>The Revd Canon Paul Hamilton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canon Shirley Biro</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Canon Robert Hammond</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr John Bloomer</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Mr Frank Hawkins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr John Bloomfield</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Mrs Jill Healey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs Wendy Boenke</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Mrs Celia Heath</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Revd Christopher Bolster</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Mrs Margaret Henning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miss Sheila Bradley</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>The Very Revd Nicholas Henshall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Harvey Braithwaite</td>
<td></td>
<td>The Ven Vanessa Herrick</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs Christine Brown</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Mrs Pam Higham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Ven Christopher Burke</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>The Rt Revd Peter Hill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Philip Carmelley</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>The Revd Clive Hillman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Ven Elwin Cockett</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Mr Andrew Holt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Revd Canon Jonathan Collis</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Canon Christine Horton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs Ann Colton</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mrs Heather Housden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Revd Vanessa Conant</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>The Revd Asa Humphreys</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Revd Canon Martin Court</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>The Revd Susan Iskander</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs Christine Cox</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Canon Shirley Jeffery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs Katia D'Arcy-Cumber</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Mr Mark Jobin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs Alyson Davies</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>The Revd Gareth Jones</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Revd Chris Davies</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Mrs Lesley Judd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs Ursula Davies</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Mrs Diana Kennedy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Gregor Davis</td>
<td></td>
<td>The Ven Robin King</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Revd Margaret Davis</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Canon Wendy King</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Revd Katie de Bourcier</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>The Revd Simon Law</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canon Yevet Deer</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>The Revd Hilary Le Seve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Revd Canon John Dunnett</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Canon Jill Leonard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs Mary Durlacher</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Mr Mac Leonard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Nigel Dyson</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>The Revd Dr Justin Lewis-Anthony</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miss Mary Edwards</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>The Ven Mike Lodge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Revd Peter Edwards</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Mr Percy Lomax</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Robert Edwards</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>The Revd Katharine Lovesey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Revd Ade Eleyae</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>The Revd David Lower</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Nicholas Ellis</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Dr Diana Lowry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canon Roger Ennals</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>The Revd Marco Filipe Lopes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Revd Helen Flack</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>The Revd Dr Susan Lucas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Revd Ola Franklin</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Mr Chris Luck</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Canon Harry Marsh
Mr David Martins
The Revd Canon Dr Roger Matthews
The Revd Dr Adrian McConnaugie
Canon Ronald McLernon JP
Mrs Judith Meaden
Miss Hannah Mickleburgh-Gardham
Miss Mary Moore
The Revd Shaun Moore
Mr Gwilym Morris
Mr Larry Morris
The Rt Revd Roger Morris
The Revd Christine Newmarch
The Revd Canon Paul Norrington
Mr Piers Northam
The Revd Christian Okeke
The Ven Ruth Patten
The Rt Revd Dr John Perumbalath
The Revd Dan Pierce
Mrs Kathy Playle
Mr Andrew Podd
The Revd Peter Rabin
The Revd Canon Jane Richards
Canon Mike Robinson
The Revd James Rodley
The Revd Canon Nick Rowan
The Revd Clive Russell
Revd Robert Ryan
The Revd Mick Scotchmer
The Revd Canon Marie Segal
Mr Colin Setchfield
The Revd Canon Margaret Shaw
Canon Gordon Simmonds
Canon Adrian Smith
The Revd Lydia Smith
The Ven Elizabeth Snowden
The Revd Dr Anand Sodadasi
Canon Dr John Spence
Mr Robin Stevens
Mrs Michelle Tackie
Mr Hugh Thomas
Mr John Tipping
Mrs Cat Trinder
The Revd Canon David St Clair Tudor
The Revd Marion Walford
The Revd Brenda Wallace
The Revd Mark Wallace
The Revd Canon Louise Williams
Mr Malcolm Woods
I. INTRODUCTION

The General Synod recently approved two Amending Canons, numbers 40 and 41. These are to be promulged (or proclaimed) at a meeting of each Synod in each Diocese.

2. AMENDING CANONS NO 40 AND 41

The text of the two Amending Canons and the Instrument of Enactment are attached.

Amending Canon 40 relates to a number of changes which make provision for a framework for members of religious communities, including the introduction of a new Canon, Canon DA 1.

Amending Canon 41 relates to relatively minor changes regarding:
- register books of services, including facilitating the use of electronic service registers,
- updating references in the Canons in respect of Ecclesiastical Courts and Commissions, the Chancellor or judge of Consistory Courts, and
- replacing outdated references in Canon H1.
- amending a series of Canons so they now include gender neutral references.

3. RECOMMENDATION

The Chair to read out the following text:

“I give notice that, at its November 2020 group of sessions, held remotely, the General Synod resolved that Amending Canons Nos. 40 and 41 be made, promulged and executed.

Amending Canon No. 40 makes provision relating to religious communities and Amending Canon No. 41 makes miscellaneous amendments to the Canons.”
GENERAL SYNOD OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND
AMENDING CANON NO. 40

(Of religious communities, Of the titles of such as are to be ordained deacons or priests, Of ministers exercising their ministry, Of the licensing of ministers under seal, Of the General Synod and the Convocations, Of the representation of the Clergy in the Lower House of the Convocations)

Religious Communities

1. After Section D of the Canons, insert—

"Section DA

Religious Communities

DA 1 Of religious communities

1. The Church of England affirms that, since the time of the early Church, there have been Christian people who, in response to God’s call, have committed their whole lives to God in the religious life, a radical commitment, shaped by the evangelical counsels, marked by consecrated celibacy, poverty and obedience, and fulfilled as a member of a community where the religious life is lived in common or as a solitary; and that at various times, other Christian people have responded to the same call, fulfilling their baptismal promises through particular forms of public commitment and of accountability in obedience to Christ as members of other communities and societies.

2. (1) A religious community in the Church of England is a community of persons—

(a) which has a particular vocation in the service of the Gospel,

(b) whose members seek to frame and fashion their lives in accordance with a rule or other pattern of life that is particular to members of that community, and

(c) which is declared by the House of Bishops to be a religious community in the Church of England.

(2) A reference in this Canon, or in any of the other Canons, to a religious community is a reference to a religious community in the Church of England.

3. A religious community may include among its members persons who are not members of the Church of England.

4. (1) The House of Bishops may not make a declaration under paragraph 2(1)(c) in the case of a community unless it is satisfied that the community meets such conditions as the House shall specify in regulations.

(2) The regulations may, in particular, specify conditions relating to—

(a) governance;
(b) financial affairs;
(c) safeguarding children and vulnerable adults;
(d) the making of vows or promises;
(e) the minimum number of members required for a community to be eligible for a declaration under paragraph 2(1)(c).

(3) The conditions which may be specified in the regulations under sub-paragraph (2)(a) include conditions as to the procedure which a community must follow in order to amend its constitution or other governing document.

(4) In paragraph (2)(c)—

“child” means a person aged under 18, and
“vulnerable adult” has the same meaning as in the Safeguarding and Clergy Discipline Measure 2016.

5. The House of Bishops may, for some grave cause, revoke a declaration made under paragraph 2(1)(c).

6. The House of Bishops shall compile, maintain and publish a list of religious communities.

7. The House of Bishops may by regulations make further provision about religious communities.

8. (1) The House of Bishops may by regulations amend or revoke regulations made under this Canon.

(2) Regulations under this Canon may make different provision for different purposes (including, in particular, different provision according to whether a community was established before or after the commencement of this Canon).

(3) Regulations under this Canon may confer a discretion.

(4) Regulations under this Canon shall be laid before the General Synod and shall not come into operation unless and until they have been approved by the Synod.

(5) Where the Business Committee of the General Synod determines that regulations under this Canon do not need to be debated by the Synod then, unless notice is given by a member of the Synod in accordance with its Standing Orders that the member wishes the regulations to be debated, the regulations shall for the purposes of paragraph (4) be deemed to have been approved by the Synod.

9. (1) The House of Bishops may issue guidance on religious communities.

(2) Every member of a religious community, and every person exercising functions in relation to a religious community, shall have regard to such guidance as is issued under this paragraph.
(3) The House of Bishops may amend or revoke guidance issued under this paragraph.”

2. (1) In Canon C 5 (titles of such as are to be ordained deacons or priests), in paragraph 2—

(a) omit paragraph (e), and

(b) in the full-out words at the end, for “school or house of a religious order or community” substitute “or school”.

(2) After that paragraph, insert—

“2A. A bishop may also admit into holy orders any person who is a member of a religious community.”

3. In Canon C 8 (ministers exercising their ministry), in paragraph 4, after “and Canon B 41” insert “or as a member of a religious community licensed in accordance with that Measure”.

4. In Canon C 12 (the licensing of ministers under seal), in paragraph 1, for sub-paragraph (b) substitute—

“(b) of a licence to perform some particular office, or

(c) of a licence to serve for the purposes of or in connection with a mission initiative endorsed by a bishop’s mission order, or

(d) of a licence to perform offices and services for the furtherance of the work and mission of a religious community.”

5. In Canon H 1 (the General Synod and the Convocations) in the form in which it has effect in each province, in paragraph 3(c), for “religious communities in the said province” substitute “such religious communities in the said province as are designated by the House of Bishops for the purposes of this Canon”.

6. (1) Canon H2 (the representation of the clergy in the Lower House of the Convocations) is amended as follows; and the amendments in sub-paragraphs (4) to (7) are to the Canon in the form in which it has effect in each province.

(2) In paragraph 1 in the form in which it has effect in the province of Canterbury, in sub-paragraph (f), for “religious communities having their mother house” substitute “designated religious communities”.

(3) In paragraph 1 in the form in which it has effect in the province of York, in sub-paragraph (d), for “religious communities having their mother house” substitute “designated religious communities”.

(4) In paragraph 2, in sub-paragraph (a) of the proviso, before “religious communities” insert “designated”.

(5) In paragraph 4, in the full-out words after sub-paragraph (e), before “religious communities” insert “designated”.

(6) In paragraph 8, in sub-paragraph (b), before “religious community” insert “designated”.
(7) After paragraph 11 insert—

“12. A reference in this Canon to a designated religious community is a reference to a religious community designated by the House of Bishops for the purposes of this Canon.”
GENERAL SYNOD OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND
AMENDING CANON NO. 41

(Of the register book of services, Of the language of divine service, Of ministers exercising their ministry, Of Ecclesiastical Courts and Commissions, Of the chancellor or judge of a Consistory Court, Of the General Synod and the Convocations)

Register book of services

1. In Canon F 12 (the register book of services), for paragraph 2 substitute—

“2. Every service held at the church or chapel, including the Occasional Offices and whether or not a service of public worship, shall be recorded in the register book, together with—

(a) the name of the officiating minister,

(b) the name of the preacher (if the preacher is not the officiating minister),

(c) the number of persons attending the service and, so far as it is practicable to ascertain, the number aged under 16 and the number aged 16 or over,

(d) in the case of the celebration of the Holy Communion, the number of communicants (as well as the total number of persons attending) and, so far as it is practicable to ascertain, the number of communicants aged under 16 and the number aged 16 or over, and

(e) if desired, notes of significant events.

3. The form in which the register book may be kept includes any electronic or other form approved by the General Synod, subject in either case to any conditions approved by the Synod.

4. In a case where the decision is taken to keep the register book in an electronic or other form approved under paragraph 3—

(a) every service held after the decision takes effect shall be recorded in that form, and

(b) services already held in the calendar year in which the decision takes effect may (but need not) be recorded in that form.”

Language of divine service

2. In Canon B 42 (language of divine service), in paragraph 3(1), omit “the Standing Committee of”.

Ministers exercising their ministry

3. (1) In Canon C 8 (ministers exercising their ministry), in paragraph 4, after “1992” insert “or section 4 of the Church of England (Miscellaneous Provisions) Measure 2018”.

(2) In that Canon, in paragraph 7, omit “or provost”.

(3) In Canon C 21 (the title to which becomes “Of deans and canons residentiary of cathedral or collegiate churches), in paragraph 1, omit “, provost” and “or provost”.

The Ecclesiastical Courts etc: updated statutory references

4. (1) In Canon G 1 (ecclesiastical courts and commissions), in the opening words, for “and the Clergy Discipline Measure 2003” substitute “, the Clergy Discipline Measure 2003 and the Ecclesiastical Jurisdiction and Care of Churches Measure 2018”.

(2) In that Canon, in paragraphs 1 and 2(a), for “the Ecclesiastical Jurisdiction Measure 1963” substitute “the Ecclesiastical Jurisdiction and Care of Churches Measure 2018”.

(3) In Canon G 2 (chancellor or judge of a consistory court), in paragraph 3—

(a) after “The chancellor of a diocese,” insert “and”, and

(b) omit “and a person appointed to preside over a court by virtue of section 27(1) of the Ecclesiastical Jurisdiction Measure 1963”.

General Synod and Convocations: replacement of outdated references

5. In Canon H1 (the General Synod and Convocations) in the form in which it has effect in each province, in paragraph 3(b), for “the Prolocutor and Pro-Prolocutor” substitute “the Chair and Vice-Chair”.

Minor corrections

6. In each of the following provisions, for “2015” substitute “2016”—

(a) in Canon C 8, in paragraph 8(2);

(b) in Canon C 30, in paragraph 6;

(c) in Canon E 6, in paragraph 10;

(d) in Canon E 8, in paragraph 12.

Gender neutral references

7. (1) Canon C 8 is amended as follows.

(2) In each of paragraphs 1, 2 and 4, for “his ministry” substitute “ministry”.

(3) In paragraph 2, in the first sentence, for “he” substitute “the minister”.

(4) In paragraph 2, in paragraph (a) of the proviso—
(a) for “that he”, in the first place it appears, substitute “that the minister”,
(c) omit “that he” in the second place it appears, and
(d) for “when he officiates” substitute “when officiating”.

(5) In paragraph 2, in paragraph (b) of the proviso, omit “his”.

(6) In paragraph 3, for the words from “by instituting” to “giving him” substitute “by institution to a benefice, by admission to serve within the diocese by licence under the hand and seal of the bishop, or by giving the minister”.

(7) In paragraph 4, for “he”, in each place it appears, substitute “the minister”.

(8) In paragraph 6, for “his” substitute “the minister’s”.

8. (1) Canon C 21 is amended as follows.
   (2) In paragraph 1, for “he” substitute “the person”.
   (3) In paragraph 2, for “his” substitute “a”.

9. (1) In each of the following provisions, for “he enters on the execution of his office” substitute “entering on the execution of the office”—
   (a) in Canon G 2, in paragraph 3;
   (b) in Canon G 3, in paragraphs 3 and 4;
   (c) in Canon G 4, in paragraph 3.

   (2) In Canon G 2, in paragraph 3, for “he is a layman, he” substitute “the person is lay, the person”.

   (3) In Canon G 3, in each of paragraphs 3 and 4, for “he is a layman” substitute “the person is lay”.

   (4) In Canon G 4, in paragraph 2—
   (a) for “he should be a person who has” substitute “the person should have”, and
   (b) for “appointing him must satisfy himself” substitute “making the appointment must be satisfied”.

   (5) In Canon G 5, in paragraph 1—
   (a) for “committed to his charge” substitute “in question”, and
   (b) omit “to his charge” in the second place it appears.
CONSTITUTIONS AND CANONS ECCLESIASTICAL, maturely treated upon by the Archbishops, Bishops, Clergy and Laity of the General Synod of the Church of England in their Synod begun at Westminster in the Year of Our Lord Two thousand and fifteen and in the sixty-fourth year of the Reign of Our Sovereign Lady Queen Elizabeth the Second by the Grace of God of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and of Her Other Realms and Territories Queen Head of the Commonwealth Defender of the Faith being Canons entitled respectively “Amending Canon No. 40” and “Amending Canon No. 41”, both of which received Her Majesty’s Royal Assent and Licence on the 16th day of November Two thousand and twenty.

WE, being the Presidents, the Prolocutor of the Convocation of Canterbury, the Prolocutor of the Convocation of York and the Chair and Vice-Chair of the House of Laity of the said Synod do hereby declare and testify Our Consent to the said Canons entitled “Amending Canon No. 40” and “Amending Canon No. 41” And in testimony of such Our Consent We have hereunto subscribed our names, or authorised our names to be subscribed, as hereafter follows:

DATED this twenty-third day of November in the Year of Our Lord two thousand and twenty and in the sixty-ninth year of the reign of Our Sovereign Lady Queen Elizabeth the Second

+Justin Cantuar: +Stephen Ebor:
President President

Simon Butler Christopher Newlands
Prolocutor Prolocutor

James Harrison Elizabeth Paver
Chair, House of Laity Vice-Chair, House of Laity

Alexander McGregor
Registrar
Title: Interim Report on the work of the Racial Justice Task and Finish Group  
Author: Racial Justice Task and Finish Group  
Date: 20 March 2021  

Introduction  
The Racial Justice Task and Finish Group was set up by Chelmsford Diocese following the Black Lives Matter protests in the summer of 2020. The protests prompted various institutions to respond with anti-racism work. Since the last report to Synod, the Task Group has continued to meet. As has been reported, the Task Group has divided its task into five workstreams. Its focus now is to identify a number of recommendations under each of the five workstreams to put forward.

The Workstreams  
Below are the work streams some of the questions and issues they are addressing:

- **Addressing systemic issues**  
  This subgroup has started looking at the various processes that relate to lay and ordained roles in the Diocese, such as recruitment, appointment, election etc. to identify steps to take to mitigate against systemic racism.

- **Communications and the development of resources**  
  This subgroup is looking at who overseas policies and procedures in Diocesan communications and how can various media be used to publicise the outcome of Task Group’s work.

- **Statistics and monitoring**  
  There has not been effective monitoring of ethnicity either in the Diocese or nationally. This has hampered anti-racism work by not making solid evidence available. This workstream will follow what is being done nationally to produce reliable statistics on ethnicity in the Diocesan structure.

- **Racial Justice and advocacy beyond the church**  
  The two issues here are how Chelmsford Diocese can learn from outside organisations such as other Christian denominations, universities and Government bodies like the NHS and how it can speak on issues of racial justice beyond the Diocese.

- **Education and training**  
  This workstream will look at the education and training that is offered directly by the Diocese or with which the Diocese is involved in order to see how the influence of systemic racism could be mitigated.

Memorial and Monuments  
At the present time, the Group has decided to be guided by the work being done in this area at the national level. Some guidance for those in the Diocese would be included in the final report.

Time frame for completion  
The Task Group is working to present a full report about November.

Implementation  
It has become clear that the failure of past anti-racism efforts has been mainly due to a lack of commitment or proper attention to implementation. The Task Group intends to produce a plan on
implementation when it produces its final report. The success of this initiative would depend on the commitment of the leaders of the Diocese to follow through in the implementation phase.

In this regard, the Task Group has been encouraged by this message of support from Bishop Guli:

Following the events of last summer, there was always a danger that the public outcry would subside and that society would move on without meaningful and real change. This is true for the church too, where we have tried and failed to tackle issues of racial injustice in the past. This time must be different. The journey will not be easy; we must recognise and confront difficult truths; we must act with grace, moving away from condemnation to create opportunities for teaching and redemption. We must remain focused on our vision, which is articulated so clearly in the group’s terms of reference; to become a church that is actively anti-racist, where people are liberated by the presence of those from different ethnicities; where our rich diversity is celebrated as the blessing from God that it is; where people are treated not as ‘other’ on the basis of their colour, and misguided notions of what is normative and the prejudice and discrimination that too often accompany this are swept away. I will be praying for you as you continue with the work of the Task Group and look forward to receiving the recommended outcomes and actions and working with you and supporting you all when I become your diocesan bishop in the spring.

(Bishop Guli Francis-Dehqani

Task Group Membership
The Task Group is currently made of the following people: Bishop Roger Morris, Chigor Chike, Tim Elbourne, Sandra Eldridge, Aleishia Lewis, Dave Neita, Sharon Quilter and Nathan Whitehead

Parallel Work by the Diocesan Board of Education (Based on Report by Tim Elbourne)
Parallel to the work being done by the Task Group, the Diocesan Board of Education team convened a group of BAME church school leaders – headteachers and members of senior leadership teams – to offer a ‘safe space’ to explore experiences and perspectives. Starting in July 2020, the group has gradually grown and has met four times. The group has identified the following areas for future work:

- Curriculum diversification. Whilst there are many resources available the task might be to offer navigation resources to help schools to identify the most helpful ways through which to broaden their curriculum offer.

- Empowering the BAME pupil voice. This would involve creating practical guidelines both for schools with significant numbers of BAME pupils – secondary and primary – and also those schools where numbers of BAME pupils are small.

- Other areas include, 1) Raising aspirations among BAME pupils, 2) Supporting schools serving largely white localities inc. small, rural schools and 3) Nurturing career development among BAME teachers.

To further these aims it is proposed to establish a diocesan BAME Teachers Association.

In addition, the DBE has co-opted a BAME deputy headteacher, held a Reflection day on diversity and inclusion, is promoting a new RE resource ‘Anti Racist RE’, plans to hold a teacher-training event on this issue and is preparing a Statement of Intent to guide future developments.

Diocesan Synod is asked to note this update.
Rev Canon Dr Chigor Chike
9th March 2021
Living in Love and Faith (LLF) – Purpose and Process
A note for Chelmsford Diocesan Synod 20/03/21

It is important that we are absolutely clear about the purpose and direction of the Living in Love and Faith process and the resources it offers us.

Sex, religion, and politics: 3 topics that many in the past have said should not be discussed in polite society. Yet of course that is exactly what the whole LLF project is about.

It is not about promoting one particular line or doctrinal conviction on sexual ethics. Rather it offers a well-resourced exploration on the specific issues of identity, sexuality, relationships, and marriage: personal and sensitive topics for us all. Some of us may feel comfortable to be open in discussing these issues, but for others, they will be deeply troubling. Of course the same is true within the congregations, home groups and youth groups that we are part of or oversee. In opening up these fundamental topics there is always the risk that we can cause not just embarrassment, but also real hurt. But not to open up and discuss them can cause hurt too. So, we need to tread extremely sensitively and carefully.

A few Synod’s ago Revd Ade Eleyae, Our Equalities Adviser, helped us reflect on what are called The Pastoral Principles for living well together, which underly the LLF process and any other sensitive conversations we have as disciples of Christ. They are:

- Addressing Ignorance
- Acknowledging prejudice
- Admitting hypocrisy
- Casting out fear
- Speaking into silence
- Paying attention to power

They are well explained at the beginning of the LLF Resource Book.

So that’s sex. But what about the religion? For the LLF resources aren’t a bunch of secular reflections on identity, sexuality, relationships, and marriage. They are a specifically Christian exploration and learning on these sensitive themes. Whatever wider society promotes and practices they are central to our Christian faith, our sense of identity and purpose, our values, and convictions.

These things go really deep. First and foremost our identity is in Christ: we are children of the God. That’s who we are called to be and that is why we are here. And that is why we must honour one another with grace, courtesy and sensitivity, whatever our deeply held convictions on sexuality or our dearly held understanding of scripture. There is no place for shallow assumptions or intemperate words in this exploration. It is simply not Christian.

Ok that’s the sex and the religion, now the politics! LLF is part of a process in which we are seeking the guidance of God the Holy Spirit about the way forward for the Church regarding questions of identity, sexuality, relationships, and marriage. It is about putting ‘politics’ (with

---

1 An electronic copy of the Pastoral Principles card can be downloaded from COFE_02715_PastoralPrinciplesCards-UpdateApril19_AW-NEW.indd (churchofengland.org)
a small ‘p’) to one side for now, and not falling into the trap of spin, abuse, or a failure to engage with those outside our own spiritual echo chambers. Our Lord Jesus is far bigger than that, as the Gospels show us.

We all have things to learn about ‘living in love and faith’, and that’ll mean our discussions need to be held in safe space: safe for those sisters and brothers who identify as LGBTI+ or same sex attracted; and safe too for those sisters and brothers who would really want to engage openly and honestly, but are fearful of somehow being labelled homophobic, a description which instantly stifles all good and honest conversation.

Please, please, sisters and brothers, at all costs, remember we are taking about real people. Also that we have an awesome responsibility to teach the faith and to pastor the flock.

Finally, wherever we stand on these matters today, I believe there are some central Gospel truths we can all gather round:

- Firstly, that together we believe that all human beings are created equally in the image of God;
- and that all of us are sinners, in which that divine image is marred, and are therefore capable of being wrong;
- yet in Christ we know ourselves to be ‘ransomed, healed, restored, forgiven’;
- that we agree that our churches should welcome everyone, regardless of race, gender, ability, or sexuality;
- that actual homophobia or self-righteousness has no place within the Kingdom of God;
- and that our churches are to be places of prayer and schools of Christian discipleship.

That is not in any way to minimise our differences, but it is to remind us of the shared context in which our conversations take place as the LLF resources are used across the diocese. So many have invested so much in LLF in time, energy, research, and preparation. So many have invested their personal hopes in this process across the whole spectrum of viewpoints and aspirations. It is essential that at the very least we must all respect that, whatever the Church of England decides on matters of sexual ethics beyond this listening and learning process.

+Peter Barking 02/03/21
DIOCESAN SYNOD

Title: QUINQUENNIAL INSPECTION SCHEME
Author: HEAD OF SERVICE DELIVERY
Date: 20 MARCH 2021

1. INTRODUCTION

The Church of England (Miscellaneous Provisions) Measure 2019 made amendments to the Ecclesiastical Jurisdiction and Care of Churches Measure 2018 which are now in force. This requires Diocesan Synods to approve a new Scheme relating to Quinquennial Inspections.

2. CHANGES MADE BY THE MEASURE

The Measure amended the 2018 Measure with the principal effect being that instead of the diocesan synod being required to make provision by scheme for the appointment of persons approved by the diocesan advisory committee to inspect churches in the diocese, the diocesan scheme is to provide for the parochial church council of each parish to appoint a person to inspect its church(es) and to make a report.

It places a responsibility on the PCC to consult the Diocesan Advisory Committee before making the appointment and the PCC must be satisfied that the person to be appointed has the necessary qualifications and experience. A copy of the inspection report must be sent to the archdeacon, the PCC, the incumbent and the DAC secretary. Equivalent provision was also made in relation to non-parochial buildings that have been opted-in to the faculty jurisdiction.

In exercising their functions under the diocesan inspection scheme, PCCs, managers of opted in buildings and DACs must have regard to any guidance issued by the Church Buildings Council. This guidance had been published and can be viewed on this web page https://www.churchofengland.org/more/church-resources/churchcare/advice-and-guidance-church-buildings/quinquennial-inspections

3. PROPOSED SCHEME

The National Church’s Church Buildings Council have helpfully provided a template scheme for Diocesan Synods to approve. The proposed scheme for this Diocese follows the template very closely with the exception of some tweaks, suggested by the Diocesan Registrar, and in reflection of the fact that this Diocese does pay the fee on behalf of the PCCs.

Should the Synod approve this scheme it will be circulated to the PCCs in the Diocese along with the guidance prepared by the Church Buildings Council.
4. RECOMMENDATION

That the Diocesan Synod APPROVE the motion that:

‘This Synod, in accordance with the Ecclesiastical Jurisdiction and Care of Churches Measure 2018 as amended by the Church of England (Miscellaneous Provisions) (No.2) Measure 2019, approve the Diocesan Quinquennial Inspection Scheme as set out in paper DS(2021)04.’
Diocese of Chelmsford: Quinquennial Inspection Scheme

INTRODUCTION

Under the provisions of the Ecclesiastical Jurisdiction and Care of Churches Measure 2018, as amended by the Church of England (Miscellaneous Provisions) (No.2) Measure 2019, referred to hereafter as “the Measure”, all parish churches in the Diocese, all other consecrated churches and chapels including licenced places of worship opted in under paras 38 to 44 of the Measure (previously the Care of Places of Worship Measure 1999), and buildings licensed for public worship, must be inspected at least once in any five-year period.

The Diocesan Scheme which follows should be studied carefully with the relevant guidance documents from the Church Buildings Council (“the CBC”).

THE DIOCESAN SCHEME

1 This scheme was established by the Diocesan Synod by a resolution of 20 March 2021 and it supersedes all previous schemes. It comes into operation on 1 April 2021.

2 The Scheme shall be administered through the Diocesan Advisory Committee (the DAC). All correspondence concerning matters dealt with under the Scheme should be addressed to the DAC Secretary.

3 In support of Parochial Church Councils (PCCs) within the Diocese, the Chelmsford Diocesan Board of Finance will make payment from its general fund of a prescribed fee for the Quinquennial Inspections. The relevant PCC will be directly responsible itself for any costs incurred in excess of the prescribed fee. The prescribed fee is set by the DBF and reviewed on a regular basis. (For information on the current fee level, please contact the DAC Secretary.) The PCC must ensure that the inspector is aware of the current rate of the prescribed fee prior to entering into any contract for the inspection.

4 Nothing in this Scheme affects the legal responsibility of every PCC for the proper care of each church under its authority, and its duty to apply for a Faculty or for permission under Schedule 1 of the Faculty Jurisdiction Rules 2015 (as amended from time to time) before any work is commissioned.

5 All parish churches in the Diocese, as well as all other consecrated churches and chapels and buildings licensed for public worship, which are required to be inspected under The Measure, shall be inspected at least once in any five-year period ("the Quinquennial Inspection") under this Scheme. For the avoidance of doubt, where a Quinquennial Inspection has taken place under a previous Diocesan Scheme the five-year period shall commence from the date of that previous report.

The scope and contents of the report

6 The Quinquennial Inspection shall be completed in accordance with the current guidance of the CBC. There is an interactive report template within the Church Heritage Record entry for each church. The DAC recommends that this template is used, although reports submitted in a similar digital format which is compliant with the Scheme and the accompanying CBC guidance will be accepted.
The structure and content of the Quinquennial Inspection Report shall follow the recommendations set out in the CBC guidance.

The report shall summarise the works needed in the following categories:

1 - Urgent, requiring immediate attention
2 - Requires attention within 12 months
3 - Requires attention within the next 12 – 24 months
4 - Requires attention within the quinquennial period
5 - A desirable improvement with no timescale (as agreed with the PCC)

Any routine items of maintenance (including repairs) within these timescales may fall under Schedule 1 of the Faculty Jurisdiction Rules, ie under List A or B, and the Inspector must indicate if he/she considers this to be the case. All other matters will require faculty permission.

Broad indicative costs within the bands set out in the CBC guidance and template for all such works will be given, to enable the PCC to understand the level of funding which is likely to be necessary. When considering executing such works, PCCs may need to get accurate costings from a Quantity Surveyor.

Appointing and reviewing the Inspector

Advice on appointing a new inspecting professional can be found in the CBC Guidance. The DAC Secretary holds a register with details of current Quinquennial Inspectors within the diocese and can offer advice on the appointment process. A suitably experienced and where appropriate accredited professional who is not presently on the register can be employed as a Quinquennial Inspector, but the PCC must seek and have regard to the advice of the DAC before making such an appointment.

The DAC strongly encourages parishes to periodically review the appointment of their Quinquennial Inspector in a competitive tendering process, and the most appropriate time would be when the next inspection is due. Reviewing the appointment does not imply that the PCC must change their inspector, but offers the opportunity to reflect on whether the PCC is receiving good quality service and best value, and has a good relationship with the inspector.

Many parishes find that there is advantage in renewing an appointment, as an ongoing relationship with an experienced inspector who fully understands the building and its ongoing needs, and has a good relationship with the PCC and Churchwardens, is invaluable.

Appointing for project work recommended in the report

It is for the PCC to decide who to commission to undertake any project work identified in the report, for which a separate agreement would be needed. If the PCC wishes to carry out any publicly funded works which require tendering (over £10,000) under the supervision of the Inspector it will need to be able to demonstrate that the Inspector was appointed or re-appointed within the last 5 years through a competitive tendering process.
Duties and responsibilities of the PCC, Inspector, DAC and Archdeacon

14 All Quinquennial Inspectors shall be responsible for entering into and maintaining adequate and appropriate Professional Indemnity Insurance cover, and shall provide written evidence thereof.

15 A person who is appointed as a Quinquennial Inspector shall enter into agreement with the PCC of the church (or body acting on their behalf) which they are to inspect. The DAC Secretary can provide advice if requested.

16 Agreement of the fee to be charged, including the preparation and issue of the report shall be included in the contract between the PCC (the client) and the Quinquennial Inspector (the service provider) before the inspection takes place. If the inspection necessitates additional professional services, access provision, or work which necessitates a higher fee, additional contracts or a variation must be entered into by the PCC beforehand.

17 Within three months of making the inspection, the Quinquennial Inspector shall send copies of the report in paper and digital format to the relevant Archdeacon, the PCC of the parish in which the church is situated, the Incumbent or Priest in Charge, and to the DAC Secretary. The report will be uploaded to the Church Heritage Record, if it has not been compiled on the template there.

18 The DAC Secretary is responsible, as per the Measure, for keeping a register of those buildings which are covered by the Scheme, containing details of the current Quinquennial Inspector and dates of inspection. The PCC Secretary shall inform the DAC Secretary of the date of the inspection. If the PCC finds it difficult to agree a date with the Quinquennial Inspector they should consult the DAC Secretary who will offer support.

19 Nothing in this Scheme shall affect the powers of an Archdeacon to ensure the inspection of every church in their archdeaconry once in five years, as laid down in the Measure.

20 In order to provide for the cost of inspections and therein recommended works, every PCC should budget for the report and fabric repairs. They should not, however, use the report as a specification for such works.

Interpretation and Amendment of the Scheme

21 Any questions which arise concerning the interpretation of this Scheme shall be referred to the Registrar, whose decision shall be binding.

22 This Scheme shall be subject to amendment only by means of a formal motion, presented after due notice to the Diocesan Synod, and approved by it.
This paper summarises the business of the Bishop’s Council since the report circulated to the November Synod meeting.

**December 2020**

**Bishop’s Council**
- Approved a motion regarding the improvement and monitoring of commitment in this Diocese to the Five Guiding Principles and Mutual Flourishing.
- Agreed to recommend a scheme for Quinquennial Inspections to the Diocesan Synod.

**DMPC**
- Agreed to recommend the closure of the church of St Mary the Virgin, Little Wakering to the Church Commissioners.

**Finance Committee**
- Approved the auditors’ remuneration for 2020.
- Approved the disposal of St Nicholas’ churchyard in Colchester.
- Approved a grant of £50,000 to support the Retreat House during the ongoing restrictions caused by the pandemic.
- Approved the redesignation of the Mission Opportunity Fund and Closed Churches designated funds to support the general fund.
- Received a verbal update on the process for the 2021 parish share communications and the outline plan for a review of the share scheme.

**February 2021**

**Bishop’s Council**
- Received an update on St Mark’s College and approved the continuance of scoping work on the potential future use of the site by the St Mark’s Project Team.
- Received a verbal update on senior CDBF staff appointments.

**DMPC**
- Agreed to recommend the closure of the church of St Mary in Sturmer to the Church Commissioners.
- Agreed to the appointment of an interim minister to the benefice of Burnham on Crouch.
Finance Committee

- Approved the revised CDBF risk register and agreed to hold an additional review of it in six months, with a review from scratch next year.
- Agreed to add Michaela Southworth (CDBF Finance Director) to the bank mandate.
- Approved a proposal from the Chair of the Houses Committee to look into and segment the CDBF's housing portfolio to better inform use of resources.
- Approved a proposal to sell eleven curates' houses when they become vacant and to purchase a new house for a curate in Stanway.
- Approved a proposal for the review of the parish share scheme.
- Received an update on the CDBF IT infrastructure improvement project.

Synod is asked to NOTE this report.